

15. Meeting on May 17, 2008

Opening remarks by Nicolai Viktorovich Levashov



Good afternoon to everyone present here who found the time to come. I hope that, as much as possible, I will be able to answer the questions you have, although I am not sure that my answers will satisfy all of you. At the very least, I will say what I think on this matter.

Before moving on to the questions, I would like to make an introductory remark about how reactions are currently being handled. In general, the enemies have mostly adopted what is probably the most correct tactic: everything is simply being ignored. That is, as if nothing is happening, nothing exists, and nothing can exist.

However, among the not very intelligent enemies, there are those who act and try to act foolishly. You see, when there is an enemy whom one can respect, it is not shameful to engage with them in some way. But when the enemies are fools, it simply becomes laughable to observe what they have done — and what they have failed to do.

If someone has read my article “Blessed Are the Poor in Spirit,” you may remember that I changed the radius after certain attacks. I like to say: the deeper you go into the forest, the more firewood there is; the further a fool goes, the more he shows that he is a fool. The same thing applies here.

After that, another article appeared from the same comrades who tried to continue their efforts — but you can congratulate me, I have already been promoted in rank. I have now been declared a false prophet. Well, imagine that. And it’s interesting what they’ll promote me to next — probably they’ll turn me straight into the Antichrist, right? Immediately into the Antichrist. Of course, it’s funny.

But the essence of the matter is this: when I was practicing, the person wrote the first article without even signing it. Then they decided to act more cleverly and signed it. Only the surname they signed with

does not exist — that is, it is a fictitious surname. They decided, then, to publish an anonymous article but still sign it.

I specifically gave an assignment to check whether such a journalist actually exists at all — with a real surname, under a pseudonym, and so on. You know that if a journalist writes under a pseudonym — which is a completely normal practice — all of this is officially registered, and the journalist is known at least within the editorial office where they work.

The surname and the name under which the article was signed — there was no such journalist, and there is none. That's how amusing it is. You see, if you want to carry a pure word, why do you begin your activity with lies and fabrications? To be such fools is simply a gift, I would say, from God — although there is no God, you understand?

But the funniest thing is that it's not only in that article that they try to label this as a sect. What we are doing with you is supposedly a sect. Simply because it carries knowledge — it is already a sect. I deliberately asked for, and was deliberately given, not my own definition of a sect, but the definition that exists in all classical and academic reference works, in order to clearly clarify what a sect is: a teaching, movement, school, religious group, or community that has split off from a dominant church; in a figurative sense — a group of people closed within their narrow interests.

The question is: split off from which dominant church? Excuse me, I have always been an atheist, even in Soviet times, and I became even more of an atheist after I learned more. So, does that mean atheism is a sect? If it is a sect, then it must have split off from someone — but the Christian church is something else, and so on. Not bad, right?

You see, they could at least approach the issue competently. If you want to criticize or pour dirt on someone, at least do it competently. Find points where something can actually be falsified — because this is just outright stupidity. It really is that ridiculous.

After that, I could go on to read you a whole series of other definitions from explanatory dictionaries — Dahl, Ushakov, Efremova. And everywhere, everywhere, it is defined as a religious community. And enlightenment through knowledge, on the contrary, leaves no room for...

I could honestly compare religion and modern science, because it is based on postulates that no one has ever explained or justified. That is, the postulates were introduced and then forgotten as having been introduced, and everything just continued to move forward. As a result, hundreds of postulates now lie on the table. In that sense, science can be called a religion, because there are things in it that are accepted on **FAITH**. A postulate is precisely something that is accepted without proof.

Here, on the contrary, I help people understand and give them enlightenment through knowledge, so that a person understands what is being put into their head. So that they do not perceive what is given to them blindly, not on faith, but so that it truly passes through the person, and the person begins to feel and understand every nuance, every subtle movement — how to live, the understanding of why, for what purpose, and how. Why is this being done — can anyone say why this is being done?

There is only one reason: because with regard to sects, a negative public opinion has been created — and in most cases quite rightly so. And therefore, when a label is attached — “sect” — they thereby try

to immediately predispose people negatively. Even without explaining why it is supposedly a sect. This trick might seem reasonable to me if I were talking about some religion, some form, or something else — they could apply it then. But in this case, it is complete nonsense. Nevertheless, for some poorly educated people...

As I often say and repeat, our ancestors always distinguished between two concepts: **ignorance** and **willful ignorance**. Ignorance is when a person did not have the opportunity to obtain certain information — that is forgivable. Willful ignorance is when a person has such an opportunity, is able to gain understanding, but does not want to.

In this case, both factors are present among people: ignorance — which is forgivable — and willful ignorance — which, in my view, is unforgivable. Therefore, such attacks, in principle, only help to expose things more clearly.

Those articles that have already appeared are not particularly important to me. Let people read that article more, and then start publishing responses — then more people will understand how, what, and why. Because they are simply trying to discredit. There is nothing in my work that can be used as a basis for attack — there is nothing to latch onto, they have no compromising material on me and cannot have any. All they can do is resort to general phrases and the like. However, I think they will achieve very little.

And you know what the funniest thing is? I have heard more than once about people who join the Movement. Many people have no idea what the Movement actually is, and once they understand that it is not just nonsense or something I arbitrarily wanted to do, but that there is a real explanation of why things are the way they are, they stop drinking, stop smoking, begin to lead a healthy lifestyle, and so on and so forth.

You know what happens to some of them — and you have heard this more than once. People say to them, not to me but to others: “You don’t drink?” “And you don’t smoke?” “Ah, then you’ve definitely joined a sect.” It’s ridiculous. Especially when this happens within families, and even more so when people start giving ancient names — then it’s absolutely certain, and all sorts of things begin to happen. It turns into complete nonsense.

For example, I myself have never drunk or smoked. Does that mean I have been in a sect since childhood? Do you understand? This is the kind of thinking that has been imposed on people. Unfortunately, it is laughter through tears, because such a reaction — that if a person stops drinking and smoking, then they are already a sectarian — is not accidental at all.

Although I can say the following: isn’t it strange that if a person drinks and smokes and goes to church, that is considered normal? Because people drink and smoke in church? Yet, in theory, church figures should be the very first not to drink or smoke at all, because according to their own concepts both alcohol and nicotine are devilish poisons, and in the past churchmen fought against them very harshly — right?

But now many church figures themselves “never sober up,” so to speak. Not to mention the other parishioners. That is, they should be the ones promoting health among people, not creating more problems than already exist. Yet they strive to do exactly the opposite as well.

What is most frightening is that this very Orthodox Church, which speaks about the revival of spiritual culture — you know that it received an interest-free, duty-free license to purchase alcohol and nicotine, and that the main flows of alcohol and nicotine from abroad, and not only from abroad, passed through the Church, and the Church made money from this.

The question is: how can an institution that, in theory, should be thinking about people, about the soul, about preserving it — speaking in church terms, about preventing a person from falling into the hands of the devil — profit from selling precisely these instruments of the devil, nicotine and alcohol, to its own parishioners, so that they do fall into the hands of the devil? A paradox, isn't it?

And most importantly, the very same people who go to church know about this and still continue to believe that those who call themselves servants of God cannot, in principle, have anything to do with this — despite the fact that by such actions alone, not to mention others, they discredit themselves. So yes, this is a curious point — but it belongs precisely to this category.

But now, I think the introductory part has been brief enough — there's no need to spend any more time on various nonsense, right? Let us move on to the questions that were already sent to me before the talk, and I will also try to answer those who wish to speak from the audience. So, I will try to answer the questions as fully as possible.

What I can say is that while answering, I try to focus on questions that should be of interest to the majority of people. Because there are questions that are often of interest to just one person. I understand that they may be very important and necessary for that individual, but since we are not having a one-on-one conversation here and a large number of people have gathered, I must answer what may be interesting to most of those present.

Therefore, if I do not answer some questions, it is either because there was not enough time or for this reason. Please do not take offense. All right?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

15.1. QUESTION: *A question regarding water: how can it be made structured and beneficial?*

ANSWER: Structuring water — first of all, every person, with a certain level of understanding, can use their own potential to do something positive in this regard. That is, all of this can be done, and quite successfully.

For example, you take the water you intend to drink, place it between your hands, and imagine that a flow of energy is passing through your hands. It does not matter whether you feel it or not — the brain gives a command, to a greater or lesser degree for each person. Tune yourself to the idea that this water is being purified.

That is, imagine that everything negative and harmful to your body is being broken down. Even if this is not 100 percent effective, if even 10–15 percent of the negative is removed and the water is structured by you yourself, it will in any case be more beneficial than water drunk straight from the tap, or even from the same transparent bottles. Although bottled water is, of course, better than tap water — but still. That is the first point regarding water.

As for the structure of the water that I make, for example, I can say the following. Even during the same health-improving session — both the first and the second — if you turn on the session and place water nearby while watching, it will also acquire a certain structure. It will likewise have a positive effect, already from within you.

Other options — making it specifically for a particular person — would require me to do it for that specific individual. That is, I would have to work directly: take the water, take a photograph of the person, scan them, fully visualize what they need, and place it into the appropriate “compartment.” So, nothing happens by itself, you understand? I want to clarify this a bit so that it is clear: someone takes it and thinks, “I can do it the same way.” Of course you can. But do you know why there is a slight difference?

The difference is that when I structure water for a specific person, I first scan that person. I get an understanding of what problems the person has. After that, I work out a strategy — how and what needs to be done to bring this person into balance and make them healthy. Then I create an appropriate program, which I simply attach to — imprint onto — the water, and the water becomes a carrier. When a person drinks it, together with the water they consume, this entire health-improving program goes inside the person and produces its effect. And outwardly it looks like it’s just — once, and it’s done.

Therefore, charging water is simple — if you know how to do it and understand why, for what purpose, and to what end. The process itself, so to speak, does not rely on the hands; it is the brain that works. The hands are merely a conductor. I can do the same thing without moving my hands at all. If I did not move my hands whatsoever, everything would already be charged, right? But then people would ask, “So what did you do?”

People’s emotions need to be calmed; sometimes it is necessary to cover the water with a hand, and so on. Moreover, it is a bit inconvenient otherwise — why? Because when I work, for example, with my hand, I should not charge the entire surrounding space — only the water. So, I hope that today I have given a more or less comprehensive and sufficient answer regarding water. I hope it is now clear to those who wish to obtain such water what can be obtained and how.

15.2. QUESTION: *If one were to kill Koschei, would that be considered a sin or not?*

ANSWER: This is, in principle, a very good question. In any case, killing is always an extreme measure, and whenever it is possible to avoid it, one should always do so. The point is that everything depends on what capabilities the person acting against Koschei has.

I have always given my students and listeners the following position. If someone has already heard it, I will repeat it; if not, they will hear it for the first time. People come to these meetings who have attended more than once, and new people also come, so it is always necessary to repeat the material. As the saying goes, repetition is the mother of learning.

So, I always said the following. Suppose you have a rifle with a telescopic sight, and you are out of reach. And you see a madman who has grabbed a machine gun and is firing in all directions, mowing people down like grass with a scythe. What are your actions? And people begin to pontificate: “You know, killing is a bad thing; we must explain to this person so that he understands that killing is wrong...,” and so on and so forth.

Yes, but while you are explaining it to him, he will be pulling the trigger, and every minute there will be ten deaths. So, what will you do? "Well, how can that be?" And to whom are you going to explain — to the person? Excuse me, but the person is not present in that body at that moment. Because most psychos — maniacs — who kill have mental disorders. Most often this is connected with the fact that the physical body of a person is seized by the essence of an extinct animal, which acts by using the human body in order to obtain food for itself — that is, it kills and through this gains potential for its nourishment. Therefore, explaining to the monster sitting inside a human body that killing is bad is useless. That is its principle of life. Explaining or not explaining — it is useless.

So, if you have nothing at your disposal except a rifle with a telescopic sight, then you must kill the madman — in this case, Koschei or simply a madman, it makes no difference, right? It is all the same thing. And not because it is good, but because it is the only option to prevent far more victims. That is, you save hundreds of people by killing one madman. This is bad — no one considers it good — but it is an inevitable evil.

But that is if you have a rifle with a scope. And what if, for example, you already have the ability to influence and know how to affect a person's muscle so that they cannot pull the trigger? In that case, they would stop killing people, orderlies would arrive with a straitjacket, put it on them, and take them away... But in any case, this influence blocks movement — it is also violence. Of course, it is not killing, but it is still violence.

And then the person is locked away in a psychiatric institution — until the next moment. For good behavior, they are released, and they begin committing murders again. That is, as long as the cause exists, as long as this monster seizes a particular person, the situation will continue. Therefore, simply leaving it as it is would also be wrong.

But if you understand that you can not only stop the pulling of the trigger — if you understand that at that moment the human Essence is not present in the human body, and that a monster is sitting there — and if you understand and know how to do it, then the next level of influence is to remove this monster from the body and return the human Essence back.

After all, the insane — especially those who are violent — when they come back to their senses, remember very little. They truly remember nothing, because they were not there. It is like this: you hang your jacket on a chair and leave; someone else takes the jacket, puts it on, comes in wearing it, kills people, then comes back and hangs it on the back of the chair again. You return, put on the jacket, and are told: "You killed people." And you do not understand anything, because you did not kill anyone. And you would be right.

