

## 7. Meeting on 10/23/ 2010

### Opening Remarks by Nicolai Viktorovich Levashov



Good afternoon to everyone who came today and found the time to attend. I will try to answer the questions from most of those who submit notes today. However, I must once again emphasize that personal notes regarding health issues should not be sent, because this is a meeting with readers, not a medical or wellness conference. Therefore, I will only respond to notes that relate to the topics of my books or my activities.

That's the first point. Second: depending on how many notes we receive, I will answer as many as I can in the time we have. So, if I don't get to your question, please don't take it personally—unfortunately, our time is limited.

As usual, I will begin with a review of the current situation and the information on what's happening. Today is our meeting with readers, and since many people later watch these meetings on YouTube, my address is not only to everyone sitting here in the hall, but also to those who will watch this later online.

At the moment, the total number of books downloaded (this is general data) is 1,846,000, and the number continues to grow. This shows that interest is increasing more and more, which means that what we are doing together is not in vain. I mentioned earlier this year that my website had reached its first million visitors—it took almost five years to reach that milestone. However, in the past nine months alone, the number of visits has surpassed two million. This level of traffic indicates that people are showing growing interest in what is being conveyed through my books, articles, and other materials available on the website.

I'd also like to point out an interesting detail. If anyone remembers how the provocateurs used to behave—particularly in relation to the material on the "Source of Life"—you'll recall that an experiment

was being conducted and continues to this day. Initially, they claimed that everything was Photoshopped. But even the provocateurs eventually realized that it's simply impossible to create thousands of photographs using Photoshop. Moreover, any doctored photo can be easily identified when zoomed in on a computer screen—it's immediately clear whether it's been edited or not.

They kept spinning that "record" for quite a while, but eventually realized how ridiculous it looked. So, they moved on to a second phase—more cunning and "refined." Whereas before they just hurled insults—calling me a fool, an idiot, a scoundrel, a bastard—now they've changed tactics. They are trying to claim that I am supposedly taking advantage of people's ignorance and pulling the wool over their eyes. This is a new tactic, developed after they saw that the first one didn't work. So today, I'd like to take this opportunity to give an example of how this is done.

One "reader," Sergey Brut (and I mention his name because I believe provocateurs should be named—at least, that's the name he uses online), writes: "Why use Photoshop when you can simply appeal to ignorance and sell people one thing instead of another?" He cites: "People don't trust photos—what if it's Photoshopped...? So why bother with Photoshop when you can exploit people's ignorance and pass off one thing as another—here's an example with water lilies."

And he presents an example where I wrote that the water lily *Arum lily* emerged onto land, which is uncharacteristic for all conditions in open ground—something quite interesting. And here the provocation begins—very subtle.

"In fact," he says, "the *Arum* is a cuckoo" (he actually even gets the names wrong—he refers to *calla lilies*, but they are not 'cuckoo arums,' that's another issue though), "white tall lilies, and this Araceae family has several names—*calla aethiopica*, etc." (he lists several names), "a larger plant reaching heights of over 150 cm, mostly with white flowers, descended from *calla aethiopica*—many gardeners grow their own callas."

Sounds plausible. But *calla aethiopica* has absolutely nothing to do with the *Arum lily*—they are different species. Yes, both are called "lilies," but that's where the similarity ends. And to prove I'm not just saying this, I'll show you a photo of a water lily—it's quite clear, and this is from our garden. As you can see, the flower grows directly from the ground and has this shape. Now here is a photo of a calla lily—you've all seen them. Do they look anything alike? Not at all. Huge difference.

Callas have a flower stalk that can reach up to a meter in height, while here there is no stalk at all. But the funniest part—if you open any source on callas (here you can see, I have many pages on callas), what do they say? That even the *calla aethiopica* was originally a marsh plant. How about that?

And that's not the only source—there are many like it, with various names and taxonomies. Even though both are called "lilies," they belong to different families. Look at how cleverly the deception is carried out. It would seem that yet another "scholar" has supposedly exposed something—now he's trying to adopt my method. I say that I expose ignorance, and they try to use a kind of "mirror" tactic in response. But they don't do it well, because this kind of attempt is simply ridiculous. A basic comparison of two photographs shows that these are entirely different flowers and entirely different plants. And besides, they really did come out of the water and moved onto limestone.

But that's not all—you might think our “truth-seeker” Sergey Brut (who chose a rather amusing pseudonym) stopped there? Now comes the next bit. I didn't include the photographs here because there are too many of them, and it's already obvious enough to everyone. Those who read the articles on the “Source of Life” have seen how various plants changed under the influence of the Generator. For example, I showed what happened with strawberries. And the same person (Brut again) starts writing more so-called “revelations.” He writes: “In the photo from October 21... you can see that ripe strawberries appear alongside flowers.”

Well of course! If the plants bear fruit all year round, I still don't know of any method by which a fruit could appear without a flower. Apparently, Sergey Brut has discovered a new way—but that's still not all. He then continues: “Let's explain this miracle—Loire Valley has a temperate climate, without large temperature fluctuations, with lots of sunny days,” etc. Yes, maybe that was true about 200 years ago. The Loire Valley—if anyone has read all my materials—was known as the Valley of the Kings precisely because even in winter, the temperature (the so-called isotherm, or temperature zone) did not drop below 15°C. But that was 200 years ago—100 years ago—even in the middle of the last century.

Since the late 20th and early 21st centuries, the climate there has changed quite significantly—it has become sharply continental. Even now, as of today and over the past two weeks, there have been nighttime frosts—below zero. That's the first point. The second point—those who have read all of my materials know that each year the temperatures there have been steadily decreasing. There are no extreme fluctuations, but in summer it can reach 40–45°C, and in winter it has already dropped to –20 to –24°C. That's what they call a mild climate without sharp fluctuations, right?

Anyone interested can look up the weather for the past 10 years to see what the actual climate in that valley is like. And you'll see that in October (I even wrote and included data on what frosts occurred on which days), frosts and ice formation begin—there are photos. But Sergey Brut, for some reason, chose (you see how cunningly he does it) to use some old information about the Loire Valley, the very same old data I myself mention in the article, and he presents it as if it's some kind of revelation—again relying on people's ignorance.

Now, if you actually read carefully, I gradually explained that strawberries bear fruit all year round. I detailed that yes; there are frost-resistant varieties of strawberries that are planted in September and bear fruit by the end of October. But there are two key points: they are planted in September, and only the most frost-resistant ones will produce fruit. And even then, if the soil temperature drops to –4°C, they die. I included all of this in my articles.

He, however, just picked one source. But in the follow-up sources, I provide the full data. So, if you saw the most recent update, our strawberries are bearing fruit—with ripe, unfrozen, living berries—even in November, December, January, February, and even under snow in –20°C frost. There are photos, and everything is documented.

But here's another interesting point—take, I believe, the third source, where in 2006, strawberries (and not just strawberries) were planted in limestone soil. They were planted once, in April. What does that tell us?

Anyone who has ever grown strawberries knows that if you plant them in April, those are spring varieties—regular varieties. These types bear fruit once over the course of two months and then stop

fruiting until the following year. In our case, we planted two varieties, which are clearly distinguishable by their fruit—one round, the other slightly elongated. No one has replanted them; they've been growing in the same place for six years now, without replanting.

And here's the latest data: they've started bearing fruit all year round—one and the same plant. That is, it blooms, bears fruit, then new flowers appear, and it continues to bloom and fruit continuously. In winter, of course, not as intensively, but even in the past year, they were fruiting during the winter.

Look at how subtly the information is being manipulated. Not a single strawberry variety, not even the frost-resistant ones, fruits year-round—they only bear fruit after being planted in the ground in September. But in our case, we're talking about spring varieties, which were never replanted—they've remained as they were originally planted, growing for all these years without transplanting.

So, what is this designed for? It's aimed at people who haven't read anything, don't know, and don't understand. And naturally, such people will be led to think that someone is deceiving them. But in reality, it is *our* Sergey Brut who is doing the deceiving—a man who didn't even have the courage to use his real last name. But that's typical, as usual.

Next, there are other kinds of “debunking.” For example, someone listened to one of my lectures—I don't know how he was listening or in what state—a young guy. I won't mention his last name, even though he wrote it himself. He writes something like, “Don't try to fool me—I studied astronomy, we covered this, and don't try to pull the wool over my eyes.”

The funniest part is, he claims the Kuiper Belt is located between Mars and Jupiter, and then says it's between Jupiter and Saturn. But I never even mentioned the Kuiper Belt at all. And in fact, the Kuiper Belt is not between Jupiter and Saturn—it is located beyond Pluto's orbit, beyond the average orbit of the solar system. (I have the information here on purpose to clarify this.)

But I didn't talk about that at all—I was referring to asteroids, which originated as a result of the explosion of the planet Phaethon, or *Deia* as our ancestors called it, whose orbit was located between Mars and Jupiter. That planet exploded, and the resulting debris formed what we now call asteroids. These asteroids follow elliptical orbits, but all of their orbits intersect at a single point—precisely where that planet once existed.

And again, these are not my conclusions, but those of astronomers who have studied and confirmed that if all asteroid orbits intersect at the same point, it indicates that they once formed a single celestial body. This fully confirms the information that there was once a planet there which exploded, creating the asteroid fragments. So, this person “heard the bell ringing, but doesn't know where the sound is coming from,” and tries to demonstrate his supposed knowledge.

Second point: regarding Titan, the moon of Saturn—he claimed that Titan has rings. First of all, Titan is not a moon of Saturn, but a moon of Jupiter, and yes, rings have indeed been discovered around it. I don't know when he studied astronomy, but rings have been discovered around many planets. Again, I'm not the one providing this data—these are findings from researchers, astronomers, astrophysicists. So, if anyone has complaints, they should direct them to them, not to me. But in fact, Titan—a moon of Jupiter, which is also larger than Earth—has been found to have rings similar to Saturn's.

Now, regarding the formation of our solar system: how could Mercury, Venus, Saturn, and all the other planets have survived if supernova explosions—for example, from Alpha Centauri, the closest star system to us—could destroy or threaten destruction on Earth? The idea that a supernova in Alpha Centauri could pose such a threat is, once again, merely a hypothesis of scientists—no one has ever observed such an event.

Supernova explosions have occurred even in our time—within the past 1,000 years. They don't happen very often compared to the span of human life or human civilization, and when they have been observed, the only effect was a bright flash. A bright star would appear in the sky. That's the first point.

Second—the person clearly didn't understand that when our Sun had a companion star, and when that star exploded, our Sun had no planetary system at all. It was only after that star exploded, from the masses of matter ejected during the explosion, that the solar system began to form around the Sun—including Mercury, Venus, and so on. This is a clear example of how people try to “debunk” something without really understanding what they're talking about.

Remember how people used to lash out at me for criticizing Einstein's theory? And yet, it has been disproven by facts and instrument-based studies—not conducted by me, by the way; you can read the article if you're interested. I've always criticized it—it was squeezed out of who knows what, so to speak. And now, new publications have started to appear—someone recently sent me one: — “Did you know that even scientists are now beginning to question whether Einstein's theory makes any sense?”