So why can a monster jump into one body but not into another? The point is that there are certain damages in the person into whom it jumps — an open defense, an open door — and this gives the monster the opportunity, when the human Essence leaves the body, to jump into it. Therefore, driving the monster out of the body is not enough; it is necessary to restore both the body and the human Essence in such a way that no monster will have the opportunity to jump into it again in the future.

But suppose you helped, stopped the killing, and stopped the monster from entering that person. The monster is still hungry, right? One door has closed, so it will begin to roam, searching for another door. Unfortunately, such doors are not so rare. Therefore, driving the monster from one place to another

does not fundamentally solve the problem — it only does so temporarily, which is also very good, if you understand all of this.

The next level of the task is to take the monster, extract it, and neutralize it — that is, to put it into a kind of prison, so to speak, into a system from which it will no longer be able to escape or jump into other “doors.” This is already a different level of work.

But an escape is possible from any prison. After all, there is no eternal prison, and monsters also have a certain kind of intelligence and accumulated tricks, and they can escape from prison. And if they do escape, they will do the same things again. Therefore, in this case, in order truly to prevent this altogether, it is necessary to completely neutralize this monster — to make it cease to exist entirely. A parasite must be destroyed, right?

In any case, through your actions you will already do harm to that parasite, because its essence will be unwound to zero, and it will cease to exist. But one monster is just one monster — and there are not just one, right? There are thousands, tens of thousands, millions of such beings of different levels. That means something must be done with the entire system.

What I want to say is this: actions, in my view, must always be taken. And actions must always be appropriate to the situation. That is, each person must act in the given moment, without waiting until... as some Indians believe — that I have no right to interfere in what is happening because I must first “grow,” and then, when I have grown enough, I will have the right and only then will I intervene.

The question is: how can one grow if one does nothing? Sit by the sea waiting for the weather to change? There will be no growth that way. It is precisely during action that a qualitative change of the person occurs, and they move either forward or backward, depending on how and what they do. Therefore, it is very important here to understand what truly exists.

But in any case, even the killing of anyone — even Koschei — although positive in the sense of benefiting everyone else, still carries a certain negative aspect. What is very important, however, is the consequence of that action, and that depends on the inner state of the person who performs it. If a person enters a state of hatred or rage — no matter how “noble” that rage may seem — destruction of the Essence immediately begins, and the consequences of such an action are very serious, even if the rage is noble and justified.

Therefore, even when a person acts, they must not act through rage or hatred. They must be in a completely different state of spirit, understanding that this action is an inevitable evil. One must not enter what I call the “state of killing,” but act in a fundamentally different way — and then the consequences will still exist, but they will be far less severe.

And one more point. Naturally, the consequences are very different for people who are at different evolutionary levels. Conditionally speaking, if a person has ten evolutionary units, and killing takes away five units, then by committing a killing they lose five units and are left with five. But if a person has one hundred evolutionary units, they lose the same five units — but five out of one hundred leaves ninety-five, so the consequences are much less significant. And if, say, there are a thousand or a million evolutionary units, then of course five units still have an effect, but not nearly as substantially.

And one more thing I wanted to say: when an action such as destruction becomes necessary, it is still preferable not to resort to it, because there are other methods. Unfortunately, very few people are capable of using them — methods where one can allow the same opponent to attack. I usually call this “unwinding to the point of distortion,” that is, evolutionarily unwinding a being to the point where it turned in the wrong direction, returning it to the point of distortion, restoring it there, blocking the possibility of moving along that wrong path, and giving it the opportunity to move forward again from there — to give it a second chance. That is the most correct approach, but unfortunately very few people possess this method.

Therefore, it is difficult to recommend a method of action, because if it is done incorrectly, you yourself may suffer. But in any case, speaking for myself, I would take responsibility and, in any situation, would act exactly as I have described — from the rifle with a telescopic sight all the way to this last method. Not because I speak well about it, but because one must do it oneself. And that is exactly how I acted.

What else — what additional methods exist that can minimize the consequences of a certain negative action? Again, they require a certain level of understanding and knowledge on the part of the person. For example, when you are forced to stop a madman and still have to use a rifle with a telescopic sight — that is, you have destroyed a life. In this situation, it is still possible to compensate for what happened if the human Essence had bodily damage due to multiple distortions from previous lives. These distortions — I call them karma — made it possible for the “door” to be open and for parasites to jump in.

So, if you did end up using the rifle, then the only way to minimize the consequences of destroying Koschei, so to speak, is to take the Essence of that person and work through their karma for them: remove the consequences of mistakes from previous lives and guide them evolutionarily as if the person had actually developed correctly, compensating for the loss of life.

If you do this in such a way, then in principle you reduce the karma to zero, and there will be no consequences for you from such an action. But again, the consequences of your actions depend on what you know, how you know it, and what you are capable of. Nevertheless, waiting passively “by the sea for the weather” is wrong. If someone is killing, raping, or abusing others before your eyes, waiting until you “grow” enough to use another method in order to prevent the crime — that, in my view, would itself be a crime. If a person stands aside and does not even try to do what they are capable of doing. This is my position. It does not mean that it must be yours — but this is how I understand it.

15.3. QUESTION: *Plants, animals, and people have Essences. Do planets have Essences as well, and does our Midgard-Earth have one? And if not, what are the stages of its evolutionary development?*

ANSWER: There are many different ideas claiming that a planet is alive, that it has an Essence, that it possesses intelligence, and so on. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Yes, a planet is alive — but not in the way it is usually understood. Intelligence, as such, does not exist in the planet itself, at least as far as I know. This is certainly true of our planet, and of many others.

This is a long conversation, but if we speak specifically about our planet, many people are confused on this point. And in this respect, blame also lies with what I would call the imposed — and false — philosophy of Hegel, with his “Absolute Idea.” According to this view, every person is a little cell of the Absolute Idea, of Reason; each person is like a neuron that merges together, forming a collective mind

that governs everything, and so on. He somewhat confused humans with ants — we are, after all, a little different from ants, at least in terms of the number of limbs. (Laughter.) We have fewer limbs. I don't know whether that's better or worse — but fewer.

You see, there is also the concept of a planetary egregore, if you've heard of it. And again, the idea is that the egregore unites and governs. Nothing of the sort! The only egregore that truly governs and directs is the Black egregore. That is, there are certain Black Hierarchs who collect potential from people — and not only from people — and direct it toward turning people into slaves. In any case, none of this happens by itself.

But you might say: does this mean it does not exist at all? It does exist — but not quite in the way it is usually understood. Let us put it this way: there are two people; one person changes their structure, their concepts, their position, their viewpoint. Two people think in the same way — yes, a resonance appears; three people as well. Zoning is created; they create a field.

It is like taking one magnet — strong enough up to a certain scale. But if there are two magnets, three, four, five, ten, all being together in resonance, they begin to influence more strongly. But not because some common super-magnet appears above them that controls all the small magnets — this does not happen. What happens is the accumulation of quality, that is, a resonance of quality that unites, like small magnets; it accumulates, and the power of the field grows. The same thing happens here. That is all. And that is what an egregore is.

Yes, indeed, the more thinking people there are who resonate with the same thing, the greater the influence — both on themselves and on those around them. But again, not because some super-entity arises that can control the smaller ones. This distinction must be clearly understood. That is what is called an egregore — when people unite around shared positions. But that does not mean that a collective mind arises which controls these people.

This is a positive phenomenon — but not in the way it is often presented. It is presented that way by dark forces, who thereby make people act in such a way that they give up their potential to the “dark ones.” And the dark ones then use it against the very people from whom they take it. That is the general outline, because going much deeper would take many hours. For now, these are just sketches to give you an overall understanding.

15.4. QUESTION: *Please explain the concept of dimensionality. How and with what can this concept be associated in order to understand it more deeply? I would like to clarify where the coefficients of dimensionality come from, and whether they are present in your thesis, in the category of the electric field.*

ANSWER: No. This is not in my thesis. My thesis was on the topic of the passage of an electron beam through the boundary of vacuum — the vacuum medium. It has nothing in common with what we are talking about here. Although processes occur there as well, similar in some sense. But at that time, I did not raise this question, because my task was entirely different.

So, what is dimensionality? Dimensionality is a concept that I am forced to use within my three-dimensional space. Yes, everyone says: three-dimensional space, right? But for some reason no one asks

— what about time? Immediately, time is added as well. Time was invented as a fourth dimension. Although time is a conditional unit and, in principle, does not exist. It is a concept introduced by man.

To make this clearer: our ancestors had nine months in a year of forty days each, sixteen hours in a day, and nine days in a week. Now the entire world uses the same standardized system. And whether you count how many hours — sixty minutes each — or whether you count sixteen hours, you will get a completely different number of minutes if you recalculate through minutes. This is a conditional unit introduced purely for convenience, nothing more. Therefore, it cannot be any additional dimension.

And I use the concept of dimensionality in order to build from what a person is accustomed to. A person is used to living in three-dimensional space, although this is not entirely true. I have already spoken about this, but I will remind you: if you have dived into seawater without goggles or a mask — are all objects there reachable? Yes. But the distances are distorted; that is, you cannot orient yourself accurately, because the perception of the surrounding world is completely different from what we have when looking through an air medium. Yet we are on the same planet, in the same three-dimensional space.

Remember the experiment from school: if you put a pencil into a glass of water, it appears bent. This experiment shows that the concept of three-dimensional space as it is usually applied is quite conditional and inaccurate. But in order to write about this, I need a foundation — not for myself, but for those who read — so that one can start from something familiar and then move further, in order to explain how things really are.

Therefore, when I speak about three-dimensional space or dimensionality, I am simply showing that yes, we exist in three dimensions — but not quite in the way it is usually understood. So, what is dimensionality, if we try to relate it to what we all have in three-dimensional space?

Here is a not very good, but illustrative example: take spheres of the same size but made of different materials and throw them into water — preferably seawater, because it is denser. What will happen? Each sphere will stop at a certain depth. If it is made of lead, it may sink all the way to the bottom; if the material is not very heavy, the sphere will stop at the depth where the external and internal forces balance each other — where the force of buoyancy and the force of gravity compensate one another.

And what does this actually mean? What stands behind the words “buoyant force?” We call it a buoyant force, as if it simply pushes things out by itself. But what is really behind it? What stands behind it is the fact that a specific form of matter has a specific structure. Simply put, it has certain properties, qualities, and states. A stable equilibrium arises when the sphere stops at the point where the properties and qualities inside the matter are identical to the properties and qualities outside. A balance is achieved. A stable equilibrium state arises, and the sphere remains in that place.

One could say that here lies the level of dimensionality of this particular material, of this particular sphere. And for each sphere, depending on its material, there will be its own level. The same applies to atoms — where an atom stops and remains.

For example, let us say the sphere has settled, stopped, and is oscillating slightly at a certain depth. If we take it and lift it above the surface and then let it go, it will again oscillate back and forth and then return and stop at the same place. This is clear to everyone. No matter how high you lift it, it will return — this

specific sphere. Any other sphere, naturally, will not behave this way. If we lift a sphere of a different density, it will fall to where there is correspondence with its internal qualities.

The concept of dimensionality, properly speaking, is when the space in which matter exists and the matter itself are in harmony and identity with each other — that is, when the internal state of matter correctly corresponds to the external space. This is what can be called the concept of the dimensionality of space.

That is why all matter in our space is arranged according to this principle, and that is why planets, atoms, and so on are formed. You are accustomed and adapted to the idea that we live in three-dimensional space, and we say “three-dimensional space,” but this is not entirely so — it is our brain that reproduces it this way. But if you understand what I have explained, then this will become clear to you.

Now regarding the quantization coefficient. If we take this topic from physics — what is quantization in physics? It is a distribution by quality. That is, when spheres of the same size but different density stop at different depths according to their internal qualities, they are distributed by qualities identical to one another. This results in the quantization of spheres by quality, by properties.

The same applies if we take seven different liquids of different densities that do not mix, color them differently, and pour them together. After some time, they will also arrange themselves in layers. The principle is the same, and this can be extended infinitely.

The coefficient of dimensional quantization introduces a small number simply because we have to start from the fact that we are accustomed to three-dimensional space. In principle, one could take a unit and introduce new units — coefficients 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on — but that would be inconvenient.

A person who is accustomed to believing that they live in three-dimensional space will say that such things are difficult to understand. In addition, different types of matter exist in our Universe, and each type of matter has its own principle of quantization. The same will be true in parallel Universes that exist alongside ours. They may be right next to us, but because they are created from fundamentally different matter and according to different principles, we do not perceive them. But that does not mean they do not exist.

In my book, I did not describe this in detail, because if I were to explain that millions of variants exist, people would probably become completely overwhelmed. Therefore, it is necessary to create a single foundation and then move forward from it simply and easily — if a person is not lazy.

Because there is resistance in the brain to information that forces change; the brain defends itself against change. And unfortunately, it does not matter whether the brain is defending something bad or incorrect — the brain does not think, it reacts. For the brain, any disruption of an existing system is dangerous, because it cannot determine whether this disruption will lead to imbalance or, on the contrary, restore it. There is a military saying: *first we shoot, then we talk*. The brain acts in exactly the same way — and there is a reason for that.

The same schizophrenia and other mental disorders in humans are caused by the brain being unable to cope with the information that has entered it. That is, the brain is unable to sort and organize the

incoming information, and inadequacy arises. The brain's defense mechanism is aimed at preventing the destruction of an already formed paradigm — regardless of whether it is correct or incorrect.

That is why, in this case, my information is built upon key positions that a person already knows. I try to start from those points and gradually lead the person toward understanding, step by step, so that there is no shock and no chaos in the mind. Therefore, a person simply needs to overcome themselves and make an effort to delve into the material. If they do so, everything will be quite clear and accessible. If they do not want to work — well, nothing can be done about it: free will is free will; salvation is for the saved. A person has the right — it is their personal choice.

But I can say the following. I have a special school for children, where I work with them and teach them from an early age. And children have no problems at all in perceiving information. They grasp it easily, quickly, and naturally, because there is nothing to break down. They do not have a false foundation that first has to be destroyed and then replaced with a new one. That is why, in my work with children and school students, several teachers teach my knowledge about the non-homogeneous Universe and related topics as extracurricular subjects. I have been told that children perceive this information exceptionally well — easily and quickly.

So, the issue is not that we adults are somehow bad, but that we were first indoctrinated, conditioned, taught not to think or reason; the brain was blocked. And now it needs to be unblocked, which requires time and effort — not only from my side, but from the person as well, who must also do a bit of work themselves.

15.5. QUESTION: *“It is known that, unlike people — namely white Slavic-Aryans — who, in addition to the physical body and the soul, also have a spirit, creatures (i.e., created beings) have only a body and a soul and lack a spirit. Therefore, the Judeo-Christian assertion applies to them that they live only once. Does this mean that a child born in a marriage between a human and a female creature will not have a spirit? And if subsequent generations intermarry only among themselves, can ‘bad blood’ dissolve over some number of generations so that an immortal spirit begins to incarnate and be born again? Could you describe this mechanism in detail?”*

ANSWER: It is evident that the person asking this question is influenced by not entirely correct notions. First of all, I do not separate the soul and the spirit. The spirit is simply a property of the soul. When we speak of more developed people who possess “strength of spirit,” this means they are developed and have principles and positions. It does not mean that they are immortal while everyone else is mortal — i.e., that some die and others live forever.

The point is that the so-called “immortal” soul exists even in plants, in viruses, and so on — so long as it is not deliberately destroyed by someone. A soul, an essence, can also be destroyed, unfortunately. Until someone destroys it, it exists. Therefore, the position that there are people who were “created” and thus lack a soul or spirit, while others have an immortal soul and still others a mortal soul, is an incorrect position.

Once I had to prove the opposite. I think that in this case it does not really matter which side one proves. Among my students there was a woman — a rabbi — and when I began explaining things about Moses and the like, she naturally disliked it very much. “Why are you saying this?” she asked. “Excuse me,” I replied, “I am only giving examples from the Torah and the Old Testament; I am not inventing

anything. Find at least one example of an action by that same Moses, the messiah, where he did good — other than death, destruction, and devastation. There is not a single such fact there, at least from my point of view. If he is a messiah, then he is clearly not of the light forces in any case.”

After that I said to her, “Okay, you say that you are Jewish.” She said “Yes.” But what was good was that she was quite sensitive and had already gone through a certain transformation. I said: “So that you do not say that I imposed something on you or influenced you in some way, I suggest that when you go home, you look at all your past lives — who you were.” She said: “Okay.”

The next time she came back completely disoriented — rather, shocked by her disorientation — and said: “You know, I looked at my past incarnations. In one I was in Africa, a Papuan, as I would roughly put it; in another I was an Eskimo; in a third I was in Russia, at my own grave — then I was a man.” And the name for her was something like Vyach... Vyache... something like Vya. I said, “Vyacheslav?” “Yes, Vyacheslav was written on the grave. Is that a Russian name?” “Yes, it is.” “Do you understand? And now tell me—who are you now? A Papuan, an Eskimo woman, a Russian, or a Jew? After all, the physical body, genetics—this is only clothing.”

Yes, genetics is a construction material, a foundation that is very important — but the basis of everything is the **Essence**, which always enters genetics that is identical to itself; that is, it will not enter genetics of a different quality. There are cases when this happens, but these are exceptions to the rule. In general, at the moment of conception, an Essence enters. For those who want to study this in detail, an entire spectrum of rules that influence the level of the Essence entering at the moment of conception is described in the book *“The Last Appeal to Humanity.”*

You see, the Essence is the main thing — the one that is inside. Yes, genetics, upbringing, and the so-called idiotic notions that are hammered into people — such as how Jews are supposedly to be treated — are important, because they block human development and obscure the correct direction.

But if someone shouts today that they are a “pure-blooded Russian,” well, that may be so — yet in a past life they could have been a rabbi, for example. And what then — should they be beaten for that as well? Because their Essence was a rabbi — should they be beaten in the face for that too? We must fight the system of social parasites.

I often give an example that is quite interesting, because in the Gospel of Matthew there are words where a Canaanite woman asks Christ to rise, go, and help her daughter, and he replies that *I am sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*. Do you remember this phrase? *Only* to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. These are specific people, you understand?

That is, it clearly follows from this phrase that he came — the messiah, who actually lived about two thousand years ago, not as Christianity deceptively presents it — in order to free the Jews, precisely to free them from the slavery imposed by social parasites, which had seized them, which the god Yahweh had imposed, you understand? And, so to speak, fed them illusions about their exclusivity and chosenness. This tactic, by the way, was very skillfully chosen, because small nations often live with a certain inferiority complex, you understand? And everything that forced them in the past to bend the truth a little in order to survive naturally instilled such a complex.

So, it was calculated very precisely that a small people, whose inferiority complex was especially pronounced because they had been punished and expelled for their deeds, would be fertile ground. And social parasites chose them. And Christ says that he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel — that he came to free them from enslavement by social parasites.

As I always say, fine — if the god Yahweh came from outside, for example from another planet, and said: “I have chosen you as the chosen people.” There is a good joke that illustrates this — I don’t remember it word for word, but the essence is this: aliens arrive on planet Earth, meet a modern human and say, “Thank God we don’t have to fool you by saying that we are gods and so on. You understand that other civilizations exist, and so forth.” The person listens and then says: “And now tell me — what kind of nonsense are you going to feed me instead?” The same thing applies here.

Christ’s task was precisely to free that people from the obscurantism that had been imposed on them by social parasites who came from outside. So, if something like that were offered to me — this idea of “chosenness” — I would ask them... And who wouldn’t want to be chosen, special? Tell me, doesn’t everyone want that? Here’s a question: okay — if you were on other planets, would you have your own chosen ones there? Yes, of course you would. And then I would ask you: could I talk to at least one of them? No, you couldn’t. And why not? Because I destroyed them too. When they completed their mission, when they fulfilled what they were supposed to do — that is, completely destroyed the planet on which they lived — why would I need them anymore? They did their job, and I destroyed them.

Question: would a normal person, after hearing this, want such “chosenness?” I think not, right? But for some reason Moses did not ask this question, so to speak — if we joke a little. That is why this point is important.

I am not speaking purely theoretically. In practice, in what I do, I do not wage war against anyone, despite the fact that some try to accuse me of antisemitism. Please — how many Jewish people have come to me for help; I have helped and will continue to help, but not in order to do parasitic work — rather to do good, to help free themselves. If someone among the Jews wants to stop being a social parasite, they are welcome: I will free them from zombification, from blockages — and I have done this more than once. And the person becomes normal, begins to awaken, and begins to fight against the same filth.

So, saying that there are “this kind” and “that kind” is incorrect. There are simply different levels of development of the Essence. And why is it like this? Because someone deliberately imposed a false assumption — enemies also worked on this, using the ignorance of certain people to whom this was presented. Why?

The point is that our ancestors who came here more than six hundred thousand years ago arrived from very highly developed civilizations. All of this was the result of many millions of years of development on other planets, and naturally this was reflected in those settlers — colonizers of our planet — who came here.

Other races, which were accepted as refugees about thirty-five to forty thousand years ago on Earth, arrived as refugees. They came from different planets that had suffered during the war with the Black forces — the war between the Dark and the Light forces — and they were at very different levels of

development. Their level of evolutionary development was much lower than that of the settlers of the White race. This does not mean that they were bad.

If you go into a nursery group and ask a one-year-old child to explain what an integral is, or what quantization or a quantum phenomenon is, and the child cannot answer — does that mean the child is an idiot, primitive, or something like that? Of course not. It simply means the question was asked at the wrong time. First the child must grow up, go through education, acquire the necessary qualities, gain everything required to answer such a question correctly. Only if, after going through all of that, the person still cannot answer — then you could say something is wrong. Until then, excuse me, it is just a small child.

So, completely different civilizations of very different levels of development arrived on our Earth. Refugees were accepted, and as we say, nothing is more permanent than the temporary. They were accepted temporarily, with plans to later resettle them on other suitable planets where they could continue to live and develop according to their own laws. But it turned out there was nowhere to resettle them, because the situation developed in such a way that the refugee settlers remained permanently on Earth.

As a result, a situation arose in which four races with completely different levels of development ended up together. Roughly speaking, it was like an adult, a mature person, a child, and an adolescent all living together — approximately such proportions. Completely different principles of evolution, culture, traditions, and so on. Naturally, the levels of development of the Essences incarnating in such people are also different.

This is not something bad — it is simply a situation that arose, unfortunately. And it became necessary to help them, which our ancestors did in the past. True they did not finish this task, because, I think, they assessed the situation incorrectly.

In principle, I will elaborate on this further in my book. What our ancestors decided to do next was the following: they concluded that if such a situation existed, then they had to live in one common house — there was no other choice — and since it was necessary to help the “children” grow up, to raise them and bring them closer to their own level so that everyone would be at approximately the same level of development.

For this purpose, they began to try to pass on knowledge and to use the concept of **alpha genetics**. I have spoken about this before; for those who have not heard it, I will repeat it. Alpha genetics means that if a certain change is introduced into a carrier of the alpha genetics of a given species — that is, into a small number of individuals — then these changes are automatically transmitted to the entire species. This is a genetic law; even modern science now knows this. They knew it far better than modern science does, at a much higher level of mastery.

So, they decided that they would help by modifying a specific alpha-genetic carrier, so that these changes would then elevate all the others. This was done in China, in India, in Egypt, and in other places. But what came of this — you already know. There is no need to repeat it, is there? I have described some of it already and will continue to do so. The mistake was that they did not take into account the actions of the Black forces, who did not sit idly by waiting. On the contrary, they took advantage of the situation in order to turn everything in their own direction.

And now we are dealing with the consequences of that situation which arose. But I think we will sort it out. In any case, forgive me, are there really no scoundrels among Russians, who are supposed to possess the Russian spirit? Unfortunately, there are. I would like to say otherwise, but I cannot.

Forgive me, I cannot call one of them anything other than a scoundrel — Marshal Zhukov, well known to everyone, on whose conscience lie several million unnecessary deaths of people, our grandfathers and fathers. On my mother's side of the family, three people did not return from the war, including my grandfather. On my father's side, my grandfather was already quite old at that time — he was born in 1890 — so by the beginning of the war he was already advanced in age and, naturally, was not drafted. My father himself was born in 1938. That is, neither my grandfather nor my father, and certainly not my great-grandfather, could fight on the front from my father's side for these reasons. But other members of the family — more distant relatives — did fight and died, and not a few of them. One of them, whose surname was also Levashov, was found among those who perished in the Young Guard. I am speaking about my closest relatives on my mother's side — three people died.

They sing praises to him (Zhukov), but in reality, they do so for one reason only: because he did everything possible to destroy as many of our compatriots as he could — several million lives unnecessarily lost. If you come across the book *"I Take My Words Back"* by Viktor Suvorov — although I do not approve of betrayal in any form. That is, he might have disagreed with the regime and with what was being done, for example, but betraying one's Motherland is wrong. In his own way, he is a traitor, and that does not adorn him. Still, let us set this moment aside, forgive this factor, and pay attention to what he writes in the book. Of course, one could say that it was not really, he who wrote it — that is not important.

The information is as follows: the victories that are attributed to Zhukov, unfortunately, were never actually achieved by him. And the failures — for example, the beginning of the war — were a one-hundred-percent failure precisely because of Zhukov. The same applies to what you've heard called the Kharkov Cauldron. Do you know who led the operation that resulted in the Kharkov Cauldron? Zhukov. And who was his political commissar? Politburo member Khrushchev. Zhukov and Khrushchev are responsible for the fact that about half a million people were taken prisoner there, and very many were killed.

And when Zhukov began operations, if he did not have a five- to seven-fold advantage in manpower and equipment, he always lost those operations. And most importantly, this book clearly proves that the lifting of the siege of Leningrad, the victory in the Battle of Stalingrad, and the capture of Berlin... as you know, Rokossovsky approached Berlin with his army, he was stopped, Zhukov flew in and entered in his place. Is this what is called a great military commander? When all the work had already been done, he entered instead of Rokossovsky.