Of course! Especially when those very same astrophysicists observe how galaxies in the universe are moving away from each other—galaxies, which are supposedly “very small” (I say that with irony)—and they're moving apart at speeds greater than the speed of light.

How can modern scientists even measure that entire galaxies are moving apart at speeds greater than the speed of light—without considering the fact that experiments have already been conducted, which I wrote about in the article *“The Theory of the Universe and Objective Reality,”* where I cite real experiments?

If I had conducted those experiments myself, someone might start to doubt—saying: “You wrote it and did the experiments yourself.” But I didn't conduct those experiments—other scientists did. It's just that information about their work is being deliberately silenced. I simply found these experiments to support my statements. Of course, I could conduct certain experiments myself—and I do—but if I did, they'd say I falsified the results. That's why I use a different approach: I find experiments carried out by others, so that no one can say I conducted or manipulated them myself.

We're now entering a peculiar era—a new era of criticism—where, under the guise of pseudo-scientific rhetoric, people once again try to discredit what is actually real. Very interesting things are happening, and I discussed this in the *“Source of Life”* article, where I presented facts—real facts—about what's going on, including a unique method for solving the food problem without chemicals, without anything genetically modified. This problem *can* be solved on a large scale—if we begin taking action.

This is an experiment that has been ongoing for many years, and moreover, it's being conducted not only on our site in France. Here in Moscow as well, there's an enterprise where it's no longer just an experiment—it's industrial-scale food production, and it's operating quite effectively.

Instead of being glad that there's a solution—that we can produce ecologically clean food without health-damaging toxins—we get this kind of “criticism,” which I can't even call criticism, because it's complete nonsense. I've deliberately revealed this situation and laid it out clearly, so that those who are truly interested in real understanding can see what's really behind it. Don't be too quick to believe those who try to smear everything with pseudo-scientific jargon. That's a typical tactic of the parasites.

You see, they came up with the idea that those were calla lilies—“well, they kind of look similar”—but in fact, they don't look alike at all. I showed that clearly—they are different plants. And even calla lilies are marsh plants. In any case, even callas won't grow in limestone soil. Nevertheless, a person who knows nothing, who hasn't read any of my materials, might read an opinion from some so-called “expert debunker” ...

This comes from the “Slovensk” site—they're the ones trying to “expose” me. They “love” me so much they'd like to see me in a coffin and white slippers—but wishing harm is easy. That's probably where this is coming from—these “scientists” doing the exposing. But the most interesting part is that the majority of these critics are either 15- or 16-year-old kids with “extensive” education—or just provocateurs, as I've mentioned before, who do this for money.

But sometimes the criticism reaches a slightly ridiculous level—I won't mention the person's name. It's unfortunate when someone lacks both critical thinking and a sense of irony or humor. Here's an example: “Dear Nicolai Viktorovich, you write — ‘let's get into a time machine and travel back in time’ (*Essence and Mind*, Vol. 2), to the moment when the first spark of reason appeared in *our* Adam and Eve.” That's irony—and even in my text, “Adam and Eve” is placed in quotation marks.

But the person indignantly objects — “How are they *our* Adam and Eve? Those are the ancestors of the Jews, created by their god-devil Yahweh/Jehovah. Our ancestors called them *yevichi*; the Jews trace their lineage through the mother, but we are the children of Ramkha.” And he writes all these things...

Well, at the very least, read my other books! If someone can't grasp irony or a bit of humor, then this kind of critique just becomes amusing. The person clearly lacks a sense of humor. Because the reference to Adam and Eve was made with irony—it was my little jab at certain things and certain people, at the absurdity written in those myths. But the person didn't get it—instead, he interpreted it his own way.

Now the enemies are trying to act in a slightly different way. After certain events that took place this past summer, they are very displeased with what happened—and outraged. Just so you know, financial mafias are now gathering with the goal of eliminating the “tamer of the elements”—that is, me—and they've set a deadline to report by the beginning of November that the task has been completed.

Let them try. You know how many attempts have already been made to destroy me—hundreds. That doesn't mean it's impossible in principle, but it's already difficult because they've tried so many times. And I've developed my own methods of protection, which have been working well so far.

That doesn't mean nothing can happen—but even if they do manage to do something, which I highly doubt, it won't help them. Because even if they succeed in eliminating my physical body, it won't change anything. That hasn't helped for a long time—in fact, it will only cause them more problems.

In general, I'm an inconvenient person for many. I get in their way, spoil their "wonderful" projects—like this summer's heat wave. My wife and I interfered, ruined their plans. We disrupted their "brilliant" program—and here I am, this scoundrel Levashov, poking his nose where it doesn't belong. And we'll continue to interfere, even though it causes us a lot of trouble. I simply don't talk about all the harm they try to do to us—but it's a different kind of harm.

That's why I appeal to you, and to others as well—don't be too quick to believe those who hide behind pseudo-scientific rhetoric. Read the materials, but draw your own conclusions. I'm not saying you should draw the conclusions I want—just make your *own*.

I provide information, and it's up to the reader to either accept it or not. I simply present it in a more expanded form so that a person can gain understanding—and from there, it depends entirely on the individual. Do you want to understand or not?

You can give a person everything they need, but if they don't want to accept it, that's their choice. My goal is not to force anyone to believe in what my information conveys. I understand faith the way our ancestors did—as enlightenment through knowledge. It's something needed by the person who genuinely wants to understand what is happening around them and within themselves.

The point isn't to impose anything on anyone, but to help a person sort things out. The vast majority of messages I receive are not full of criticism or barking attacks—only a very small number are, especially when you consider that the website is visited by millions and the books have been distributed in the millions as well. That speaks volumes—it shows that it's a minority, which of course has the right to exist. Some people get hysterical—I don't even know why. Maybe because they're being paid for it.

Take Sergey Brut, for example—although that's not his real name. He's gained "fame," but not for himself—only for his pseudonym. And what kind of fame is it? As a provocateur—a basic, simple provocateur.

But thank you for sending that message to the website. I read how he claims I'm deceiving people. Turns out, I'm not the one deceiving anyone—he is. The question is: was it accidental? Only someone blind wouldn't be able to see the difference between the photos I presented and the ones of calla lilies.

Only someone blind—or a provocateur—after reading about how things actually happen and how strawberries and other plants are cultivated, could write such things. I don't know who benefits from this. Of course, for many people, it's easier to disengage — "Why should I change anything about myself if everything suits me?" But what exactly suits you?

Is anyone truly satisfied with the situation we're living in? Who is okay with what's happening on Earth and in our country? What we're seeing is the result of what has been embedded into so-called "modern knowledge." I'm not saying everything about it is negative—actually, even negative findings in science are considered positive.

That is, if someone follows a certain path and hits a dead end—that's still valuable information. It means: don't go that way—it's a dead end. Many branches of "modern knowledge," as defined by the official system, have led to dead ends. But that's not a bad thing—it's good. It means we need to look for different paths, rather than keep banging our heads against the wall, which doesn't work very well. I

don't know anyone who has broken through a solid wall with their forehead—unless it's made of cardboard. Do you know anyone like that? You see—on that point, we agree.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**7.1. QUESTION:** *Could you please explain what the Russian word "lyubov" (love) means, how it is connected with the word "quality," and what levels of love exist in the universe?*

**ANSWER:** I haven't deciphered the word "love" in a linguistic sense—I'm not that much of a linguist. In order to say something specific about it, I would need to study the matter thoroughly. However, I can respond to the second part of the question—about the levels of love in the universe—based on the information I already possess.

What is currently being imposed by the mass media is an effort to turn people into cattle—reducing everything to sex. They equate love with sex, claiming love doesn't exist and that it's just all about sex. This is being aggressively promoted in Russia now. But in fact, a truly diabolical campaign (and I use the term "diabolical" symbolically—not because I believe in God or the Devil, but as a convenient label) has already been carried out across the world, aimed at turning the majority of the population into a herd of sheep.

This effort has been led by a specific group—the true rulers of the world. There are very few of them, and they are, by the way, all practitioners of magic—most of them black magicians. Their goal is to orient people solely toward base, minimal needs—to reduce them to the level of animals and keep them in that state for the rest of their lives.

That's why sex is promoted—not just sex, but total depravity. For example, a thousand psychologists authored a book aimed at young people, and do you know what conclusion they came to? The world's top psychologists wrote in this book that sex relieves stress. So, if you're stressed—have sex! It's now treated like a medicine. For young people, whose hormones are already surging, this is a "blessed gift"—"Oh, I'm stressed, let's go have sex to relieve it." As a result, nothing else seems important—and sex becomes a form of medication.

Think about it—why did a thousand of the world's "top" psychologists write that book? Most psychologists—how can they speak about things they only know from external manifestations? They don't even understand the nature of emotions, feelings, consciousness, or memory.

I'm not saying that I've studied psychology in depth, but I've had to study certain aspects of it. As far as I know, in psychology, the understanding of memory and consciousness is purely conditional. Simply stating that "memory is memory" is not knowledge—it's just an observation. Saying that a person has consciousness is also not knowledge—it's merely stating a fact. You don't need to be a psychologist to recognize that.

I'm not saying that practical psychology isn't needed. But some of my students in the U.S. were psychologists, and the methods they used to treat psychological trauma were, frankly, catastrophic. I told them: "You're destroying people." For example, consider this situation—a woman has been raped. What does one of the very popular therapeutic methods do? It forces the person to mentally return to

the moment when the assault happened. In every session, the woman is brought back to the state she was in during the rape. Does that help? Be honest—those of you who are women here—would it help you if you had to relive that over and over again? Because when a person thinks about such an event, they tune into it and enter the same psychological state. In other words, the person goes through the trauma of rape again and again.

From my point of view, this doesn't pull a person out of the pit—it pushes them deeper into it. But that's actually convenient—because then the patient will keep coming back to the psychologist for the rest of her life with the same unresolved problem.

Now imagine if you worked with a person two or three times effectively and they fully recovered—they wouldn't need to come back anymore. Do you see what this turns into? This kind of psychological technique, with trauma victims like this, is very—very—popular in the West. I don't know if it's used in Russia, but in the West it is. And you don't need a psychology degree to understand that such a method is unacceptable.

On the contrary, a person needs to be told that what happened was an anomaly—that normal relationships *do* exist—and that what the degenerate or degenerates did should be erased from memory. It does *not* mean that all other men are the same. Real love *does* exist—but no one talks about that.

This is just one example of how certain psychological techniques work, and I could give dozens more. But why did I bring this up? Because it's directly connected to how sex is being promoted—reducing people to seeing only gender in one another. That is the level of animals. And even among animals, this occurs only at certain times—when nature dictates—and it happens in a much more graceful way. There are mating dances, calls, rituals. It's not crude or vulgar like the way humans are being turned into.

So, who benefits from turning people into animals? And why is it being done? It's done so that a person, obsessed only with sex, eating, and drinking—will have no other interests. But those are *not* human interests. Yes, we have an animal nature—we are living beings—and indeed, without physical closeness, none of us would be here. But that does *not* mean it has to be reduced to a bestial act, which is exactly what they're pushing us toward. There must be love.

So, what is love? I explained this in more detail in the book "*Essence and Mind*"—read it, because I can't cover everything here. Each of us—man or woman—feels attraction toward another person of the opposite sex, assuming our orientation is normal. Look—when it comes to so-called sex, it doesn't really matter *who* it is, only that the person is of the opposite sex. The *who* doesn't matter—just that certain "conditions" are met, so to speak.