These are facts, but for some reason these facts are forgotten, because a falsified version is being presented. And as for what he did — you know how he shot people? He personally shot several hundred people. This is not fabrication; this is reality, not slander of any kind.

That is, he comes to a division commander and says: by this time the hill must be taken, let's say by 05:00. If it is not taken, you will be shot. What does the division commander do? He calls the regimental commander and says: if by 04:30 the hill is not taken, I will shoot you — right? The regimental commander calls either one battalion or all the battalions and says: by three o'clock the hill must be taken — right? And what do the battalion commanders do? They raise the men and go together with

them, without preparation. The important thing is to take it, not how many are killed — that doesn't matter, right? And what is this — war? This is a method of exterminating the Russian people and other indigenous peoples as well.

But for the most part, during the Second World War it was the majority of the population who suffered — Russian men, Slavs. Is that a great military commander? A commander is great when he achieves victory with minimal losses on his own side. But to lay down several million people, to advance over piles of corpses, does not require being a great commander. That requires being a butcher. That's exactly what he was — a great butcher, I would call him. So, here is an example of the method by which destruction was carried out.

Alright, I got a bit carried away. So — soul, spirit, essence. A human being has an essence. It can be of different levels and can possess a greater or smaller number of bodies. But some people say things like: "My etheric body went here, my astral body went there, and my mental body went somewhere else." Yes, that sounds interesting. Yes, a person can be said, conditionally, to have etheric, astral, and mental bodies — but this is a single whole. They are not separated. They do not exist independently of one another. They are one system.

In order for an astral body to appear, a fully developed etheric body is required. In order for a mental body to appear, a fully developed astral body is required. That is, without one, the others cannot exist. A person may have, conditionally speaking, only an etheric body. An essence may have etheric and astral bodies of different levels, or etheric, astral, mental bodies, and so on.

But none of these bodies can "go around" separately, and they cannot exist on their own. And the same applies to the soul and the spirit — these are simply different words used to denote different qualities or manifestations of the same essence, made up of those very bodies that we call the essence, that we call the human being.

Our physical body is a foundation — very important and necessary — but it is a foundation that we eventually shed, whereas the essence remains after that. And this essence can have a different number of bodies, depending on the level of development a particular person has reached. The higher the level a person has attained, the greater the number of bodies their essence possesses.

But these bodies never exist separately; they are always together, because they form a single system. That is, just as the head, arms, legs, heart, and so on do not exist or act independently but function only together — correct? — the same principle applies here.

15.6. QUESTION: *A university lecturer in electrical engineering wants to master my material and asks: how should one teach students, and what exactly should be taught?*

ANSWER: How should one put it? What is written in the thick textbooks is written incorrectly — in the textbooks that are approved by the Ministry of Education, stamped and officially authorized. And what are you supposed to say — that this is not so, that it is wrong, and so on, and that someone like Levashov explains everything correctly, and that you want to include this because it is correct, because you believe it to be so? How should one act in such a situation?

The solution is very simple: you should say that there exists an official, classical explanation, but that there are also other ways of explaining the same material, and then present these alternatives. Let the students themselves decide which explanation they prefer.

However, unfortunately, a situation may arise similar to what occurred in my school for children. Those who have heard know that I have a mental school, where several thousand children, during sleep, find themselves in my school; the children's entities undergo training there, and then in the morning they wake up and remember everything they were taught. They go to an ordinary school, study there, and say: "At school the teachers explain things to us, and we know it is incorrect. What should we do?"

I told them: "Unfortunately, even knowing that it is not so, you still must master it, because you need to obtain the piece of paper." We live in reality, and if you do not obtain that paper, no one will listen to you at all, right? You need to get an education — not only as a piece of paper, but also in order to understand the language spoken by everyone else.

For example, if I were to start saying the same thing I am saying now in English, only those present in the hall who know English would understand me. Everyone else who does not know English would understand nothing — not a single word — even though I would be saying exactly the same thing I said in Russian. So, if I started giving my talk in English right now, would there be any benefit from that? None.

That is why I say: in order to explain something differently to another person who knows a different language, you must know the language that person knows, so that you can teach them another language. Therefore, even knowing that something is incorrect, and understanding why it is incorrect, you still need to learn it in order to master the language of those who understand it in that way, so that later you can help them figure out what is what and truly understand it.

The same applies here. I can advise the person who asked the question to act exactly in this way. Yes, to present it like this. You are a teacher, you have time, you can say: here is the classical understanding, which in principle explains nothing — it is so simply because it is said to be so.

As I already said, one academician — at that time still of the Soviet Union, I won't name him — one of the greatest physicists of his time, when asked what electric current is, was unable to answer anything beyond the classical example from a school textbook. That was surprising to me.

The same situation applies here: there is a classical definition that explains nothing — "the directed motion of electrons from the positive to the negative." Then a somewhat amusing situation arose in connection with this when I gave this example — those who read the interview in the newspaper *Zavtra* may remember it. It was a remarkable article, and afterward I occasionally looked at how people reacted. Opinions began arriving by email: "This Levashov is a complete idiot, a brainless fool, an ignoramus. What school did he study at? What education does he even have? Where did he buy his diplomas? He has no understanding of electric current."

Do you know what I did? I took an encyclopedic dictionary and copied from it the definition of electric current, which states that electric current is a *conventionally accepted* directed motion of electrons and ions from the positive to the negative. This is how it historically developed. When electric current was discovered, they had no concept of electrons at all. First of all, electrons, in principle, do not actually

move anywhere; what really moves are ions, and when motion is observed, it is the motion of positive ions that is observed. And therefore, it was written that electric current is the motion of electrons and ions from the positive to the negative, and this concept remained as a *conventionally accepted direction*. Again, the motion of electrons from the positive to the negative.

So, I took an encyclopedic dictionary, copied the definition from there, and presented my own definition of electric current — the one I stated here. That is, people who criticize something should at least first look up the definition, right? They initially shouted that what I was saying was incorrect — well then, prove it. But it turns out that they themselves are the ignorant ones, because I did not invent the concept of electric current; I repeated what is written in the school textbook.

But that is not the point. The point is that the questions I raised — what is plus, what is minus, what is an electron, and why an electron moves from plus to minus — an academician of world renown at that time could not answer, whereas I did answer them.

One simply needs to tell the students: “Look, there are definitions like these, behind which there is nothing except empty words, and there is another explanation that clearly explains everything from a single concept, without contradicting anything, without the need to introduce postulates that negate previous postulates in order to explain something, and so on. It explains things clearly and precisely, and then you yourselves decide what is what. If you are interested, we can study this further in additional classes and go through the book with this new understanding.”

That is the advice I can now give. And when people also ask about experiments, the same applies. One can come up with thousands of experiments, and one already exists and is happening all around us constantly. There are facts that confirm that space is non-uniform.

Everyone knows what a crystal lattice is, right? That’s no secret to anyone. Solid matter consists of a crystal lattice in which atomic nuclei are located at lattice points, correct? Well, here you have an example of a “pit,” an example of non-uniformity. Inside a substance, even at the microlevel, there is, for instance, a concentration of matter in the atomic nucleus, then small oscillations of matter around it, and then emptiness.

After all, the distances between atomic nuclei are enormous compared to the sizes of the atoms themselves. It turns out that here there is matter, then again, a little bit of matter, and then there is nothing at all, and then again there is matter. What is this? Is it homogeneous? Of course not — it is non-homogeneous. We simply do not think about the things that surround us every day.

In reality, there has never been and cannot be homogeneous matter or homogeneous space. Even neutron matter is non-homogeneous, for certain reasons. But that is a long discussion.

15.7. QUESTION: *The Slavic Aryan Vedas were written by our ancestors many millennia ago. They describe events of the past and the future relative to the time of writing. Many events are written in the future tense and cover what happens many thousands of years ahead. For example, the Exodus of the Jews from Egypt and many other events, and not only those of planetary scale. Even if there were people who could foresee events that would turn the whole world upside down in a far from positive way, why did they not interfere in the course of events in order to prevent evil? For example, why did they not prevent meetings between certain individuals so that what happened in history with Vladimir and his*

Indian wife would not occur, and from the very beginning prevent the reproduction of the gray sub-race? Why did our wise ancestors not interfere in the course of events?

ANSWER: The question is peculiar on the one hand and logical on the other. To say that our ancestors did absolutely nothing would be incorrect. They simply did, at that time, what was within their power.

Returning to what we discussed about the optical rifle: of course, they were far more highly developed than our current civilization. They acted and could do many things that seem incredible to us, but those capabilities were clearly insufficient to prevent what is being asked about in this question.

The fact is that foreseeing something in the future is one thing. Having foreseen it, they placed the Source of Life — which I have spoken about many times — inside the Earth in order to prevent the maximum influence of negative regions, knowing what was coming. But unfortunately, the enemies were not fools either. To think that enemies are complete simpletons who would just sit and wait for things to happen would be naive. They managed to penetrate and seize everything at a certain time — there was the Source of Life, the Generator, you understand — and to force it to work for their own purposes.

If we recall other moments as well, actions were taken too — for example, when the god Tarkh destroyed Lelya, remember? Later, Fatta was destroyed 13,000 years ago. As you can see, the forces involved were not small for such events to occur; nevertheless, those forces were intended to tear even moons from their orbits. As a result, they were shattered into pieces, and those fragments then fell to Earth. This was considered the lesser evil, yet even so, the falling fragments caused many changes.

The first time, the consequences were not as severe: our ancestors were able, over several millennia, to calmly migrate to Western Siberia after Daariya began to sink to the bottom. The second time, however, the consequences were serious — the civilization was thrown back to the Stone Age, and a global flood occurred. Why? Because when the Earth's axis was shifted, all of this led to numerous volcanic eruptions and similar phenomena.

Naturally, take a glass filled with water and shake it — the wave moves, right? Now imagine the Earth's axis being sharply shifted by impacts. What does that lead to? Naturally, the waters of the oceans overflow their boundaries. Enormous tsunamis become possible, destroying everything in their path — and that is exactly what happened.

Our ancestors acted to the maximum extent of what they were capable of at that time. But at that time, they could not — they did not have the ability — to simply intervene and prevent what happened in the future. To prevent it would have required a completely different level of knowledge, skills, and capabilities — that is, the ability to influence and control the present and the future. But that is a separate topic.

At that time, they did not yet have such capabilities at their disposal; therefore, they did what they could. Unfortunately, that turned out to be insufficient, and several mistakes were made. That is the reason for what happened, regrettably.

15.8. QUESTION: *There is again a question about dimensionality. I already explained it today, so I will not repeat myself. At the same time, they are asking about units of measurement — about the units used to measure dimensionality.*

ANSWER: You can introduce any unit you like. What difference does it make which unit it is? I used certain coefficients only in order to show that this refers specifically to three-dimensional space. Otherwise, modern physicists start talking about four-dimensional, seven-dimensional, eleven-dimensional spaces. Has anyone taken an interest in string theory? They write there about eleven-dimensional space — but what actually stands behind that? No one explains anything, yet they talk about eleven-dimensional space simply because it is a whole number.

But what matters is not how many units are named, but what stands behind them. If someone can explain to me — hopefully in a sufficiently clear way — what lies behind the concept of dimensionality in their own understanding, then the particular unit they use does not matter at all. Any unit can be used.

15.9. QUESTION: *Several questions about the thickness of the spheres, and whether their thickness changes during daytime and nighttime.*

ANSWER: In principle, the thickness of the spheres does not change very much depending on whether it is day or night. What mainly changes is the thickness of the qualitative barrier between the spheres. That is, the spheres themselves are more or less stable. They do “breathe,” of course, but they do not breathe because of the day-night cycle; rather, they breathe due to galactic processes — what kind of space our planet has entered, which flows dominate there, which primary matters dominate over others, and so on.

Daylight and nighttime affect only the thickness of the qualitative barrier between levels. That is precisely why, after midnight, the time begins when all sorts of “evil spirits,” as people say, become active — apparitions and the like. This is connected with the fact that, in such deformed zones, the qualitative barrier becomes depleted at night in general, and a door opens between, for example, the physically dense level and the lower astral.

Through this door, various beings naturally penetrate here — parasites that begin, so to speak, hunting for their prey. And if they attack someone, they sit and feed. If these predators appear not in physical form, they are invisible to the human eye. But if someone is feeding on you, whether you see it or not — what real difference does that make?

I think there is no difference who is feeding on you — visible or invisible — the main thing is that you are being fed upon. It is even worse when someone invisible is feeding on you, because then you usually do not even understand that it is happening. You begin to feel very bad: you cannot sleep, weakness appears, illnesses develop. If you could see them, you might struggle against them, right?