And yet—each of you has fallen in love not with just *anyone*, but with a *specific* person. Maybe not the most beautiful woman or the most handsome man, not the strongest or the most flirtatious—but with someone specific, not just whoever happened to be nearby. Even children, teenagers—when they experience their first love, that first love isn't directed at everyone—it's focused on *one* person. Why is that? If we were only driven by sex, we wouldn't care *who* it was—it would be whoever came along first, right?

And that, right there, is proof that *feelings* exist. It's just that people often make mistakes—especially in

youth—when choosing one another. And still, very often, those people later break up. There are many reasons for that. I explain them in greater detail in the book—particularly in terms of harmony on other levels.

To put it briefly, here's a simple metaphor: two people arrive at the same intersection at the same time. At that moment, they are at the same "crossroads"—that is, they are aligned in terms of qualitative harmony with one another. But if they then go off in different directions, over time they'll grow further and further apart, and eventually even sex won't keep them together.

But—if they both turn and move in the same direction, even if one moves faster and the other slower, but they help each other grow—morally and spiritually—then the feeling of love can last a lifetime. Unfortunately, this doesn't happen often. Because, very often, at the crossroads, people *mistake* something *else* for love...

In the past, our ancestors had a tradition of getting to know a person for a long time—two to three years—before creating a family. Of course, they made mistakes too; there were also divorces. But the number of mistakes was much lower.

Because when someone wakes up in the morning and has to ask, "What's your name?"—that kind of relationship is based purely on physiology. And when a person is under the influence of physiological attraction, it's like being in a fog—those who've experienced it know what I mean. That attraction will last for a certain period while everything feels fresh, but over time, it becomes tiresome. And if there's nothing beyond it, people suddenly realize they're complete strangers.

In the past, people acted much more wisely. Before jumping into bed—without even knowing the other person's name—they would first get to know each other as human beings. And when that happens, when the attraction isn't just toward the male or female body—which is natural—but toward the *specific person*, their inner world, that's when true love forms. You fall in love with the inner world of the one who is your destined partner.

And when that happens, and the relationship is later completed through marriage, then physical closeness—what people call "sex"—also appears. Though personally, I don't like the word *sex*, because it's crude and inaccurate. What arises is *intimacy*. And then, such families can truly last, because they're not built on physiology alone (which exists in animals too), but on something deeper.

And what makes us different from animals? What do animals do—those who've observed this? When it's time to reproduce, mating season begins. The females go into heat, and right away the males show interest. But once the cycle ends—zero emotion, even though everything else remains.

So then—should we act like animals? Is that what the rulers of the world—the dark ones—want from us? Should we follow what *they* want? Or should we stand firm within ourselves and defend our human essence—not the animal part, but the truly human part?

And from my point of view, that human aspect is not just present—it is fundamental. What's most important is that we, hopefully, are endowed with *reason*. And the fact that we are rational beings—that is the most essential part of us.

The feeling of love, both on Earth and on other levels of existence, is based on harmony between a man and a woman. Not on *physiological* harmony, which is the most basic and brings no real benefit—but on harmony at other levels, on *qualitative resonance*.

And it is precisely this kind of resonance that allows children to be born more gifted than their parents. It is thanks to this resonance that evolution takes place—that there is forward movement. But if everything degenerates into mere physiology, into filth—how can there be any movement forward, right? And now, especially with drugs being so widespread, people wake up and say, “Who’s the father of the child?” — “I don’t know... maybe this one, maybe that one.” I consider that a pathology.

But today’s youth, unfortunately, often believe that just because they are young, the older generation are idiots who don’t understand anything. Yet they don’t stop to think that the older generation were once young too—that they also had hormones surging, maybe even *more* than today’s youth.

Nowadays, there are very few truly healthy children, and people’s physiology has weakened. But back then, people were generally healthy—so things surged and stirred *much* more strongly than in most of today’s youth. And even then, parents would tell their children to behave properly—for the very same reasons.

In one film—an American film, actually—a teacher walks into a senior high school classroom and asks, “How many of you already have children?” And nearly half the students raise their hands. Then he asks, “Do you want your children to grow up and be killed in gang violence?” They say, “No.”

And then he says, “Now listen—you are *our* children, and *we* also don’t want you to be killed in gangs, to die from drugs, and so on.” And they suddenly understood—that he was telling the truth. You see, when it’s about their own child, they say, “No, I don’t want that.” So why wouldn’t a teacher, like a father figure, want the same for *them*?

The problem is that a teacher has to find real connection with their students—not just preach at them, which is what usually happens—but to have a *genuine, live* conversation. So, when we speak about love, love must be based above all on *spiritual harmony*—when your soul resonates with the soul of another person, with their essence. And when that happens—when you unite as man and woman, and intimacy arises, and children are born—that is *beautiful*. But when it’s just dirty sex—that is deformity. That is my opinion.

And in space, it’s the same—only the harmony is different. On some planets—at least from what I’ve seen, though I haven’t been involved in traveling to planets for quite a while—when I used to do that, I visited one planet where women were not allowed to have children until they reached a certain level of evolutionary development. Only when they attained that level were they permitted to marry and have children. And that’s the right approach—because the developmental level of the mother determines what kind of child will be born.

Why did the Arab world fall into the darkness it did? Because before the adoption of Islam, it had a very high level of culture—created by our ancestors as well. It was a highly developed civilization. But as soon as Islam was introduced, women were reduced to the level of animals. A woman wasn’t even considered a human being. Yet Islam is actually a sect of Christianity—or more precisely, a derivative of the Greek

cult of Dionysus. I don't remember exactly at which Ecumenical Council of the Christian Church the question was raised: "Is a woman a human being?"

## **7.2. NEXT QUESTION: Do you consider your teaching to be the only true one?**

**ANSWER:** I don't consider it the only true one—I'm simply expressing my understanding of what I know. My task is to convey this to people, and each individual either accepts it or not, depending on whether it resonates with them or not.

What does "only true" even mean? That's the wrong kind of question. It's like saying, "Our party is the only guiding party"—and where is that party now? Knowledge doesn't care whether people like it or not. If the sun is shining, you can close your eyes and say, "I don't see the sunlight and I don't want to,"—but that doesn't mean the sunlight doesn't exist.

Truth is indifferent to how people perceive it or how they choose to approach it. I share the knowledge that I've managed to acquire, because even when I was in school, I noticed many contradictions and inconsistencies in the curriculum—in physics, chemistry, and so on. But I thought: school is for children—surely higher education will provide real answers.

Eventually, I finished school and entered university. I received the best scientific education available at the time in the Soviet Union. The Soviet school system was still intact, and the education in the USSR was excellent. That was one of its great strengths—if we set aside the Communist propaganda. Though I must say, having lived in the United States for 15 years, there is even *more* propaganda there—just a different kind. I've seen both sides of the coin, and I can say there is more propaganda in America than there ever was in Soviet schools.

I received the best education, earned my degree, and graduated from an elite department of an elite faculty. The Kharkov School of Radiophysics was considered the best in the Soviet Union. And that's not just my opinion—it's something anyone can verify.

I graduated from Kharkov University, Faculty of Radiophysics, from the Department of Theoretical Radiophysics, which was considered the elite department within our faculty. I received what was supposed to be a very solid education. I earned my diploma, and in physics I always had excellent grades. I didn't get a red diploma (with honors) because I had a few Bs (in the Soviet system, "4" is equivalent to a B). But I never chased grades.

I remember when I was up north, in the Arctic Circle, working in a student construction brigade—I caught hepatitis (Botkin's disease). I ended up treating myself, but they kept me in an isolation ward, like everyone, for a month. Naturally, I didn't attend university during that time.

Later, during the exam on the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, I answered all the questions. The examiner said: "I'm giving you a 4." I asked, "Can I know why? I answered all the questions correctly." He replied, "Yes, but you didn't attend my lectures and seminars." I said, "As you can see, I copied all the lecture notes. I couldn't attend because I was in the hospital isolation ward with Botkin's disease. So, what's the problem—did I answer incorrectly?" "No, your answers were correct, but since you didn't attend my sessions—4."

Now tell me—isn’t it hard to fight such idiocy? Right? I understand if I had been getting Cs like Einstein—that would be one thing. But I never got Cs. If I had two Bs out of five or six grades, that was the maximum in any exam session. And our faculty was considered the most difficult not only in our university, but beyond. So yes—I received a serious, high-quality, complete education. I got my degree, graduated, and still hadn’t received answers to the questions I had since school. So where do you go from there?

And that’s when I realized—I wasn’t interested in simply getting an education. What I really wanted was *understanding*. And I didn’t get that. So, starting from my second year, I began to explore things on my own. I thought—let me try to find answers myself. And so, I began searching.

What I found is reflected in my books. These are not just abstract words that no one can verify or understand. For example, the application of my knowledge has led to what is described in *The Source of Life*. The experiments have been conducted for many years. There’s also an enterprise in Moscow—and it will keep expanding. This knowledge has *real*, practical application.

I also remembered something amusing—about the generator I developed. I refer to it as a psi-generator or a generator of dark matter, or what I call *primary matter*. Somewhere I read something very funny: “Did you know—Levashov says he uses dark matter! That means he’s dark himself. He lies when he says he brings light and good. He wrote it himself — ‘generator of dark matter,’ so it must be dark forces, which means he’s on the side of darkness, the same parasites he claims to fight.” Brilliant logic, isn’t it? The term *dark matter* wasn’t even coined by me—and it has absolutely nothing to do with dark forces or black magicians.

Dark matter is a physical term—it was introduced by physicists. I specifically use the phrase “*generator of dark matter*” so that people can understand what I mean. I get letters from people saying, “Please send us the generator diagram by mail.” I respond: “Sure—here you go. The generator is described right here—just read carefully.” Or they ask, “How can I build the generator myself?” It’s very simple: you need to reach a certain evolutionary level, attain a certain level of understanding—and when you have that understanding, you’ll be able to create it.

But here’s the most interesting part—let me explain *dark matter*. Physicists introduced this concept because astrophysicists and astronomers, while observing the universe, noticed something: cosmic objects—stars, galaxies—move along their trajectories in such a way that the total mass of the universe, as calculated, should be ten times greater than what’s observed. For these movements to be possible, there must be more mass exerting gravitational influence. It turned out that the matter we’re familiar with—physically dense matter, everything around us (including our own beloved selves)—makes up only 10% of the total matter in the universe.

Why they called it “dark,” I don’t know—maybe because interstellar space looks black. But there is no emptiness there—it is completely filled. And because it looks black, they called it *dark matter*. It’s a term from physics. I use it to help people understand what a psi-generator is. But people still ask, “What is it? What’s it made of? Where’s the device? Can I touch it?” But the truth is—it doesn’t exist in the way you’re expecting. It’s made from that 90% of the universe’s matter—*matter* that we cannot perceive with our regular senses, simply because our sensory organs are built to detect only the matter we’re familiar with. You *can* attach the psi-generator to a physical device—that’s not the issue—but even then, it’s not the device that’s doing the work.