I can give you an example of this kind to make it clearer. A long time ago, back in 1989, one of my patients had a little daughter who was three years old. One day he came to me and said, “Could you help me?” I asked, “What’s the matter?” He said, “My daughter, late at night, suddenly jumps out of bed and starts fighting with someone in her room, but there is no one there. What should I do, take her to a psychiatrist?” “Well, you can take her to a psychiatrist,” I replied. “They will give her pills that will fry her

brain, after which she will stop struggling at night. But the question is whether this needs to be done, and why.”

I told him to bring the little girl to me, and he did. His wife and daughter came with him. The little girl said that at night creatures come to her, and she fights with them, fights and fights. That is how a child understands it. The girl really was very sensitive, and I helped her a little. I looked at what was happening to her. You can’t explain brain restructuring to a three-year-old child. I told her: “I will put a little flashlight on your forehead, and when those creatures you fight with appear, think about the flashlight — the light will turn on, and those fellows will run away. And if they don’t run away, think about me and ask for help, and I will come and help you.”

The next time her father brought her, she said: “Yes, I tried it, I turned on the flashlight, the little star lit up, and that was it — everything disappeared right away and never came again.”

Here is an example. This little girl was quite sensitive; by her natural abilities she could see these entities, these beings that feed on people. And do you know how many acquaintances come to me who have children — very small children who still cannot speak, or who are not so sensitive? When a small child starts crying, making noise, cannot calm down, becomes nervous, even hysterical — what is that? I usually just clear out those “fellows,” and the child immediately calms down and sleeps normally.

It is simply a phenomenon that is not understood. We are used to thinking that reality is only what we can touch, what we can see with our eyes. In fact, that is only part of reality. If one understands correctly and acts correctly, many things can be prevented — both with one’s own health and with the health of children as well.

15.10. QUESTION: Are you familiar with the series of books “*TAO. The Path of Ascension?*”

ANSWER: I am not familiar with it, so unfortunately, I cannot say anything specific about my attitude toward this author or what is written there. I am used to speaking concretely and I am not accustomed to discussing something without knowing it firsthand. However, in general I can say the following.

As I understand from this note, this author received information in a certain way. I already have experience with people who received information from “someone,” and in all cases that I have encountered — and there have been quite a few of them — the information was transmitted by parasites. And in most cases, it was transmitted in order to exploit those people who receive the information, and through them to obtain potential from others as well.

In my books I try to give understanding; I do not give instructions like “turn here, then turn there, after which an atomic bomb will explode.” I do not give such instructions, because that is incorrect. Knowledge should not simply be given — knowledge must be felt and passed through the person. That is, if someone transmits a ready-made template, saying that one must act only in this way and no other — this is clearly not a carrier of the Light forces, in any case. Not because they are bad, but because this is equivalent to, for example, giving a child a nuclear briefcase and saying: “Here is a red button — never press this red button.” One must answer the question: what will happen? The planet will no longer exist, right? The same applies here: a person can receive knowledge only by passing it through themselves.

Why is it called “enlightenment through knowledge?” Because a person must pass knowledge through themselves, reflect on it, understand all the nuances — and only then do they move forward. What I do in my books is try to give a person the opportunity to do exactly this: to provide understanding. And how these understandings are then applied — that is already a separate system, a special moment, the next stage, of a completely different quality and level. But in the way information is usually transmitted...

When I had to deal with this myself, I had contacts, though of a somewhat different type. I asked: “Why are you observing me instead of telling me what I should do correctly?” Logical, isn’t it? I’m floundering like a puppy — thrown in like a blind puppy, and they’re watching to see where I’ll swim. Why not give guidance, if you know?

And they told me: “Don’t worry. If you do something wrong, we will stop you; we won’t allow it.” I thought — why? At first, I was indignant, honestly, though not for long, because at first you react, and only then you think — but in fact, you should think first and then react. When I thought it through, I realized that it was absolutely correct.

For example, one can give instructions on how to do something. I can give instructions on how to prepare water and cleanse it as much as possible using one’s own potential — this is a harmless instruction, right? But you will do it without even understanding how or what is happening, simply doing it because it is easy and not difficult.

Let’s say a person is told that two times two equals four. But if they were simply forced to memorize that two times two is four, then when they see “two times two,” they will answer “four.” However, if no one explained to them what “two” is, what “plus” is, what “equals” is, and what “four” is, then they will repeat it when they see it, but they will never understand why.

But if they then see “two plus three,” they will never say that it equals five. Why? Because they never understood why “two times two is four.” And in this case, if it’s harmless — if a person didn’t understand why “two times two is four” and just memorized it, and then doesn’t understand “two plus three” because they didn’t understand the previous concept — well, as they say, it makes no difference to anyone.

But if a person holds potential in their hands and does not understand how to manage that potential, and someone tells them, “Just press this button and you’ll get the result,” they press it — and it works. But it works not because they understood why it worked, but simply because they pressed the button as instructed.

Then a situation will inevitably arise when there is no one nearby to give the correct hint — or someone may deliberately give the wrong one — and the person will press the button again in the same way, and a catastrophe will occur.

That is why this kind of approach is fundamentally wrong. Any person must reach enlightenment through knowledge. One can be helped on this path, but not by chewing everything up and implanting dogmas. Understanding must come through comprehension and reflection.

15.11. QUESTION: *They ask about the baptism ritual.*

ANSWER: Unfortunately, I may disappoint those who were baptized. The baptism ritual is a form of blocking. It is said that this is protection from unclean forces. You've heard that concept, right? But why is protection needed if a person is born with their own natural, inherent protection? The question is: if this is protection, then why does a baptized child still scream at night when astral entities attack them, if they are supposed to be protected? That means it does not protect at all.

This is a method, a way of blocking the essence at the earliest age. Among Jews, the blocking ritual is even harsher: the circumcision ritual is performed on the seventh or eighth day after birth — I don't remember exactly which. On the 7th–8th day after birth, a pain shock is created in the child; circumcision is done without anesthesia, and this pain shock causes the blocking of the person.

In one way or another, religions attempt to block a person so that they remain blind throughout their entire life — so they do not understand or see what is happening right under their nose. Remember Gogol's story "Viy?" Everyone has read it, or perhaps seen the film. Interestingly, the witch and all the unclean forces in that story manifest themselves not somewhere else, but in a church. After midnight, yes — but where? In a church. A holy place, which in theory should be sanctified, prayed over for a thousand years — people have been praying there, so it should be a pure, holy place, right? Then how is it that unclean forces behave freely there, feel completely at ease? That is a very good question.

Now tell me this: if anyone has studied Satanist cults — do you know where Satanists conduct their rituals? In churches. After midnight. In the very same churches where miraculous icons hang. Where holy relics lie. And for some reason, Satanists perform their black rituals in churches after midnight, and people don't even ask such simple questions.

Now, I say this: what is the ritual of communion? It is a ritual of cannibalism that came from voodoo. Yes, of course, when a person is given a wafer, they are not literally eating the flesh of Christ, and when they are given wine, they are not literally drinking blood. But what matters is not what a person physically eats or drinks — what matters is that they consciously, mentally tune themselves to the idea that they are eating the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood. That is cannibalism.

In Africa, where this ritual originated, it is still practiced today — the voodoo ritual, one of the darkest rites of black voodoo. This is when, after an enemy has been defeated, the victor eats part of the enemy's flesh and drinks his blood. The purpose of this ritual is for the enemy's power — his spiritual force, his potential, his essence — to become the victor's slave forever. That is the ritual. And unfortunately, this cannibalistic ritual is being used.

I can say the following: practically the majority of rituals that take place in any church are based on magic — and most often on black magic. It is a magical ritual, no matter how loudly they denounce magic. Everything that happens in a church is magic, by all definitions.

(Voice from the audience: "Can a person change themselves?") Of course — but it is difficult for a person to do it on their own. However, for those present here today, at the end of the meeting, whoever wishes, I will try to remove this.

15.12. QUESTION: *An interesting question — regarding the formation of spaces not along the central axis of the six-rayed structure. This is a very specific question; perhaps I will answer the author separately later, because there is no point in discussing this with everyone.*

QUESTION: *What are the mechanisms for growing your plants?*

ANSWER: So as not to take up too much time now, I'll answer briefly. A more detailed explanation will be given in the upcoming article that I am currently finishing; it will be titled "*The Source of Life: A Tale of Fruits and Berries.*" There I explain the mechanism more or less in detail.

I just want to say the following: it works in a completely different way. Even if you explained it to a person, they would not be able to reproduce it, because it is a *psi-device*. It is not material, and again, it is not blind influence — it is a targeted influence of this generator, which performs corrections. To achieve the desired effect, when you do it for the first time you make assumptions, and then you begin refining everything down to the nuances.

In the three articles that have already been published, some things were implemented, but I explained additional aspects in the fourth article, "*The Source of Life,*" which should appear on my website soon — within about a week, or even sooner. So please read it there; I explain things in more detail, so as not to take up too much time today.

15.13. QUESTION: *Here they are inviting me to give a lecture on plants, to speak.*

ANSWER: In principle, it's possible to meet — there are contact details here. As far as I am able, I will do this; I'll get in touch, and perhaps we will hold such a lecture for people. But again, a lecture will give you understanding — yes, a person may wish for a plant to grow better, and to some extent it will indeed grow better.

Almost everyone who has ever had a plant knows that a plant senses a person. And if the person who cared for it dies, very often the plant begins to die soon after that person. Our ancestors had a very unusual custom, which is now largely forgotten and almost no longer practiced. Although my ancestors did it: when I was born, they planted a tree on the day of my birth, and the same was done for my brother. In the past, when a child was born, a tree was planted and "linked" to the person who had been born. The tree that was planted on my birthday died when I was still a boy — it could not withstand the blows that were directed at me. But I, as you can see, endured them.

What did this ritual consist of? The point is that in the past, when there were no telegraphs, no telephones, no communication at all — no airplanes, trains, or steamships — and when people left home for war or on some other business, years would pass, sometimes five or six years or even more. The relatives who remained behind would observe the tree and knew what was happening to that person.

They simply watched the tree that had been planted on the day of birth: if the tree was healthy, it meant everything was fine; if the tree was sick, it meant the person was sick; if the tree dried up, it meant the person had died. And in practice this was almost always the case, except in those situations where someone had cut the tree down with a knife. In all other cases, it worked.

Why? At the moment of this ritual, the tree is "linked" to the person, and a constant connection arises — distance does not matter. What happened to the person was reflected in the tree, and very often the tree took part of the blows upon itself, helping the person to whom it was connected.

(Voice from the audience: *“Was there no feedback in the opposite direction?”*) That happened too, but to a much lesser extent, because the tree was, so to speak, a helper to the person, not the other way around. Yes, of course, if the tree was connected, the person would also feel the connection — at the very least, they would feel the loss of something. But unfortunately, this custom is no longer practiced today. Not only is the planting of a tree no longer linked to the birth of a child, but people hardly plant trees at all.

And just imagine: if every parent planted a tree, our planet would be far greener than it is now — it would be much better overall. There is nothing bad in that, so perhaps such a lecture could take place.

But unfortunately, even if one explains theoretically how to do it and the principle behind it, in order to actually carry it out one needs not only knowledge. Knowledge requires quite a lot of time to acquire in sufficient detail, but also skill — the ability to do it — and that is not so simple. I can do it, but for certain reasons I am not doing these things at the moment. In the near future, I think I will be doing similar things for all of Russia — but not yet, not right now.

15.14. QUESTION: *Again, about dimensionality — why not whole numbers?*

ANSWER: I won't go on at length about this, because I think you'd fall asleep. I just want to say that there are both non-whole numbers and whole numbers. In principle, whole numbers do not exist in nature at all — mathematics is an artificial science.

Let's take two bottles, for example. Even though they may be very similar to each other, you can still find differences that do not allow us to say they are two identical bottles. We can only add things that are 100% identical, right? But in nature there is no such thing as 100% identity, and there cannot be. There are no two identical apples, because they will differ in shape, color, taste, size, whether they are worm-eaten or not, and many other things.

But we conditionally discard all these nuances. When there are two apples and one apple is given to one person and another apple to another person, both are eating an apple. But when we add two apples together, we must understand that this is conditional — whole numbers do not exist in nature.

Therefore, what I am talking about is a fractional number. It reflects our idea that something whole must be round, complete, and so on — but that is completely incorrect.

(Voice from the audience: *“But there are two atoms.”*) No, not quite.

(Voice from the audience: *“There is no difference there.”*) Oh? Are you sure? Let's talk about that later.

15.15. QUESTION: *They ask about the Shchetinin School.*

ANSWER: I am only slightly familiar with it — only indirectly familiar with this school. But unfortunately, I have more negative impressions of this school than positive ones. First of all, I have a negative view of Shchetinin himself as a person; I have my reasons, but I won't go into them now — it's not important here.

Also, for example, children receive a higher education at the age of 17. What kind of higher education is that? Zombies? They turn them into excellent zombies, into well-made zombies, by hammering false standards into their heads — standards that everyone already knows are false. If people didn't know they were false and were teaching them anyway, that would be one thing. But today, higher education is based on Einstein's theory of relativity, which is a complete fiction. All the other theories that were important in the past — no matter who proposed them — the theory of Einstein is a fake. But history is history; the past is the past.