In order to *perceive* dark matter, one must develop the appropriate inner qualities. For example, if a person is blind, can they see colors? Just because they don't see them—does that mean colors don't exist? Of course not. So how can you help a blind person see colors? Only by *restoring their vision*.

Likewise, in order to *sense* or *perceive* those other forms of matter—the so-called *dark matter*—a person must, through their own development, *create additional sensory organs* within themselves. That is—figuratively speaking—if you didn't have an eye, you need to add one.

These are other kinds of sensory organs on different levels of perception—just as eyes function on the physical level. And once a person develops those, they are then able to *understand*, *see*, and even *interact* with these forms of matter. So, what conclusion do some people jump to? “He wrote ‘dark matter’—that means he’s a black magician and involved in dark deeds, working with parasites.” When you come across such gems of logic, all you can do is marvel at the sheer idiocy of it.

**7.3. QUESTION:** *Lately, more and more children are being born sick and far more fragile, with 80% of them born with health issues. Why is this happening?*

**ANSWER:** Unfortunately, this is a fact—and a sad one. Why? Well, let’s thank our “glorious” medical system—there’s no other way to put it. People have been pumped full of pills—whether needed or not. For some individuals, especially the elderly, breakfast consists of nothing but handfuls of pills. But it’s not only the elderly—young people too. Naturally, all of this destroys the immune system and breaks down the body.

And if this begins in childhood, then when a young woman eventually becomes a mother with a weakened immune system—what does she pass on to her child? Already damaged genetics, and a compromised physiology. Add to that the fact that most hospitals are infected with *staphylococcus*. Almost all newborns are exposed to this infection at birth—deliberately so—in maternity wards.

Recently, someone sent me information through the website—about the polio vaccine, which is administered right after birth, I believe. Newborns receive this “necessary” polio vaccine, and what was discovered in it? A Trojan horse—the active pathogen of meningitis. In other words, a completely different virus.

Now imagine this: a healthy newborn is given a “beneficial” vaccine against polio, and within that vaccine, in an *active* state (not weakened), is the meningitis pathogen. Will that child grow up healthy? And where do these vaccines come from? From pharmaceutical companies—Western giants, monsters whose objective is to destroy health and make people sick.

Unfortunately, the core issue is that many doctors have ceased to be doctors in the true sense of the word—not all, but most. It’s not in a doctor’s financial interest for people to be healthy. If a person stops getting sick, they won’t come back—which means no income. Right? So maybe, if that’s the situation, we shouldn’t be producing such a large number of doctors. Instead, we should reduce the number to serve only those who are genuinely ill—rather than having doctors who *create* illnesses themselves.

In one film there was a humorous scene about advertising—a character with a good sense of irony. It was a commercial for a sleeping pill. The narrator says: “If you take it, you’ll sleep like a baby and wake up refreshed and full of energy.” Then comes the fast list of side effects: “May cause kidney failure,

memory loss, liver dysfunction, blood disorders, and in rare cases, death." But — "you'll sleep like a baby." *Possibly*. Not 100% guaranteed.

Now imagine—dozens of side effects: kidney failure, liver failure, bone marrow suppression—just minor things, right? Pick up *any* medication and read the side effects—it becomes obvious. How, then, can you actually heal someone? It is impossible to truly heal a person using conventional medical means. Why?

Let me explain briefly. When I ran a medical training seminar in Arkhangelsk—it lasted 10 days—there were doctors in attendance: heads of departments, general practitioners, and so on. Even though the time was short (and now I realize it was too short), we still managed to achieve a lot.

I remember around the 6th or 7th day one department head came to me in tears. I asked, "What's the matter?" She had been a doctor for 30 years, and she said: "For the first time in 30 years, I was able to *actually* help someone." A patient had a blood clot in the leg, and she used one of the techniques I had taught during those few days—and the clot dissolved before her eyes. The patient was crying out of gratitude. And after 30 years in medicine, it was the *first time* she had truly helped someone. There really are people in medicine who *want* to help. The only field in medicine that is truly effective is surgery—when bones are broken and urgent intervention is needed, etc. But as for therapy—it's absurd. And I'll explain why.

What is illness? Everyone knows that when a person becomes infected, there is an incubation period—when the person is already ill but doesn't yet realize it. Then, the actual symptoms of the illness appear. So, what is the incubation period? The infection has entered the body, but the body isn't responding yet—because there isn't enough of the infection. Our body doesn't "think"—it only reacts to signals coming from the tissues. The infection starts interfering with the biochemical processes of our cells—in other words, it begins to consume nutrients for itself, because it too is a living organism. Just like us—if we want to live, we have to consume something.

Yes, for now, unfortunately, we need to eat chicken, pork, vegetables, and fruit. Sometimes I'm amazed when vegetarians say, "You're murderers—meat eaters—you kill." But plants grow to be eaten too, apparently? Aren't they living beings? Of course they are! And they don't want to be eaten any more than animals do.

So, if you're against eating anything living—then eat *nothing at all*, because a plant is just as much a living being. Fruits weren't made for us to eat them—fruits exist so they can fall to the ground, release their seeds, and grow into healthy plants. When we eat fruits, we're eating the *children* of plants. We eat their offspring and the plants themselves. So, what—are they not alive? Of course they are. That's why the debate over vegetarianism vs. meat-eating is nonsense. Both are living.

Unfortunately, we have not yet reached the phase where we can obtain the necessary energy directly, without using organic matter. We *have* to consume it—it's a law of nature, whether we like it or not. If we want to live, we must do this.

Now, regarding illness—even the pathogens that cause disease are living organisms. Each individual pathogen, by itself, is not inherently dangerous to us. So, what *is* dangerous? Their metabolic byproducts. They consume substances from our body and then release waste products. Now, where do we throw our waste? Into the garbage. And where's *their* garbage dump? Our body.

They dump their metabolic waste into our system. And these byproducts are often highly active and toxic. These waste substances are released into our body and interact with our cells. These are chemically reactive compounds—they enter the cells and alter them chemically. That means they trigger chemical reactions in places where they shouldn't occur. They break down the chemical bonds that *should* exist and create new ones that *shouldn't*.

This leads to structural changes in the cells—the *morphological* structure of the cells changes. And when a cell is altered, its functions change as well. A damaged or altered cell can no longer perform its original function in the way it did when it was healthy and undisturbed.

And when a massive amount of infection multiplies—before the body starts responding—the infection continues growing more and more. When the threshold of our body's sensitivity is reached, when our nerve receptors begin reacting to those toxins and waste products, a signal is sent to the brain. And that's when the *active phase* of the illness begins—when the body starts to fight back.

The first response in this battle is fever, because in most cases, infectious agents die at around 39 degrees Celsius (102.2°F). But what does our famous medical system do? As soon as there's a fever—they immediately try to bring it down. And that is the *first major mistake* of modern medicine. Because in fact, fever kills the infection.

If someone has a temperature of 40 or 41°C (104–105.8°F)—that's actually *great*! If the body manages to raise its temperature to 41, it means the immune system is very strong. Most often, by the next day the person will be healthy—or in two to three days at most. Yes, it's tough to endure a high fever—but you should not lower it. It is the body's natural immune reaction, the strongest and most effective one. Only in rare cases—perhaps 1 in 100,000, as far as I know—does a person's body fail to tolerate a high fever. In such rare cases, yes, it must be reduced—because otherwise, the fever itself could become lethal.

Our ancestors were wise. When they caught a cold, they would go to the banya (steam bath) and give themselves a thorough steaming. And what happens in a steam bath? The body heats up from the inside to a very high temperature. They would go into the steam room—stay there awhile—and come out completely flushed, especially after sitting in there thoroughly.

After catching a cold, our ancestors would go to the banya, warm themselves up, use a birch whisk (*venik*), rub themselves with honey, which would be absorbed into the skin, cleanse the body, open the pores, release toxins—and people would walk out healthy. And by the way, people were *much* healthier back then. What's the problem with modern medicine? Medicine immediately tries to lower the fever—essentially destroying the body's immune response.

The second line of defense is the production of antibodies against the pathogen. And the most interesting thing is—once the body starts producing antibodies, it doesn't stop. As a result, the illness enters a slow, chronic phase that can drag on indefinitely.

In other words, illness never truly goes away—even with pills. It simply transitions into a chronic, slow-moving form. Why can't medicine change this? Because no pill, no matter what it is, can reverse morphologically altered cells—they cannot return those cells to their original, healthy state. In order to

do that, you would need to *identify and restore the specific chemical bonds that were destroyed*, and *break down the new, incorrect bonds that formed in their place*.

Can pills do that? No. And that's why modern medicine is, in principle, incapable of curing a person. At best, it can push the condition into a lingering, low-grade state. And if you consider how many medications are prescribed—and how many side effects those drugs have (like the ones I mentioned earlier)—the problem only worsens.

Let me give an example: a person comes to the doctor and says, "I have such-and-such problem." The doctor gives them one medication. The person takes it, comes back, says, "Didn't help—what else can I try?" So, the doctor prescribes another. Eventually, the patient ends up trying everything on the therapist's list—one drug after another. Then finally comes back and asks, "What now?" And the doctor says: "That's it. I've got nothing left." That's it. Game over. And this is a real-life case.

**7.4. QUESTION:** *Tell me, please—will people ever read the full version of "Russian History Viewed Through Distorted Mirrors," your works, without the ellipses?*

**ANSWER:** The "....."—the ellipses you see in the texts I quote—those aren't mine. When I include excerpts and refer to them, I put ellipses before or after where needed. That's a common practice: when you extract a portion of a text, you insert ellipses before and after the selected part to indicate that it's an excerpt. As for the original texts with ellipses—I had no involvement in writing those, so the ellipses that appear in those books—you'll have to ask the publishers, not me.

I can assume two possibilities: First, they may not have been able to correctly decipher or read the runes—that's one version. Second, or perhaps both reasons combined—they may have decided that the information hidden behind those ellipses is still too premature to be released to the public.

Now, when it comes to the ellipses in my own autobiography *"Mirror of My Soul"*—yes, there are indeed many of them. But those were placed intentionally by me. That's because the information behind them, I believe, is still not the right time to share. People will say things either way... and if I were to remove those ellipses, they'd say even more. What's most important to me is to provide understanding—and for that, there's already more than enough in the book.

As for when those ellipses will be revealed in *my* book—my personal one—that's something I take full responsibility for. The information that's there, when I wrote my autobiography, was written just as it happened. And I intentionally covered certain parts with ellipses—because I felt it was still a little too early. Perhaps in time... that will change.

**7.5. QUESTION:** *Why don't we remember our past lives, and why can't we use the knowledge and experience we've accumulated before?*

**ANSWER:** The question already contains the answer. If a person has reincarnated and does *not* remember—what does that mean? It means that in their past life, they did *not* reach the necessary level to complete the full evolutionary path. That's the first point. Second—there's a parable, I believe it's Buddhist. The story goes: Buddha is walking along and sees a man lying on the ground, doing nothing, spitting at the sky. Buddha approaches and asks: — "Dear man, why are you living your life in idleness?" And the man replies: — "Why should I make an effort, if I know that in three days a tiger will devour

me? I just want to enjoy my final three days before the tiger gets me.” Buddha thought for a moment and said: — “From this day forward, no human being shall know their past or their future—so that they will strive.”