But you see, they turn them into robots — perfect robots — who repeat like parrots what is drilled into their heads. But the question is: is there any understanding? That's the first thing. And the second thing is that these children are deprived of their childhood, and childhood does not exist for no reason. It is not accidental that a person must be a child, then a teenager, and only then an adult. When a 17-year-old finishes all this, where will he go — straight to work somewhere?

All these children end up unhappy. They fall out of the general social circle: their peers don't understand them, and those who might understand them don't accept them, because they belong to a different age group. In other words, they are unhappy children. There are a whole number of aspects I have touched upon, and others I have not mentioned. Therefore, my overall attitude toward this school is more negative than positive.

15.16. QUESTION: They ask about the book "*Legendary Rus*'."

ANSWER: Unfortunately, I haven't read it. There are very many books, and it's simply not possible to read everything — I already read quite a lot. But if I were to do nothing but read, without doing anything else, that wouldn't bring much benefit either.

From most of the books I've already seen and read, the picture is usually the same: a person grabs hold of one single fragment of a mosaic and doesn't even try to look for the others. "Aha, I've found some piece that supposedly never existed before." But maybe there's another piece? Or a third, a fifth, a tenth, a hundredth? No one even tries to look or think about that. Having found one fragment, the author then starts forcing the remaining ninety-nine pieces to fit around it — and the result is often complete absurdity.

There is some valuable information in many of the books I've read, but instead of searching for other fragments of the mosaic to complement it — doing real research, real investigation — the author rushes ahead and builds assumptions. In the full sense of the word, this is most often just fantasy-making.

I am not speaking about this particular book — I haven't read it, so I cannot say anything about it. But of the books I *have* read, unfortunately, one gains more harm than benefit from many of them. Those who are enemies will not look at the positive aspects; they will notice the negative ones and then begin to attack and destroy, and in doing so they also destroy the tiny grain of truth that may exist there.

For example, so as not to speak unfoundedly, I read the book "*The Strike of the Russian Gods*." I can say that this book is negative from my point of view for the simple reason that the author did not say anything new of his own and did not provide understanding of anything. He simply took excerpts from various sources — mainly from the book by Andrey Dikiy — without even mentioning this, unfortunately. From my perspective, that is also not quite correct.

And what kind of “strike of the Russian gods” are we talking about, if the book does not actually talk about Russian gods at all? Why is it titled “*The Strike of the Russian Gods*” if it talks about Jews, and why does it present documents and excerpts taken from here and there? And then, because of this, the book was banned. And what is most interesting is that this gave the enemies a pretext to then block everything else that carries something valuable, you understand?

And here the next question is: did this kind of absurdity happen by accident, or not by accident? Think for yourselves — everyone must think about this on their own. It is very convenient to use such people, who have nothing except emotions... Yes, for a person who did not know this topic at all, after reading it there will probably be shock. But it is just emotions, and there is nothing there besides emotions — no positions, and not a single primary source is cited. And moreover, it has nothing to do with the Russian gods at all.

And that gives grounds now to say that everything related to the Russian gods must be banned, right? Which is exactly what is being done, by the way — so think about that too.

15.17. QUESTION: *About killings in the defense of the Motherland.*

ANSWER: Unfortunately, killing always remains killing, even when you are defending the Motherland. This does not mean that one should not defend the Motherland. But in any case, it is a necessary evil, which a person commits and accepts as a necessity, as an inevitability. And naturally, a person bears responsibility for it.

If anyone is interested, my wife Svetlana writes in her book about the time when she was a small girl and how she encountered, on those levels she visited when her essence left the body, people who were called heroes. And even they were not located in very high places, for certain reasons. Killing remains killing.

And the state of rage and hatred — even if there are grounds for it — when committing an action, you enter the state of a killer, and the consequences will be the same as for the one who killed. In other words, if an enemy came and killed women and children, for example, that does not mean he will go unpunished. But going and killing the enemy’s women and children is no better. One must punish the one who committed the act, right?

There will be consequences as well, but again, what is important is the inner state that the person has. If he kills with hatred, then even if it is “righteous rage,” the consequences will not be good. Even though it may be the correct and necessary action in that situation, unfortunately, nature is nature, and there is no escaping that.

15.18. QUESTION: *In many books they talk about the existence of a system for extracting potential; religions speak about divine entities. According to your information, are God and the system of human suppression one and the same, or not? Perhaps God and, in your view, the dark forces are the same thing?*

ANSWER: In principle, in the understanding in which “your God” is understood today, and the dark forces — these are one and the same, because in churches there truly takes place the collection of human potential. And indeed, this was created for enslavement.

I will repeat myself again and say that when, relatively recently, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad died — his name was Lavr — it was announced that he had fulfilled his main purpose as a Christian and died. Do you know, when I heard this from an open broadcast, this was not just something someone casually said. It was clearly stated deliberately; the announcer did not invent this on his own.

You heard it, right? He fulfilled his purpose. Notice — nothing was said about uniting the churches, not a single word about that, by the way. It was said clearly and plainly. If they had said his main purpose was that he reunited the Church into a single whole — but not a word about that. It was said verbatim: “He died and thereby fulfilled the main purpose of a Christian.”

So, what are we to expect, one might ask? Then a Christian should ask to be helped to fulfill his purpose immediately, right? Cut everyone down, and the purpose is fulfilled at once. Everyone’s main purpose fulfilled simultaneously — everyone is saved, right? This is such absurdity, as they say — the absurdity just kept growing.

Therefore, religion was invented in order to force a person to be a slave and not resist this. Look how cleverly everything is constructed. If a person has some difficulties in life — it means he is very sinful, these are your sins, God is punishing you for your sins. And if a person says, “But I haven’t done anything like that,” then it is a test — God is testing you, sending you hardships to test the strength of your faith. A good position, isn’t it? Whether hit from the front or from the side, either way — if you are not sinful, it’s a test; if you are sinful, you are being punished. A good answer? Perfect. But from my point of view, it is complete absurdity.

There is another point that many Christians forget. According to the Christian position, by His innocent death on the cross, Jesus Christ sacrificed Himself and redeemed all human sins. I repeat, Jesus Christ is not a name; translated from Greek it means “Messiah.” And the question arises — why was it translated into Greek if He was among the Jews?

So, it is said that Jesus Christ, by sacrificing Himself on the cross, redeemed all human sins — “for ever and ever,” this phrase is not mine. From the creation of the world until its apocalypse, right?

(Voice from the audience: “*No, from the Flood.*”) From the Flood — well, it’s the same thing; the Flood happened once, that was before the Flood.

(Voice from the audience: “*That was the redemption of humanity the first time.*”) Ah, the first time — fine. But there was no second Flood, right?

(Voice from the audience: “*The second one will be by fire.*”) It hasn’t happened yet, let’s say. Therefore, it turns out that everyone living between the Floods should be sinless and should be happy — no illnesses, no problems, nothing should exist. Right?

(Voice from the audience: “*No, that means something else.*”) Ah, of course — anything can be interpreted however one wishes.

(Voice from the audience: *“No, it is written very clearly there, in the sense that the Messiah came to Earth in order to redeem all human sins so that the end of the world would not come, because the cup had already been filled with corruption, and then later there would be the second [event].”*)

You know, the thing is this: if we speak about it, then among the Jews it is written that if someone deviates from the letter of the Lord God, then he is a false prophet and must be destroyed, crucified, and offered as a sacrifice to Yahweh — this is written in the Torah.

So, what you are saying, young man, is an interpretation of what is written — an interpretation that someone told you, that this is how it should be understood. But forgive me, what is written is what is written. I understand that it was written by people, not by God, naturally. But nevertheless, if it is said that these are the words of the Lord God and that they are given by God, then they cannot be interpreted.

Therefore, if Christ sacrificed Himself and redeemed all human sins, then why did people suffer and continue to suffer — both during His time and after He was sacrificed? On that very same day, other people were dying as well. That means it is a complete lie and deception.

Although Christ — or the one who is called Christ — is a real historical person, and He came in order to save people from this deception, first and foremost the Jews. This is a long story. But again, what He wanted to do was distorted, twisted, and corrupted. And once again, the only reliable information, young man, about Christianity can come from Christ Himself, correct? Correct.

I can say the following — perhaps you do not know this. The fact is that Christ existed; I conditionally call him Christ, because no other name of his is known, so that no one thinks I am speaking about someone else. He was a highly educated man, knew several languages, read Ancient Hebrew, Aramaic, Judaic, and many other languages — and yet he left nothing behind? But illiterate fishermen left the Gospels, did they?

And the most important thing is that these Gospels appeared only about a hundred years later, when all of them had already, as they say, given their souls to God. So, an illiterate person wrote everything down — and not just one, but several. While a literate man, who read fluently — and this is evident even from the Bible itself — publicly exposed high priests and rabbis in synagogues and drove them out of the temples. That is a fact; it is written. They contradict themselves, do you understand?

So, Christ — the one who is called Christ — did leave behind his thoughts, written records. And do you know who preserved them? The Templars. And what happened to the Templars? Through the collusion of the Pope of Rome and Philip II — I may not be exact with the name — and Philip the Fair, the French king, the Order of the Templars was destroyed. Why? Because the Pope sought dominance — he wanted the Church to gain the right to control secular power. And it was necessary to ensure that the truth about who Christ really was would disappear.

And Philip the Fair was a greedy, foolish man whose treasury was empty, and he coveted the wealth of the Templars. But nevertheless, they failed at the most important thing. Even under torture, they could not extract where Christ’s manuscripts were hidden.

And Christ had descendants — he had children, two of them, a daughter and a son, by the way. And one of his descendants, around the year 2000, decided that the time had already come — that it was time for people to truly learn the truth about who Christ was and what he brought. And he passed on to the authors not the originals, but copies of those documents that had been kept in secrecy. And they themselves had also remained secret — that they were descendants of Christ.

And a book was published based on those documents. In Russian, its title sounded like *“Jesus Christ, the Pagan God.”* The book was released — we have a copy; my wife had pre-ordered it in advance. The pre-ordered copies were delivered, but as soon as the book appeared in stores, within a month — actually even less — it was recalled. An order was sent to the bookstores to remove all copies from sale.

When one of my students tried to contact the publisher — and it was a large publishing house, “London–New York–Sydney,” a major one — she obtained their phone number and asked whether she could purchase a copy directly from them. They told her no. She then asked whether she could buy a used copy. Again, no — if one became available, they said they would inform her.

When she asked why there were no new copies available, she was told that the publishing house had been immediately bankrupted, and the authors had received exclusive rights. When the publishing house was declared bankrupt, the creditors seized everything. And the former owner of the publishing house said that all the disks were taken and destroyed.

No, to read them — I hope that in the future this will become possible, of course, because the books have ended up in certain places. We also have one such book. Meanwhile, in the same bookstores, literature by Satanists, about satanic cults and all sorts of things, stands openly on the shelves, and no one touches it, no one even lifts a finger.

But materials which, it would seem, should be of the greatest value to any believer — namely, what the very person they worship as God actually taught, his personal views and answers — are being destroyed left and right. What does that tell you? To me it is clear. I don’t know whether it is clear to you. Perhaps it isn’t. You have the right to your own opinion. But to me it is clear and obvious why this is being done.

By the way, regarding the descendants of Christ — if we speak about his death and crucifixion two thousand years ago, then how is it that the tomb of Mary Magdalene, said to be the wife of Christ, is actually located in southern France, in a chapel built in the 12th century? And notably, there is no record of her remains ever being transferred from one place to another. It is precisely this chapel in southern France — I’ve forgotten the name — where people constantly come on pilgrimage to venerate the tomb of Mary Magdalene. Moreover, in that chapel there is a statue depicting Christ holding the hands of a boy and a girl, and to this day people continue to worship at that site.

I could tell you much more. The problem is that people simply don’t have the information — they’re being misled, given interpretations that serve certain interests, so that someone can reach deeper into their pockets, so to speak. And people themselves often think, “Why should I think for myself? Let others think for me. There are people smarter than I am — let them do the thinking.” But perhaps it’s time to start thinking with our own minds. Let’s move on.

(Voice from the audience: *“The place is called Rennes-le-Château.”*) Oh, good, that’s right.

(Voice from the audience: *"There are several books about it, about the Black Madonna."*) I know about the Black Madonna — it was connected with the Templars.

(Voice from the audience: *"I collect those books."*) If you look into it, the Templars made a major mistake at one point. When they depicted the Black Madonna, they claimed that Christianity had nothing to do with Christ, that Christianity grew out of the cult of Osiris, and that the Black Madonna represented Isis. That was what they were trying to show, though somewhat mockingly.

Unfortunately, this was later used against them. They were accused of worshipping the Black Madonna, and that became one of the charges brought against them as justification for their destruction. But it's a long story. I didn't want to go deeply into that topic right now — it's a broad subject — but that is essentially how it unfolded.

(Voice from the audience: *"Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris, before the 10th century, was dedicated to Mary Magdalene, and only later was renamed in honor of Mother Mary."*) Well, you see, it's a long story. There is so much information that, unfortunately, believers are misled left and right.

Think about this: in sources that have survived, Mary Magdalene is described as Christ's companion, correct? And the word "companion" in those times — and even today in civil registry offices where they say "life companion" — meant husband and wife. "Companion" and "female companion" at that time signified a married couple.

Not all documents were destroyed; it's impossible to eliminate everything. Something always remains, you can't rewrite 100% of history. In order to distort the essence, they redefined the word "companion" to mean merely a fellow traveler. And people forgot, or no longer know, that even today the terms "life companion" and "life companion (female)" clearly mean husband and wife. So, Mary Magdalene was his wife and certainly was never a prostitute.

(Voice from the audience: *"She was a Druid priestess and his counterpart in the mission."*) Not only the Druids — that's not entirely accurate either.

(Voice from the audience: *"She went there, and Joseph of Arimathea later traveled there with them."*) You know, this requires a proper discussion. I just don't want to get stuck on it right now. It's a separate topic and perhaps not the right moment for it.

(Voice from the audience: *"The fact is that Christ's grave is located in the state of Kashmir in India..."*) The fact is, there are also sources claiming that the grave of Jesus exists in Japan. I've read such sources as well.

(Voice from the audience: *"There were two twins."*) You know, once upon a time, during the communist era, people used to say that Lenin was a Tatar, that Lenin was a Mongol, that Lenin was this or that. Back then, for some reason, everyone thought that was a good thing — every nation claimed he was "one of theirs," right? The Cossacks said Lenin was a Cossack, remember?

You see, Christ's grave cannot be in the state of Kashmir, nor in Japan, nor anywhere else, because he was not buried in that sense. He was indeed restored and left this planet in his body. Therefore, from that perspective, his grave cannot exist anywhere — especially not with physical remains in it.

I have seen video recordings of the earliest Christian churches, which, strangely enough, were located — and still are located — where, do you think? In Yugoslavia. Strangely, not in the Middle East. The first Christian churches were in Yugoslavia, far, far from so-called Palestine, which did not even exist at that time. And in those earliest Christian churches, frescoes have been preserved that depict, above the place of Christ's crucifixion—ascension — what do you think? Flying saucers.

(Voice from the audience: *"That's why Yugoslavia was destroyed?"*) One of the reasons — quite possibly — is that those very Albanians are destroying all the old churches, destroying everything that might remain.

(Voice from the audience: *"But he came to the Jews, to the true Jews—were they in Yugoslavia at that time?"*) No, at that time they were not there. The Jews, especially after the Exodus from Egypt, had dispersed throughout the world, so they did not have a single country as such. Their short stay in so-called Palestine is, for the most part, also a myth, and they were there only for a very brief period. They scattered across the globe. Therefore, when Christ came, he came to the city that is now called Istanbul, which was formerly known as Constantinople, Tsar-grad, and Troy.

(Voice from the audience: *"Troy wasn't there."*) It was there. Excuse me, just because Schliemann excavated one small settlement and called it Troy does not mean that it was the real Troy.

(Voice from the audience: *"We'll talk about this later."*) Later.

Troy is one of the names of Tsar-grad. The head of any religion of merely local significance was not located there; that was a small place called Jerusalem, that's all. It was not a permanent residence — rather, any place where such a figure entered was called Jerusalem.

Even in Russian folk speech there was a saying: "I have passed through my Jerusalems" — not Jerusalem in the singular, but Jerusalems. Has anyone heard that expression? It meant that a person had long searched for their spiritual path, moved in different directions, studied, and tried to find what resonated with them. Through that inner state, their reason developed.

It's a long story, and I don't want to go into it now. There are many questions, and we only have 45 minutes left.

15.19. QUESTION: *Here they are speaking about diction and the microphone.*

ANSWER: Unfortunately, the sound quality today is very poor. But this is mainly because nothing was working at all earlier today. An hour before our meeting here with you, absolutely nothing was functioning.

So, I was only able to set up what was possible under the circumstances. Unfortunately, the quality is suffering because of that.

15.20. QUESTION: *They ask my opinion about Pater Diy.*

ANSWER: As I have already said, I have mixed feelings about this man. Why? I believe that, on the one hand, he did a great thing by publishing the Slavic-Aryan Vedas, and for that I am extremely grateful to him. Let's just say that he was given a task. And after that, he began to create a religion.

Our ancestors never had a religion; our ancestors had FAITH — meaning enlightenment through knowledge, when people possessed an understanding of the world and a worldview based on insight into and comprehension of the laws of nature.

But he is trying to create a religion, and he was neither asked nor told to do this, because he is not initiated to any high degree at all. He is simply carrying out what was given to him and to another person by the volkhvy (wise men). The translation into modern Russian was not done by him alone; he only participated in the process. Two people worked on the translation, so it is not solely his work.

However, it is one thing to publish a book, and quite another to lead a movement that he was never authorized to head. In principle, what he is doing is causing considerable harm — at least from my point of view, to put it mildly.

Although the first thing he did was very important — and truly, for that alone one should be grateful. Even though a person may sometimes be energetically weak, in one area he proved strong, and in another not so much — that's all.

So, thank him specifically for publishing the Slavic-Aryan Vedas. For me personally, they served as very valuable support, because I was able to rely on real historical documents when presenting what I present. That was of great benefit to me. But the rest of what he is doing, unfortunately, I cannot approve of — again, from my point of view.

(Voice from the audience: *"He created a spiritual school, a seminary."*) Yes, I've heard. You see, studying things like the runes, how our ancestors lived and thought — that is necessary. But reviving and imposing that same way of life in the form of a religion is completely unacceptable and wrong. It's a long discussion and perhaps not entirely appropriate right now, but nevertheless, this should not be done — it is incorrect.

Our ancestors fought against religion, and here, in other words, a new religion is being created based on the same principles. Moreover, he did not study or fully digest the material very well, because it states there that after the catastrophe only priests and keepers remained. And priests and keepers were not battle magicians, not those who possessed the full knowledge itself — they were, in other words, librarians whose task was to preserve and transmit that knowledge.

The keepers deliberately did not possess an understanding of the higher levels embedded in those same runes, so that no one would accidentally show weakness — some might endure, others might not, right? To prevent that, they were simply custodians, librarians — which is very important and necessary. It says there that only volkhvy-keepers remained, that is, librarians whose task was to preserve the information from destruction until a certain time and then pass it on — which they did.

And the same Pater Diy was not such a keeper; someone approached him and gave him the task to publish it. In other words, he was not even a keeper himself — that's all.

(Voice from the audience: *“Please tell us, how do you evaluate the information that Alexey Vasilyevich Trekhlebov presented in his book ‘Koshchuny of Finist?’”*)

You know, I haven’t read that book. I’ve heard about it, but I haven’t read it yet. Unfortunately, in order to answer accurately, I would need to read it first.

15.21. QUESTION: (Voice from the audience: *“You did not mention the thickness of the cells.”*) *How should one move forward, how should one develop one’s consciousness?*

ANSWER: You see, “thickness” is again a conditional concept.

(Voice from the audience: *“At least approximately.”*) It’s not possible. What unit would you use — a meter? A meter does not apply there, you understand? So, to express it in units you are unfamiliar with would be the same as saying nothing at all. It’s like trying to measure a radio wave with a yardstick — radio waves can be expressed in meters, but you can’t measure them with a physical meter stick, right?

It’s the same here. Those are different levels; they do not have the same concept of thickness as we do. They have something analogous, but on a completely different qualitative level — different parameters, different phenomena — everything is entirely different. So, our units of measurement simply do not apply there.

That is why I did not answer. To say what I technically could say would be the same as saying nothing, because for you it would just be an empty sound — you don’t technically know those units, that’s all. Next.

QUESTION: *They ask what is the best way to move forward, by what method one should develop one’s consciousness, come to enlightenment through knowledge and life, and expand one’s awareness.*

ANSWER: I can say the following: in my view, any person should deeply engage with any information they absorb. In other words, not in the way most of us were taught in schools and universities — where the teacher gives an assignment, presents the lesson, explains the material, and we simply memorize it and repeat it like “parrots,” only what is required of us. If we repeat it correctly — good; if incorrectly — bad, and that’s it. In this way, we are actually trained not to think.

Yes, it is true that a person cannot instantly attain enlightenment through knowledge from nothing. One must absorb something in order to step onto the next level. Ideally, that next level should be much higher, and the information on it should be of high quality. But if such high-quality information is not immediately available — at least broadly accessible to the masses — then what is one to do? Does that mean development is impossible?

Is it possible? Yes — but do you know what needs to be done in that case? Do they teach you in schools or universities what to do in order to truly develop further?

For example, what did I personally do? Let’s say I was studying some law of physics. I never simply memorized formulas or the final derivations. Instead, I followed the scientist who originally derived them — I retraced how he thought, how he reasoned. I would start from the initial conditions, then consider the boundary conditions he applied, and step by step follow his line of thinking, reproducing

what he achieved. When I encountered an obstacle, I would ask myself: “What did he do here?” Ah — he applied this principle here, used that approach there — and then the reasoning continued forward.

Step by step, I would arrive at the same conclusions that the scientist had reached when discovering that particular law. As a result, it became clear to me why, for what purpose, and by what reasoning he came to that conclusion. I didn’t just memorize it — I understood it.

Such an approach, in my view, is the only one that truly allows a person to move forward. This does not mean that everything humanity has created is negative — no, there is a great deal that is correct. But many explanations, especially theoretical ones, are flawed because at the time a person simply did not possess enough information.

If you see only the tip of an iceberg and describe it very accurately, yet do not realize that the overwhelming mass of it lies beneath the water, you will start wondering how such a tiny visible piece could pierce a ship straight through — a ship weighing thousands of tons — tear it apart and keep moving. You would begin inventing explanations: how could this be possible? What happens as a result? Real events that actually occurred are never questioned, but the explanations given are completely absurd — because they are based only on the visible tip of the iceberg. That is the problem.

So, if you begin to understand that beneath the visible tip there is something much greater under the surface, and you continue forward using the method of deep inquiry as I described, you will gradually penetrate further and further. Enlightenment through knowledge does not come from blind memorization, but from thoughtful comprehension — from passing information through yourself. When it truly passes through you, when you understand it, when you resonate with it internally — only then does it become genuinely useful and meaningful, and only then can you move forward.

If that does not happen, knowledge becomes mechanical accumulation — a burden. And most often it hinders a person’s progress, preventing them from moving correctly. That is the answer I can give to this question.

15.22. QUESTION: *A very fundamental and truly important question about genetically modified products — is it possible to resist them?*

ANSWER: First and foremost, the most effective method of resistance is simply not to consume them. No one is forcing you to buy genetically modified products. And how can you recognize them? At least in Russia, labeling is not always reliably done. So, it is better to eat what is grown locally in Russia.

Genetically modified products are described as a form of genetic weapon deliberately used. I once read — or someone told me — about a woman who tested genetically modified products on mice. She noticed that when she began feeding the mice genetically modified food, the third generation of mice became completely infertile.

(Voice from the audience: *“That’s dangerous for the younger generation.”*) Naturally, if people continue doing what they are doing — consuming the “nonsense” being fed to them from the West — then of course it will be dangerous.

Therefore, genetically modified products are portrayed here as a deliberate action aimed at reducing the population. Not in a visible way, like when someone is physically attacked and blood is shed — that everyone can see. But rather through the consumption of products that allegedly disrupt genetic functions, leading to sterility and, as a result, the destruction of a nation through chemical influence.

What difference does it make? Whether a nation is destroyed by having its people's throats cut or by making them infertile against their will — the result is the same. I can understand if a person chooses to become infertile — that is their personal right. But when, under the guise of food products, genetic weapons are slipped to people that destroy their future, their genes, and make them infertile — I consider that a crime.

The issue simply needs to be raised in the media; people can be stirred up to act and to resist. And if you do not buy these products, no one will bring them — that's all there is to it.

(Voice from the audience: *"But there aren't any alternatives."*) You know, if you don't have a piece of bread but you have a piece of poison — arsenic, for example, or cyanide — you could eat that instead, right? Why not? There's no bread, but there is poison. That's the wrong approach.

In Russia, at least, it would be better to pay a little more money and eat a little less, but ensure that it does not poison you, your children, or especially your grandchildren. And I hope that in the near future there will be many changes in Russia and that ecologically clean products will become widely available. Much is being done in this direction, and I hope that the consequences of such applications will be minimized, at least.

15.23. QUESTION: *Regarding bribes for education and bribery of teachers in general.*

ANSWER: Unfortunately, teachers do take bribes. For example, someone might say that if you don't give a bribe, you won't receive a good grade. Does such a situation exist? Yes, unfortunately it does. In that case, you can choose the principle of not giving a bribe — but then you may not get a high mark.

The question is: are you studying for a good grade or for knowledge? If a high grade is obtained through bribery, then such a grade is worthless, right? If most people receive good marks through bribes and know nothing, can do nothing, then they are zero as specialists. And with such a diploma, few employers will hire them — unless their parents own the company, in which case it doesn't matter what their son or daughter does. But if you don't have parents who will pay you a salary for nothing — just for showing up and "warming a chair" — then it's a different matter. You study in order to gain knowledge.