Now that’s a parable—but let’s think: is it right or wrong? From my point of view—it’s right. Why? Because very few people, upon learning that they are destined to die, would not give up. The vast majority would feel doomed and collapse inwardly.

From my point of view, even if a person finds out that they’re destined to die—that information should be a call to action. It means the person must fight to the last moment. Whether they win or not is unknown—but they *must* fight. Knowing that danger is coming should actually help a person focus and search for a solution.

Take the parable’s scenario — “the man will be eaten by a tiger.” What can be done? First, hide. Go somewhere where there are no tigers. That’s one option. Second, maybe he didn’t know—maybe he had never left his village, and the tigers only roam around *that* village. That’s also possible. In that case—it’s time to expand your world. Leave the village where the tigers are and go somewhere safer. If you know you’ll die in three days because a tiger will attack you—well, back then there were spears, swords, knives. Gather ten people with spears or clubs. Walk surrounded by them. If a tiger attacks, ten spears or swords won’t let the tiger get you. But in the parable, the man just lies there, gazing at the sky, idly doing nothing. And unfortunately, the majority of people would, in fact, react like that.

Now about reincarnation. When the essence (or *soul*) enters the body—as I explained in detail in “*Final Appeal to Humanity*”—it enters at the moment of conception, into a single-celled organism: the egg. But the essence is *far more evolved* than a single cell—it is a highly complex system composed of billions of cells, a *multicellular* structure.

So, what happens is a gradual evolution—from that one-celled state—until the biological structure reaches a point where the human essence can begin to integrate, harmonize with the body, and develop as a human being. But still, the evolutionary level of the developing biological form is *lower* than that of the essence itself.

And as long as there remains a difference in levels between the developing biological mass (the new body) and the level the essence had reached before death in the previous life, there will be a qualitative barrier between your conscious and subconscious. This barrier will disappear *only when* you reach that previous level again—and go beyond it. Only then will the barrier dissolve. At that point, the person can gain access to information about their past life. That’s the first key point. The second point is this: the experience of a past life is not necessarily positive—it can be negative as well. And that negative experience can mislead a person, steer them in the wrong direction, for example.

I have nothing against the Dalai Lama, but as far as I remember, the current Dalai Lama is the fortieth incarnation of the Dalai Lama. The fortieth. He’s a very good person—but what does that mean? Essentially, he indicates the body into which he will incarnate and incarnates into it, verifying it by reacting on a subconscious level to favorite items from his previous life. That’s taken as a sign that he has reincarnated into that body. After that, the child is immediately taught from the level of knowledge he had before he died.

Over 40 generations of such reincarnations, there should be a tremendous level of development, right? Just imagine—you don't start from zero, like most people do. You aren't starting with the alphabet, as we all did. You begin straight from higher mathematics, because the memory of previous lives remains. And you continue progressing further. Now imagine what one could achieve in 40 incarnations. Yet so far, aside from the fact that he's a good and remarkable person, not much has really changed. What does that tell us?

It suggests that maybe the so-called secret knowledge he's being given isn't all that secret—or that it contains very little that's truly effective or transformative. Think about that. That's an example of someone reincarnating and continuing to develop their previous knowledge—but with limited visible results.

So, when we reincarnate and start with a blank slate, it's a new opportunity to find a new path. Of course, not everyone manages to find it, but if they do, it can truly be a breakthrough into something never before reached. Therefore, the fact that we don't remember our past lives is both bad and good at the same time. Like everything in life, nothing is ever purely bad or good—there are always pluses and minuses to both sides. That's why we simply need to try to develop what we have, so that our life in this incarnation isn't lived in vain.

Let me give you a funny example from my experience in Arkhangelsk in 1991, at a public talk I gave in July and again in October. I was conducting a mass energy session, and after that session, a number of people passed out—I gave an average energetic load to affect as many people as possible. For some, it wasn't enough; for others, it was too much.

After the session, I walked through the hall, bringing back to consciousness those for whom it had been too intense, since they had completely blacked out. I approached a young woman who had completely passed out—she was in a comatose state. Usually, when there are many people, you try to help quickly—there's no time for delays.

So, I quickly returned her essence (soul) to her body. As I started to walk away—bam! She was gone again. Second time—same thing. Third time—I thought, "What is going on?" I seemed to be putting the soul back, but it wouldn't stay. Then a telepathic contact was established, and here's what I found out: Her essence (soul) said, "Thank you so much for freeing me from this dumb body." It turned out that a fairly high-level soul had incarnated into that body but was unable to develop it, and she was now joyfully saying, "Now I'm free." I thought, "No, my dear." Once I understood what was happening, I shoved her back into the body and said: "Go back, sweetheart, into your body and develop it yourself." I don't know whether the girl gained any intelligence after that—I never saw her again.

But look at how souls behave—even our own souls, the ones inside us. What does this tell us? Our conscious mind is only a small part of the full consciousness of our essence (soul), and everything we develop in this life simply adds to the treasury of that essence, which has already gone through many incarnations. So, my advice: don't count on that essence to do the work for you—work yourself, because it is possible.

**7.6 QUESTION:** *Where did the name of our planet Midgard-Earth come from?*

**ANSWER:** Honestly — I don't know. That's the name given by our ancestors, who colonized this planet. Why were *you* given your name? Why did your parents choose it? They just did — maybe it has some deeper meaning. Same with *Midgard-Earth*. I can only assume — and if you've read ..., you'll know — that the Earth has special properties, such that even from the mother planets — where our ancestors came from — people would come here to undergo initiation into a different qualitative level.

There's evidence — which I cite in my book — that from *Ingard-Earth*, one of the mother planets from which our ancestors arrived, a person came here in order to evolve further. That is, after reaching a certain "ceiling" of development on their own home planet — the proto-planet of our civilization — they would fly to Earth in order to move to the next stage. This happened relatively recently, just a few thousand years ago, after the catastrophe, although by that time the overall evolution of Earth's civilization had already fallen to a very primitive level.

Earth really does have unique qualities that allow its inhabitants to evolve to very high levels, but parasites have worked hard to keep people stuck at the level of animals — or, at best, *intelligent animals*. This is the goal of social parasites, because otherwise they wouldn't be able to manipulate and control the masses.

But here's the question — *why should we, the masses, obey what the parasites want, those who suck the life out of us?* Why do we so easily submit, turning into slaves? Why do we behave like animals — or at best, rational animals — who only think of themselves and no one else? As long as I'm fine — "my house is on the edge, I know nothing."

For example — tomorrow, if they really do air the segment on Anna Prokhorova's show at 9 p.m., where they interviewed me yesterday about the property tax — I was honestly shocked by the following: On my site, members of the movement and volunteers have been helping collect signatures against the property tax. In all this time since we started the initiative, only about 27,000 people have signed the petition on the site, plus a few dozen thousand were collected offline by our guys — still not even 100,000 total.

Excuse me for the joke — it's like when everyone "voted" for the freedom of Luis Corvalán back in Soviet times (older folks will remember) — but this isn't about Chile, this affects every single person sitting in this room, everyone living in this country. Because 90% of people will end up on the street if this property tax is enacted.

Do you know what Kudrin said in the Duma? "You choose — either we raise the retirement age by 2-4 years, or we introduce the property tax." He told the Duma members — *choose*. I believe it's better to raise the retirement age if it comes to that. Whether that should be done is a separate issue, but implementing a property tax will throw 90% of people out on the street. They simply won't be able to pay it.

So — ask yourself: how many people in this room or elsewhere would be among the 10% who won't be thrown out? How long can we just sit and do nothing? People often ask — *what can be done?* Well, by collecting signatures. I was hoping we'd gather at least a million, or 1.5 million. When you walk in and *slam down a million signatures* on the table, they'll have no choice but to address it — with a demand for a referendum: introduce the tax or not?

How can we fight the bureaucrats and the parasites? Right now, only through their own systems, by using the bureaucratic tools they themselves created. If we collect that number of signatures and announce it publicly (since they still can't fully block the internet), and post it online — that a million or two million have signed and the signatures were submitted to the government along with a demand to cancel even the idea of the tax — they'd have no choice. Because they don't want to openly admit they don't care about the law — they still want to pretend that everything is being done "legally," in line with the Constitution.

I said again that this same law on property tax is unconstitutional, contrary to the Russian Constitution — because the Constitution guarantees the right to private property. Now tell me — if you bought an apartment and paid for it with your own money (money from which you already paid taxes, meaning it was clean money), and you paid for it — then it's your private property, your own.

So why must you pay tax on it every year? If you're paying tax on it, then it's not your private property — it means you're renting it. That is, you're renting this apartment from the state. But if that's the case, then it's not private property, and you shouldn't have had to pay the full market price for it in the first place — only rental fees, that's all.

So, either the Constitution must be changed, or this law is unconstitutional. I'm not saying I've read the entire Constitution, but I've read enough of it — particularly the parts relevant to this topic. And this is how change can be achieved — but the most interesting thing is how passively people behave.

#### **7.7. QUESTION:** *People are asking about our Moon — its past, future, and present.*

**ANSWER:** As you understand, this is the last remaining Moon we have out of three. When there were three Moons, their gravitational interaction created a certain isolated system, an oasis, so to speak. I can say that the Moon is an artificially created object, and that probably doesn't even need much explanation. But I'll explain why.

All craters on the Moon, regardless of their diameter, have the same depth. Anyone knows: a small bomb leaves a small crater; the bigger the bomb, the larger the diameter and the deeper the crater. Everyone knows this law, right?

Well, meteors are like super bombs — they are material objects crashing at tremendous speeds, many kilometers per second. And the Moon has no atmosphere, so meteors don't burn up, but strike directly, creating a powerful explosion. And depending on the size of the meteor or asteroid falling on the Moon, both the diameter and depth of the crater should be proportional to the size and energy of the impact. But on the Moon, there are craters of colossal sizes — tens of kilometers in diameter — yet their depth is always the same.

What does that tell us? It tells us that regardless of the size of the object falling on the Moon, it encounters a certain kind of matter at a specific depth, and cannot go deeper. Are there any natural materials like that? No. Which means the Moon is an artificially constructed object. And besides, certain classified information has long since been decrypted...

Have you seen the film? It was shown on television, and you can also download it from the *Sovetnik* website. It shows how a huge spacecraft flies out from one of the Moon's poles, makes a rapid orbit

around the Moon, and enters through the southern pole. Let's call them the northern and southern poles — it flew out of the northern pole, orbited, and entered through the southern pole. Which means there is some kind of passageway there. It entered and never came out again. Watch it — it's a real-time recording. That's the first point.

Second: the age of our Solar System is about 6 billion years, you know that? But the lunar soil samples they collected — their age is 10 billion years. What does that tell us? That the Moon was brought here from another place, and that it was made from a different type of matter. Still physically dense matter, but older in age.

And what about the future? There are bases there and there are photos too. There used to be stargates, and cities under domes. All of this was discovered by American astronauts, by the way, when they were there, and they photographed everything — though it was kept secret for a long time. Naturally, there are bases there, and the black ones have been using them very actively in recent times, but I hope they won't be using them much longer — it will be cleared soon.