So, there are two options: either give bribes, or simply study — study as thoroughly as possible and prove your knowledge. You see, it will be difficult for a teacher to fail you if you are impeccably prepared — if you know the material "from cover to cover," at least at the same level as the teacher. In that case, it becomes very hard for them to undermine you.

So, from my point of view, there are two possibilities: either you give bribes, or you study in such a way that the teacher cannot lower your grade, even if you do not offer any bribe. There is also a second variation — to study the material just as thoroughly and still give a bribe, meaning you receive both the grade and the knowledge. Which option you choose depends on you. The first option is the most

difficult; the second is easier. But in any case, even if grades are given in exchange for bribes, that does not mean you should neglect studying the material.

15.24. QUESTION: *When watching my healing sessions, a fairly sensitive person experiences the sensation of a flower bud opening.*

ANSWER: This indicates that the person is quite sensitive and possesses good qualities — that even simply watching a healing session is enough for the unfolding of brain structures at the levels that already exist within them. This is good; there is nothing negative about it.

However, unfortunately, even if the brain structures you have unfolded, if you do not know how to use them, there will be little benefit from that. You need to acquire knowledge in order to move further. But from my point of view, this is very good — it means you are ready for many things.

(Voice from the audience: *“And what should we do with this?”*) What should you do? At the very least, learn to achieve the same state without watching the sessions — that is the first task. After that, we will see what comes next, all right?

15.25. QUESTION: *It is said here that after reading some of my books, a person writes that life has not exactly become harder, but different.*

ANSWER: In principle, there is no need to change everything. But I can say that changing what a person is able to change does become more difficult. Because when a person was asleep, he might say, “Everything is wonderful, I’m having a beautiful dream.” And then he wakes up — and realizes he is lying on a prison bunk. I’m exaggerating, of course, just conveying an image.

After waking up and understanding that he is in a prison, and that what he experienced before was merely a beautiful dream in which he was, say, a sultan — of course, such an awakening will be unpleasant. But the question is: what is better — to continue sleeping, or to wake up? I think waking up is still better.

The next question is: what to do once you understand that you are in a prison? Many things can indeed be reconsidered and rethought — and one should not be afraid of this. If a person reexamines things within himself, at the very least he has people close to him who are still asleep, you understand?

For example, what would you do if you were riding in a bus, fell asleep in the back seat, then woke up and discovered that the driver had jumped out, and the bus was moving on its own and could fall into a ravine? What would you do about the people sleeping around you? You would wake them up, right?

(Voice from the audience: *“Take the wheel.”*) If you know how to drive a bus, that’s one thing. But what if you don’t? If you don’t know how, you might take the wheel and make things even worse, right? So, first of all, you need to wake others and try to bring the bus under control. But you should wake other people as well, because if you’ve never driven a bus and you try — which is not so simple — you may lose time, and people could perish along with you. Better to wake someone who can then help wake others.

(Voice from the audience: “*Maybe someone knows how to drive?*”) Yes, perhaps someone does. And you can learn to drive while others are waking the rest. So, my advice is this: yes, it’s not always pleasant when a person begins to understand and take action. Naturally, you immediately become a target — attacked from all sides. The question is, is it better to go back to sleep? I, for example, think not.

If we truly want to stop being slaves, we must stop being afraid that our “master” will punish us if we dare to resist. We need to wake up and not be afraid. Yes, someone may suffer as a result — but at least they will suffer as a human being, not as a slave. For some people that may make no difference, but for me it does.

So let everyone decide for themselves. If a person says, “I can’t do anything,” that is not correct. If someone has awakened, they have a close circle of people to whom they can help bring clarity and understanding.

There is a good American film called *They Live*. The main character accidentally finds a pair of glasses that allow him to see reality. After seeing that reality, he begins to act. Of course, whether he fully understood what he was doing is another question. It took him some time to figure out what should be done properly, but he acted nonetheless.

He had a friend who told him, “You’re crazy, an idiot — what are you doing?” The hero replied, “Put on the glasses and look. If you don’t see anything, I’ll say you’re right.” A fight broke out; they beat each other badly. Eventually, he overpowered his friend and forced the glasses onto him. The friend lifted his head — and everything changed. And then he began to act alongside him, whereas before he thought his friend was insane.

Unfortunately, such situations happen in real life. People who are asleep often resist when someone tries to help them open their eyes. Is it worth starting something only to stop immediately because of that resistance? They are under influence; they are controlled. At the very least, one should try to help them throw off that control.

Has anyone seen the film *Wolfhound of the Grey Dog Clan*? In it, one young man was a slave. Once he fell asleep, and he was forgotten — he could have left and become free. But he returned to his master. Well then, welcome — if someone likes being a slave, that is their choice. But if someone wants to be a human being, they must wake up no matter what. That is my advice.

15.26. QUESTION: *What was the attitude of our ancestors — before the destruction of Daariya — toward higher culture, art, and so on?*

ANSWER: Here one can speak mostly hypothetically, because I do not possess concrete evidence. I don’t know — perhaps somewhere such evidence exists and has been preserved, but very little has remained. However, I can say the following: their culture and art were of a fundamentally different nature. What we see today can be called culture and art only with considerable reservation.

As for art, for example, when obvious vulgarity and ugliness are presented as innovative movements, to me that seems like mockery. I once read an article about an exhibition in New York featuring a well-known modernist artist (I’ve forgotten the name). The exhibition was open for a month, and hundreds

of thousands of people visited it. Then the son of the deceased artist came to the exhibition, approached one of the paintings, and said, "Why have you hung the painting upside down?"

You see, for an entire month the painting had been hanging upside down. For a whole month, guides led tours past it; hundreds of thousands of people walked by, and dozens of admirers and connoisseurs stood before it, marveling at its genius. Should one continue speaking about such "art"?

Take *Black Square*, for example — and that's even milder by comparison. If that is called art, then I must be a crocodile. That's my attitude. When an artist lacks talent and begins painting in a primitive style and then declares, "This is new, this is mine," — to me, that's absurd. Why? Because the artist did not have enough talent to depict reality in a way that conveys everything he truly wanted to express — so that a viewer could look at the work and understand what the artist felt and thought while creating it.

It shouldn't be about what someone else wants to see or hear in the painting. What matters is what the artist himself was conveying through his creation. An artist's task is to communicate his inner world — whether in painting, in theater, or in any other medium. The artist should transmit what he intended, not simply leave it for the viewer to project whatever they wish onto it, right?

If a viewer sees only what they personally want or are capable of seeing, that suggests a weak artist — because a true artist makes the audience perceive what he meant to convey. Such artists are rare. And again, this is not accidental; such artists are deliberately promoted. Experts deliberately promote them. Do you think they do not understand perfectly well what they are doing? They simply have an assignment to undermine moral and ethical foundations.

For example, when people are presented with distorted images — an ear placed where it doesn't belong, an eye in an absurd location, exaggerated colors — and are told this is an "original idea," the claim might be that the artist is expressing someone's inner world. But if a person's inner world is degraded, it is not necessarily something that needs to be portrayed at all. That is my personal opinion, though, everyone is entitled to their own.

The point is that what our ancestors laid down at the genetic level — a sense of harmony, beauty, and balance — is being deliberately destroyed. In this way, a person's personality is being destroyed. This is, again, a form of social weaponry, and our enemies are using this weapon remarkably effectively. And we, like fools, applaud it and pay for it with our own hard-earned money.

Again, it's the same approach to everything. What I've said may not apply to absolutely everything, but there is a deliberate destruction taking place — through literature, for example — where certain behavioral stereotypes are imposed, vulgarity is imposed, and everything truly human is undermined. You know that now in Russia a sexual revolution has begun; it is actively unfolding in all directions. Yet before starting a revolution in anything, one should look at what has happened to those who already went through such a revolution.

In America, the sexual revolution began somewhere in the 1960s. It led to the fact that many people became drug addicts and contracted AIDS. Although AIDS is not a virus, but a complete destruction of the immune system. In addition, those who did not perish from drugs or the destruction of their bodies and had children — not every child born was healthy. Many children are severely ill, because, according

to this view, a mother passes on everything to the child, including the genetic diseases of all her previous partners before the child's birth.

Now fewer children are being born there, and those who are born are often very sick and weak. Many are born mentally ill or intellectually disabled, with brain damage, organ atrophy, and so on. That, it is claimed, is what the sexual revolution led to — welcome to the sexual revolution; now Russia is being invited into the sexual revolution too, right? They seize the moment when young people's hypersexuality is overflowing, and they are told: "Here you go — freely do whatever you want, everything is wonderful and beautiful, the main thing is that everyone is happy and satisfied. As long as there is no violence — if there was no rape, then everything is fine."

That is not the case at all, and it will lead to what I was speaking about if it continues further. Our ancestors did not have such prudishness, but they were strict. For example, if a man raped a woman, he was neither killed nor released on bail — he was subjected to complete castration. Do you know why? Because they understood perfectly well that such behavior by a rapist was considered a manifestation of genetics. They did not kill him — why kill? — but they deprived him of the ability to pass that genetics on. Harsh? Yes. Fair.

No one says that our ancestors did not have prostitution — they did. But do you know what else there was? If a young woman decided to become a woman of "loose behavior," she was given special herbs, after which she became infertile. Yes, go ahead — but you cannot pass your sins, or illnesses, so to speak, on to a child who is not responsible for anything. So, choose: do you want children, or pleasures? "To receive pleasure," by the way, is said to come from "by the will of the phallus," a rather grim expression in this interpretation — meaning the male sexual organ. When we say we receive "pleasure," we should know the words and what stands behind them.

(Voice from the audience: *"Tell us about the future of Russia."*) The future of Russia depends on each of us sitting here in this hall. It depends on what we will do — or whether we will allow ourselves to remain slaves, as we have been for a thousand years — or whether we will finally rise from our knees and stop being slaves, because we do not want that anymore.

In one article, where I wrote a response continuing the theme of "The Poor in Spirit," I was accused of falsifying history — the Great history of the Russian people. What "great history" of the Russian people did I falsify? The one according to which our ancestors were such savages that they lived in dugouts, invited foreigners to rule them, and could not create anything of their own — that everything good only came from outside? So that means we are complete fools and ignoramuses? Is that the great history? And how exactly am I falsifying it?

I say: "My dear friends, wait a moment — our history, at least on the territory where we now live, is almost 12,000 years old, and all other civilizations are indebted to the civilization founded by our ancestors."

I have a map by Ortelius, a famous medieval cartographer, and the map, the original map, depicts ancient Europe. In the Middle Ages, he depicted ancient Europe for his own purposes. So, on this map of ancient Europe, there's no Roman Empire, neither Western nor Eastern. Most likely, if we're talking about the first or second century AD in today's terms, there's no Eastern or Western Roman Empire on this map. Funny, isn't it?

The territory that later became France was called Gaul back then, and the border of Tartary is located in this very territory. And what's most interesting is that in the territory where the Kievan Principality later arose, do you know what it says? Scythia!

I have read studies by historians — about the Kievan state, about Yaroslav the Wise (because Vladimir is a complicated issue for them, they try to avoid him), but about Yaroslav the Wise they say: “Well, imagine that — the level of coin minting under Yaroslav the Wise was such that there was nothing comparable in other Western European countries.” Have you read that? There must have been a certain technological level in order even to mint coins. The technological level of coinage under Yaroslav the Wise was higher than that of the Western countries from which, supposedly, such developments were thought to have come.

That is because on the territory of Kievan Rus, before it became Kievan and before the khaganate was artificially created and split away, there existed a state in which the Scythians lived. Only they were called the Royal Scythians, that is, agricultural Scythians. So, who were the Scythians? They were Rus, simply one of the names for the Rus people. Just as among the Greeks there is the concept of the centaur. And where did that come from?

You know that horses were introduced to China and other places only by our ancestors, and that no one else knew how to control horses except our ancestors. Do you know about this? When our ancestors appeared in the places where the Greeks lived — on that map there is a small fragment of Greece, and Greece, by the way, at that time belonged to Gaul — when our ancestors came there from Tauria, where Scythians also lived, they were called mountain Tavri — centaurs, meaning “people.”

Our ancestors rode horses without saddles, because saddles did not yet exist. Again, it was our ancestors who invented the saddle and the reins. They stayed on the horse simply by gripping its sides tightly with their legs, riding without any saddle at all. Naturally, for people who had never seen horses before, when such a being appeared — half man, half animal — and one that could also shoot arrows, the legend of the centaurs arose in Greece.

(A voice from the audience: “And unicorns?”)

I haven't studied that question, but it is quite possible that someone simply wore a helmet with a horn. Do you know how legends about unique, sacred, or magical weapons arose?

(A voice from the audience: “Good steel?”)

Exactly. The fact is that our ancestors possessed the secrets of bulat steel for tens of thousands of years. A sword made of Damascus steel — which is essentially the same as bulat — could cut through almost any other metal, even ordinary steel.

Imagine a person entering battle with a sword made of bulat, while his opponent has a sword made of copper or iron — and steel was still very rare at that time. With a single strike, such a sword could cut through the opponent's sword, his armor, and the opponent himself.

That is where the legends of miraculous or magical swords came from — everything has its foundation.