#### **7.8. NEXT QUESTION:** *Is there a mental school for children and teenagers now?*

**ANSWER:** Yes, there is, there are many more children there and it continues.

#### **7.9. QUESTION:** *How can I help my child develop his essence? Which of your books would be best to start introducing him to your material? The boy is 11 years old. Do you plan to offer a course of lectures for teenagers in Moscow?*

**ANSWER:** For children, I would recommend starting with "*The Tale of the Radiant Falcon*" (*Сказ о Ясном Соколе*), because it's written as a fairy tale, and you can begin with it well before the age of 11. The book includes both the tale itself and my commentary on it. It is important to give children both parts — then the child will begin to understand that a "skaz" (epic tale) is not just a story, but very meaningful information. What I uncovered there is actually historical truth, and recent discoveries in astrophysics and astronomy have confirmed that. These are not things I simply made up.

It worked out in a very interesting way: when I was writing that book and described the Alpha Centauri system, I myself was surprised by how precisely the distances I mentioned in the tale matched real measurements. I wasn't expecting that every single star and planet described would turn out to actually exist — exactly as described in the story. That was a surprise even for me.

Because I didn't research the astronomical part in detail beforehand. Do you think I just have all the information "floating" in the air and can pull it out at will? Not at all. It's a tremendous amount of work. It took a massive effort to dig through and analyze a mountain of information, even knowing what I was looking for. You still have to find it, verify it, and prove it.

In the book, it's Nastya (Anastasia) who narrates in the *Skaz* — she describes which star it is, what its parameters are, and what the distance is. So, I went and searched — is there a star with those parameters? And strangely enough, everything matched what was said in the *Skaz*, including spectral data from modern science. Even the climate descriptions of the planets corresponded to what science knows about stars of that type and class. And I doubt she was an astrophysicist — she was just a

farmer's daughter, in modern terms. With all due respect, I don't believe she had any high-level academic education in these matters.

But it's not about education — it's about the fact that she described things as an eyewitness, describing what she actually saw with her own eyes. And as I noted: what surprised her most wasn't that other planets had different terrain and vegetation — what struck her the most was a planet that was a copy of Earth. The plants, landscape — everything was identical.

Tell me, has anyone here ever flown to other planets in a spaceship? No one had the chance? Just imagine that you did. What would surprise you the most? You would probably be most surprised by a planet that is radically different from our own, right? When we travel to an African country, or to America, where everything is different, it's interesting to us because we've never seen it before.

But here we have a paradox: she, flying around other planets, wasn't surprised by how different they were from her own — on the contrary, she was surprised to find a planet that was an exact copy, like a sister. What does that tell us?

This is where the concept of proper psychological understanding comes into play. The person was surprised by the similarity between the planets. This shows that the person had a normal and well-developed perception — they already knew that many planets have different climates, different animals, different plants, and that these look and grow differently, that the skies are different, too. This was already familiar knowledge to them *before* traveling there.

It's like today — many people, even if they've never been to Africa, America, or Australia, have a TV and already know that kangaroos exist, they've seen them on screen, and no one is amazed by that anymore — though of course, seeing it in person is very different.

Indeed, at that time, everyone clearly understood that there are many inhabited planets where people live, and not necessarily people, but intelligent beings that differ from one another. From this understanding of psychology, you can extract a lot of interesting things, even from the very *Skaz* (Tale) that is being presented, you just need to extract it. Not just read it, but grasp its meaning.

That's why, when you absorb information mindlessly, just soaking it in without thinking, it's one thing. But if you filter the information through yourself, if you read and begin to sense it, feel it, understand it — then you will never become a blind fanatic. Instead, you will become enlightened, and what you'll have is FAITH — enlightenment through knowledge, when you understand what is what. And then, there can be no fanaticism — only awareness, understanding of what is happening around us and within us.

**7.10. QUESTION:** *What is your opinion of the works of Lazarev, author of the Diagnosis of Karma book series?*

**ANSWER:** I haven't read his books yet — it's impossible to read everything. There are things I consider a priority, but I've heard some things and have some understanding. Before talking about the diagnosis of karma, it's necessary to explain what karma actually is. Remember the scene in the film *The Magic Lamp of Aladdin*, where they explained to the princess that "a dream is a re-dream, because a dream is a re-dream..." — such was the explanation given by the scholars? Well, when something is explained in a

similar way, I don't know the details, because I assume it's about karma. In order to explain what karma is, you must first explain the nature of karma, above all else.

If someone is interested, I simply recommend reading *Essence and Mind*, Volume 2. There I have a chapter titled *Anatomy of Sin or the Nature of Karma*, where all of this is described. Read it, compare it with what you've encountered elsewhere, and make your own decision about where you believe a true understanding is provided. That's all I can say.

**7.11. NEXT QUESTION:** *From your point of view, where is the information located that determines unconditional reflexes in animals and humans? Is it possible to do anything to GMO products so that they stop being GMO?*

**ANSWER:** Theoretically, it's possible — in order to do that, you would need to alter or remove from those food products the genetic modifications, the changes that were introduced to turn them into weapons of destruction. If you can manage that, then it would work — but the best option is simply not to eat them.

Why are they called genetically modified (GMO) products? Because their genetic apparatus has been altered. And when you interfere with genetics without understanding it, it's very dangerous — and it is done deliberately in order to kill, not to create.

As for reflexes: all reflexes are located in the so-called medulla oblongata, the foundation of our brain. That's where unconditional reflexes are registered, they are formed there and are very necessary for us too. When a mosquito bites you, do you consciously think through how to swat the mosquito — do you calculate every muscle movement, which muscle to bend, which one to extend in order to create motion and kill the mosquito? That's an example of an unconditional reflex: mosquito bite — bam — done. Did you think about it? No. Did you need to? No!

Unconditional reflexes are necessary — but what *is* necessary is to stop being a rational animal and become a true human being: to control your own body, to control your animal instincts. That's what must be done. And for that, all you need is desire, will, and the effort to say, "Who is the master in this house — the instinct or me, the human being?"

If a person allows their instincts to control them — then that's bad. Then the person remains in the phase of a "rational animal." But if a person tries — not necessarily succeeds immediately, because that's not the point — the point is to make the effort, to strive to take control over one's instincts and govern them. That's when a person becomes truly human, the master of oneself.

Let's say someone sees a house on fire. Inside, a small child is trapped in the flames and could die. It's a burning house — so going in means possibly getting burned, maybe even dying. What does instinct say? Run from the fire, because it will hurt, you might get burned, or even die.

But what should a normal person do? Try to save the child, even at the risk of their own life. In that moment, the person overcomes their instinct for self-preservation, because they cannot bear the thought of a child — or another person — dying. They attempt to save them, even if it means risking themselves. That is overcoming the instinct of self-preservation. That is a manifestation of true humanity — a heroic act.

And yes, people recognize such heroism in these kinds of situations — running to save someone drowning, for example. But here's the thing: instincts don't only act in critical moments. They act every single second. And the real challenge is to be a hero *not just once* — not just diving in to save someone, earning a medal and walking around proud — but to be a hero every second, in everyday life.

One must remain human not just in a single emotional outburst, but constantly — to continually remind oneself that *you* are the master of your body, not the other way around. That your instincts do not control you — *you* control them. That you are truly a human being. This is difficult because it must be done every second, every day, year after year. And no one sees it, no one gives you a medal for it, no one applauds. But if we truly want to be *human beings*, and not just rational animals, we must fight with ourselves every day.

Take this example: a person is afraid to tell the truth, afraid to stand up for the truth. Why? Because, "What if I suffer? I have a job — I might lose it. I have money to feed my family — if I resist, I could lose that. If my neighbor gets fired, so be it — at least it's not me. I'll keep my head down so I don't get fired." There's your example. If people thought not only about themselves, but also about others, it would be much harder for the parasites to act as they do.

Remember the children's song — "Antoshka, Antoshka, get your spoon ready for lunch," "let's go dig potatoes." He's ready to get the spoon, but no one taught him how to dig potatoes. It's the same situation here: everyone wants things to change, everyone feels we've hit rock bottom and there's nowhere lower to go.

But how many people are actually doing something to move away from that "rock bottom" back toward what is normal? Not many, because everyone is afraid. I've had problems for 20 years, and I keep speaking out. My first serious problems began when I was 26, when I refused to cooperate with the authorities. And right away, they began trying to destroy me, in all sorts of ways — and they still are, endlessly.

Do you think I enjoy having problems created for me? I'm not a masochist, believe me. But I, and my wife, we continue doing what we do, no matter how many and what kinds of nasty things are done to us. Do you think I do this for myself?

Understand the following: if I had wanted to create comfort and prosperity for myself, I could've had trillions. They offered it to me — just sign, write as many zeros as you want after the one, just cooperate, work for us. If I had signed, I could've spit on everyone else. And there would've been no problems at all.

Why do you think I do this? Because I can't — at the very least, I have a conscience. I see and understand what's happening. Maybe many people don't see or understand because they don't have access to the amount of information that I do.

I can't stand aside and watch people being turned into cattle driven to slaughter. They're not chasing me — on the contrary, they'd gladly welcome me at any time. So why then? Does that make me crazy? From their point of view — yes, I must be crazy. How could someone turn down money, power? I was invited to head the world government — the real one, not the public one people talk about now.

And later they just pleaded: "We'll pay you a pension — 5 million dollars, tax-free, forever — just don't interfere in anything." That was one of their offers. Not even to work for them — just to stay out of it. Do you think 5 million a month — in dollars, of course — would have hurt me? Then why didn't I take it?

Because even staying out of it, I believe, is wrong. If my wife and I hadn't interfered that summer — then what? Several million people would have died, and maybe my homeland would have ceased to exist as a country, because they were already planning to divide it into four parts and take it over.

I'm amazed — everyone seems unhappy, everyone complains, but nobody wants to do anything, or very few people try. Why? Because everyone's thinking: *I might lose this, I might lose that.*

Do you know how many dreams I've had, what dreams I once wanted to fulfill? All of them were blocked — because I wasn't on the "right" team. I spat on my dreams because I have to do what I believe is right, and I'm doing it. And as you can see, even today I read about how much effort is spent trying to portray me as a liar, as someone who deceives people.

My wife, my friends, my comrades — those of us who work together — we do many things. And we don't do it for people to say thank you. We do it because for us, personally, there is no other way — we cannot walk past and ignore it. We ask for nothing in return: no money, no rewards, no fame.

More often, we get hit over the head for interfering with someone's plans. I've been taking hits for over 20 years. If I told you everything, you'd probably be stunned. Almost every day, some problem or other is created — why? Because I'm a warrior. I fight. I don't cry on someone's shoulder.

And if I do cry — will that change anything? Of course not. You must fight. And I will keep fighting with every possible means I have — until my last breath, until my last drop of blood. It doesn't matter whether I succeed or not. I hope I manage to accomplish a lot. But I cannot be frightened, and I cannot be bought.

That's why they are very afraid of me, have repeatedly tried to eliminate me — and let them keep trying. Do you think they've scared me? I've seen so much of this already. Do you think my gray hair came from a life of ease?

So, if you want to be not just rational animals but truly human beings, you must not think in terms of whether your actions will benefit you or not — you must think in terms of justice: whether it's right or wrong. When you reach the point where you act based on that — then you will truly behave like a real human being, a true human, and not a rational animal. Work is being done.

**7.12 QUESTION:** *Are there worthy students and successors of your work? Have you trained any? What is lacking to establish the production of "programmed watches," or the training of doctors to help people quit smoking?*

**ANSWER:** Regarding the devices — work is already underway. Devices weren't produced earlier because, back in 1990, I was dealing with some shady businessmen who simply wanted to pull off a scam and skim the cream off the top, and that didn't suit me. Now we'll see what comes of it. I already mentioned that there need to be specific instruments, so that they truly function as intended. Why did I use electronic watches back then? Because there was no other suitable form — the ones with calculator

buttons were used, pressing them allowed interaction with the process. But now I've told them — we're developing something, a certain design has already been made, they've shown it to me, and I've given my approval.

Let's see what comes of it — we will release devices that will genuinely help many people. Of course, they won't help *everyone*, because no device can work for absolutely everyone. If 15% of people typically respond poorly, then 75%... well, if 50% receive help, that's already not bad. And if someone just has a little device — presses a button and gets treatment without any medications, without anything — or places water next to it, treats it, and the water becomes healing, helping cure many illnesses. And again — no chemicals, nothing.

But who finds this unprofitable? Pharmaceutical corporations, who earn trillions of dollars from this. They'll resist with all their might. Moreover, any such device must go through certification by the Ministry of Health. Do you think the Ministry of Health will approve something like that? But the work is underway.

**7.13 Question:** *If the Jew is a virus on planet Earth, then why haven't the Light Ones developed an antivirus yet?*

**Answer:** The point is, the Jews are simply a small people captured by the parasites, who were instilled with the idea of exclusivity so that the parasites could carry out their dirty politics through them. But what surprises me is this: why hasn't anyone among them asked the question — *"You [referring to the parasites] came to our planet, were you on another planet before?"* Yes, they were. *"And did you have your own helpers there too, whom you also made 'chosen' and 'exceptional'?"* Yes, they did. *"Can I speak with even one of those 'chosen' from that other planet?"* No, you cannot — they've all been destroyed.

Not one of these people — well, the majority, not all — ever asked themselves: *"Why are we chosen? Why are we exceptional?"* Not one. Why is that? Tell me — is there anyone in this hall who wouldn't want to feel special, chosen? Of course not. Every person wants to do something to feel that way... But this shouldn't be because of the nationality you were born into — it should depend on what you've accomplished in your life, what you've achieved through your own effort and talent.

What is being done by the social parasites is simply exploitation. That's why only a few phrases were left that really belong to the one called Christ: *"I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel."* That is, it's clearly stated that they are "lost sheep." And he (meaning Radomir) wanted to help them free themselves in order to prevent what we now have today.

Back then, it could still be stopped — the infection, that is, social parasitism, was just beginning to spread. The Jews are simply a blind weapon in the hands of certain forces, who care about them just as little as about everyone else. They simply found fools, filled their heads with the idea that they were special and chosen, gave them a bigger piece of bread than the rest — and they do all the dirty work. And I genuinely feel sorry for them because they believe in this nonsense. But that doesn't mean I won't fight against the system — I do fight. You think those who try to destroy me aren't from this system? It's exactly that system.

Again, this touches on elements of psychology, and not just concerning Jews. I've repeatedly encountered people who make contact with other civilizations. Not all of them are mentally ill — though

of course, some are. What is madness? It's an inadequate perception of reality. But inadequate perception can't mean being normal in one area and abnormal in another. If perception is inadequate, then all reactions are inadequate.

Many contactees who establish contact most often end up connecting with parasitic entities—just of a different level. Among them are Russians, Ukrainians, Germans, French—people of all nations, nationalities, and races. And what do these contactees usually hear? That they are special, chosen, that they were selected because they're unique, that they have a great mission—to save the Earth, to save civilization, that they've been appointed rulers of the universe.

And the funniest thing is, these aren't Jews. I haven't seen a single one of them ask: "*Alright, you chose me to be ruler of the universe (there was one guy like that), but what have I done to deserve ruling the universe?*" A person has to do something, have some qualities or abilities to rule a universe, right?

If someone can't even organize a team of ten people, and then he's offered rulership over the entire universe—and he doesn't turn it down, but joyfully accepts it in his soul—why do you think that is? He's not Jewish; it's just that someone told him he's special.

This is a calculated psychological manipulation. Are they Jews by nationality? No. But many fall for such nonsense, especially people from smaller ethnic groups who, for various reasons, often live under pressure and need to adapt. They feel marginalized, inferior. And when this inferiority complex meets information that sounds like balm for the soul—especially when there's personal ambition—then it clicks. "*Ruler of the universe? Me? I'm the ruler of the universe! Awesome—everyone obey me now, I rule the universe!*"

But ask him: "*You can't even manage your own wife—she manages you—yet you're ruling the universe?*" Do you even know how many civilizations exist in the universe? Have you even visited one single planet? And already you're ruling it all. This is pure psychology. Parasites act with pinpoint precision on every level, selecting specific fools for each scenario.

That's why I even feel sorry for them to some degree—because many of these "fools" who get appointed rulers of universes actually have natural talents. If they developed them, they could genuinely ascend to the level of gods, as our ancestors said—those who could change space, matter, time, and influence reality. They *could*—but they *never will*, because parasites come along, feed them such illusions, and they accept it and start to flourish. Or they claim to be "messengers of the Almighty," with the "Almighty" speaking through them via some "vessel"—and the kind of nonsense that comes through that "vessel" is absurd. That "vessel" should at least read what it wrote.

I had a funny incident once—I wrote about it in my autobiography. I was conducting seminars and training courses in America. I had two groups and later held seminars. In one of the groups, a woman came to train with me—she had already written several books and was considered a healer. She explained many things, including about guardian angels or "guides," as they're called—conductors, watchers, controllers.

She actually had good natural abilities. When I explained all this to her, she said, "I want to know about my guides, guardian angels, observers, controllers." I asked her, "Do you really want to see their real faces?" She said, "Yes." I told her, "Think carefully—if I show you their real appearance, I don't think

you'll like it. Are you sure?" But she was confident. Alright, she called upon her "teachers." And you know, from the very first lesson, whenever I'd start explaining even basic things, she'd say: "How do you know this? My guides, my watchers, say these are top-secret teachings—you're not ready for them yet."

So, she called them in, and I said: "These are them? Are you sure?" She replied: "Yes, I'm sure." Then watch this—I removed their camouflage. Unfortunately, the recording of this was lost in a fire started by some so-called "friends-comrades." You should have seen the look on her face. She did *not* like what she saw. It upset her so much she didn't come to classes for several days—she fell into a deep depression.

Later, her friend who was attending said, "She's just so shaken that she can't even talk." I said, "Well, tell her she should be *glad*—they were deceiving her, and now she's free. Now no one can fool her anymore. Tell her to stop fooling around and come back." And she did come back.

So, when I offer to those who say they are in contact [with higher beings], I say: "Please, come forward—if it's true, nothing will happen to them." And you know what? Not a single one of them came. Not one of those who claim to be the "ruler of the universe" or the "vessel of the Almighty." They don't want to let go of that illusion. And you wonder why Jews don't want to let go of their illusion that they're special and chosen? It's the same nature. Many of them have done quite a bit of harm as well.

In my book "*Russian History Viewed through Distorted Mirrors*" I laid out the full system of how social parasites operate—what methods they use, what they do, and what they are (in holograms). I'm not defending anyone—on the contrary, they hate me more than anyone. I'm their number one enemy because I exposed their system, I revealed it. What's important is not just shouting "beat the Jews and save Russia"—that's exactly what they want. What we need to do is expose the system they've created to turn us into sheep. And as long as we don't understand that, they will continue to celebrate and, as the saying goes, "drink milk from the breasts of kings."

As it was written in the Torah: "And all kings will serve as slaves." As long as we sit and allow it, it will continue. But if we all wake up together and stop allowing the parasites—like mosquitoes—to drink our blood, or ticks that have latched on, then they must either change and become normal—or perish. There are only two options. But that depends on *their* choice. Because if they continue, they will be destroyed by the very system they are trying to uphold.

And the most ironic part is—if this system wins, though I doubt it—it will lead to their destruction as well, not just ours, not just us as "goyim." They will die too, and no bunker will save them. That's what's amusing.

#### **7.14. NEXT QUESTION:** *Can you at least hint at the secret of advancing genetics to a higher level during one's lifetime?*

**ANSWER:** I'm not just hinting—I speak openly, without any riddles. For example, one must first overcome the animal within oneself—that is, act not according to what's personally beneficial, but according to what's right, regardless of the consequences. This changes you and alters your genetics.

In the book "*Essence and Mind*," I described how what I called "evolutionary flesh" is built up—and how we lose it. Every one of our actions, whether we want it or not, whether we understand it or not, leads us either upward or downward evolutionarily.

If a person has no understanding, then it's very difficult for them to develop correctly. At the very least, a person must learn to hear and feel themselves. There's a phrase that wasn't invented by me: "*Do not do to others what you wouldn't want done to yourself.*"

Now, if a person is adequate and not suffering from pathology—not a masochist (masochists like to be cut, beaten, and abused, so of course a masochist would do to others what he wants done to himself—that's a different case, which I'm not addressing here)—but if a person doesn't do to others what they wouldn't want done to themselves, regardless of circumstances, that is already a big plus. But in order to truly evolve correctly, understanding is necessary. And it's precisely that understanding which I explain in my books—not secretly, but openly.

When a person understands the nature of the universe, the nature of self-development, what's what, "where the roots come from," he will begin to act in accordance with that understanding. If they do something wrong, they will understand: *I did this—so I'll get hit over the head for it*, maybe not right away, but I'll get it eventually.

When a person truly understands—not just "*Thou shalt not kill*," as religion teaches, but also how those same religions have said "*killing a heathen is a good deed for the Lord*," and they killed; or "*kill a heretic*;" or "*burn the witch at the stake*"—who most often wasn't a witch at all nor had anything to do with that. Is that a "*good*" deed? And yet they killed, thinking they were doing something righteous.

But if a person understands that regardless of who says what, and instead focuses on what *actually* happens as a result of their actions—and if they start making decisions for themselves and taking responsibility for their actions—then that person will move forward, depending on the nature of the actions they choose. In my books, I've tried to share my own understanding of what's what and how things work—and this, I believe, can help many.

A lot of letters come to my website from young people in particular, thanking me for finally helping them understand the meaning of life. They say they are starting to feel proud of their country, proud to be Russian. And it's not just Russians who write—people of all nationalities: Uzbeks, Kazakhs, people of various backgrounds. All of them express their gratitude in these letters.

Because I'm not speaking only about being Russian—I'm not a nationalist. I fight for justice, for Russians and for the other indigenous peoples of Russia alike. I talk about the genocide of the Russian people simply because genocides of other peoples are spoken about everywhere, while the genocide of the Russian people—past and present—is met with total silence, as if it never happened. But in reality, the Russian people suffered the most in the 20th century in Russia. Other peoples suffered too, of course, but proportionally, the greatest losses and the greatest blame fell upon the Russians.

Today there are all kinds of national associations. We're told we're all just "Russians," no more nationalities. That's been imposed on us. But then why do Jewish national organizations still exist if we're supposedly all just Russians? There are Jewish, Armenian, Azerbaijani organizations—many of them with no real relation to Russia, because those peoples have their own countries. But the moment someone speaks about Russian identity, about loving our homeland and our people, we're instantly labeled as nationalists, terrorists, extremists. The Constitution is supposed to be the same for everyone. So, on what basis do these national organizations exist on the territory of the Russian Federation, if we supposedly have no nationalities—only "Russians?"

When that man Gordon (forgive me, his name reminds me very much of another word—I'll let him guess which) spoke to students in St. Petersburg, he said: *"Is 1,000 years of history not enough for you Russians, you lousy people, do you want more?"* And we don't want anything from others—we simply want our own real history, which stretches back hundreds of thousands of years. We don't need someone else's version—we want the truth about our own past, not a fabricated one.

But during that speech in St. Petersburg, he asked: *"Are there any of you here who consider yourselves Russian?"* And—surprise of surprises—one student turned out to actually be Russian. Incredible, right? In Russia, even! And he stood up and said: *"Yes, I consider myself Russian."* Do you know what Gordon said? *"Then you are a fascist."* Nice logic, right?

And this—this happens in our own country! A Jew can say he's Jewish. An Azerbaijani can say he's Azerbaijani. Anyone else can say whatever they like. But if someone says, *"I am Russian,"* they are immediately labeled a fascist or a Nazi. And this is what infuriates me most. And the worst part? The people just take it in. They stay silent.

And I can say the following: according to UNESCO, if 70% or more of a country's population belongs to a single nationality, it is considered a monoethnic (or mononational) country. So—have Russians not yet all been wiped out in Russia? In Russia, people who identify as ethnically "Russian" make up between 83% and 89% of the population. That is far above the threshold to be considered monoethnic. Yet, for some reason, Russia is not recognized as such.

This does not mean that there are no other peoples—Russia has always been home to all the world's peoples, and not a single one has disappeared. But the moment one of us says *"I am Russian,"* we are treated as criminals—in our own country. And this is despite the claim that there are no nationalities here anymore, that we are all just "Russians."

But why is it that Jews living in Russia do not consider themselves "Russian?" They have their own associations, their own communities, where they gather, help each other, hire their own. And what have we Russians been turned into? We are not even allowed to form our own communities in Russia. And tell me—how many of us Russians go out of our way to help another Russian, to hire a Russian specifically? Why not? As long as this continues, we will remain slaves. Want that? Then keep going.

Do you think everything will just fix itself? That someone will bring it all to you on a silver platter with a blue border? What do people usually bring on such platters, anyway? How many of you participated in financial pyramid schemes? I bet a lot. Did you make millions? Still waiting to cash in?

Christianity, over a thousand years, has done its dirty work. It turned people into slaves at the level of the soul. Before Christianity was forced upon us, our ancestors behaved differently. There was none of this poisonous envy of the neighbor: "Oh, my neighbor bought a car? That bastard! And I don't have one." Now, if your neighbor *stole* the car, sure—get angry. But usually, the ones who steal are in positions of power, and people grovel before them. But if your neighbor worked hard and earned it—why hate him? Why go around scratching his tires? Want a car? Work. Earn it. Then buy one. A decent person would be happy for another's success. And why is it that something inside us says, "What a bastard—he bought a car, and I can't?" What have you done to believe that you should have the same

or something better? Nothing? But you still *want* it? That's a slave mentality. That's how slaves think. We need to rid ourselves of the slave within—that's what I've said before and I'll say it again.

As long as this mentality persists, we'll remain slaves—whether we like it or not. And there's no such thing as a good master. Whether he's "good" or "bad," a slaveowner is still a slaveowner. A "good" one might beat you once every ten days, while a "bad" one might beat you every day. Does that make it any better for you? Even if he doesn't beat you at all—you're still a slave. He'll still sell you like livestock. And don't they sell us? They did, and they still do.

So how long are we going to remain slaves? How long will we stay on our knees? I'm not calling for revolutions or anything like that—I'm calling for something else: for every person to live *with conscience*, right where they are. For every person to try to stop filth, meanness, and not allow evil to take place.

But why is it that, when people are offered a shady deal where they can rob others and make a lot of money, they say: "Oh, let's do it!"? Tell me—how many of you would turn down such a deal? Many? I hope so.

I wish that this inner resolve—not to be a slave—doesn't fade away but stays with you. Theoretically, it's easy to say: "We'll go fight the enemy! I'll strike with one hand, then the other, and the enemy will scatter!" But when it comes to real battle, it's often those who shout loudest about how tough they are that run away first.

I can speak for myself—because they tried to buy me off with huge sums of money, but I didn't sell out. They tried to intimidate me, to kill me—but it didn't work. You could say I passed the test of power, of temptation, and of everything else. And I hope that when your moment comes, you'll be able to stand firm in the face of temptation too—and not sell your soul to the devil, so to speak.

Sure, you could solve your problems with a quick "just this one time." Some people even said to me, regarding the offer with any number of zeros after the one: "Why didn't you take the money and then just pretend it didn't work out? Like, you tried, gave it your best shot, but sadly it didn't pan out. You meant well, but—oops—didn't work." The reason is simple: if I give my word, I *will* follow through. I can't say I'll do something and then not do it. That's just who I am. Maybe I'm an idiot, but that's my character. I *can't* go against my conscience. And lying—how is that any better?

You know, one good thing about the Soviet era—despite how scummy many of those in power were—is that they at least *tried* to instill some values in people. They themselves might have been hypocrites, but they aimed to raise others to be better.

When I was a boy, I saw the film *The Gadfly*. The older generation all saw it; the younger ones probably haven't. Back then, it was impossible to watch that film calmly—because the spirit of the character was so elevated. Of course, it's a literary work, and maybe it's not historically accurate, but it was presented in a way that stirred something in the soul and made you want to be like that—didn't it? And what kind of heroes are we shown today? Especially in the 1990s. I wasn't here then, so I can only tell you what people told me: girls dreamed of becoming prostitutes, and boys finishing school dreamed of becoming gangsters—that was the height of aspiration. Because why not have a short but "beautiful" life? But that's a *pseudo*-beautiful life. I'm not saying everyone should be equally poor or equally rich—that never

has happened and never will. But every person should have according to their talents and abilities, and apply them to meaningful work. There can't and shouldn't be equality in everything. If there were total equality, then everyone would be equally beautiful, for example. But that would be bland—because everyone would look the same. It's *diversity* that brings beauty to life.

Of course, everyone wants to be beautiful. There's an old utopian tale about a princess who suffered deeply because she was deformed—her father looked that way too, and so did she. Everyone pitied them. I forget the author, but here's the essence of the story: she lived in anguish over being so ugly, until one day a man arrived in their land who was as ugly as she was. She fell in love with him, and he with her. They decided to run away, because no one accepted them where they were. The young man, a prince, told her that beyond the borders of their land, everyone looked like her. So, they ran away—and ended up among people who looked just like them. To those people, *they were completely normal*—and the inhabitants of the princess's former land seemed grotesque and deformed by comparison.

What is the concept of "ugliness?" For example, a Black person—whom people are now afraid to call "Black" (I don't understand why)—they think that *white* people are ugly. Because for them, the concept of beauty is completely different. And for us, it's also completely different. We look at them and think, "Wow, how ugly," from our point of view. And they look at us and think *we are the ugly ones*.

Few people know this, but I've had encounters with Black people in the States—and not just casual ones. Some of them are normal, decent people. But you know what many of them think? That white people smell like dogs. Our sweat smells very different to them. Now, I can't say their sweat smells like chamomile flowers—I've had to smell it. We're just used to our own odor. The smell of Black people's sweat... for us, white people... you see what I mean? And for them, that's fragrance—they think white people stink like dogs.

Diversity is a good thing. It's just that every person should fulfill themselves, and not envy the neighbor who has fulfilled himself—assuming it was done honestly, not through theft. Each person should realize their own potential and not be preoccupied with others, but with themselves. What can *I* do? What can *I* achieve? What talents do *I* have? That's what some people find very irritating. Everyone wants to turn the universe upside down, to build the universe anew. But to do that, you have to *know* something and *achieve* something. And yet people want it all immediately.

In my life, I've had to work with wood, lay bricks, and in every kind of work I always found joy for myself. I tried to do whatever I was doing as best I could. And, it seems, it always turned out quite well, and that made me happy. I laid bricks for the first time in my life when we were building a house for my brother, and my father had hired a bricklayer when the main structure was being built. They looked at my brickwork and asked, "How long has your son been laying bricks?" But I had picked up bricks for the very first time, and I was laying them for the first time—and I enjoyed it, you see?

Because when I did it, I did it with soul. I wanted it to look beautiful, to be in harmony. Even bricks can be laid beautifully, with soul. A stool can be made like that too—even if it won't be the best stool in the world. But it will be the stool that *you* made, that *you* poured your soul into, and it will be an achievement for you, a work of art. That's how a person should approach everything in life—no matter what they are doing—and they should find joy in all of it.

If we do that, then we can truly achieve a great deal. But as long as we envy others—envy is the worst

thing there is, because envy blocks any development. Listen carefully: try to do everything with care, and if you start small and keep moving forward, always putting your soul into it, you will awaken a creative spark that will allow you to succeed here, and here, and there too. It takes effort, of course—tremendous effort.

In America, I decided to publish books myself, because there was no one willing to print them or spend the money. I bought a computer system—after first earning the money for it—and I had to pay quite a lot back then. It's still not cheap, but at the time it was very expensive, as I wrote in my book.

When I sat down to work on the computer for the first time to create illustrations, I tried to do it the way I was used to—from my experience working with a brush or pencil—but nothing worked. I thought to myself, “What a fool I am, I wasted all this money. Now what do I do?” I was serious. I thought I’d just sit down and whip something up—and nothing happened. Because I was trying to use the methods I was used to: take a pencil, a pen, do a quick sketch, draw something—and it didn’t work at all. Even though the program had brushes and pencils, when I tried to use them on the digital canvas... it just didn’t work. I got a bit discouraged. But then I thought—someone else out there is managing to do it, so let me try something different. And I started doing it differently.

Some people have seen the cover I made for *“The Last Appeal to Humanity?”* That was done on the third day after I first sat down at the computer. If you’ve opened *“The Last Appeal to Humanity,”* you’ll see I included a text called *The Third Appeal to Humanity* from KON. I made charts in there to show types of logic—binary logic—and I tried to do them on the first day, but I couldn’t. I gave up and decided to draw it instead, and on the third day I made that cover.

Why was I able to do it? Because I gave up the methods I was used to. I used to work with pencils, even though many of the illustrations were initially drawn on paper. But when I scanned them in, the quality turned out to be awful—so much noise and dirt. I tried cleaning them up—it didn’t work either. So, I started remaking everything from scratch, because I realized that with the old approaches, I wouldn’t achieve anything.

I created—in my own way, maybe someone else does it differently—but when people saw what I had done, they said, “You need five years of study to learn to do this—and even then, not everyone can.” Why? Because I found the strength to let go of the standard, template-based approach, and I found a new one. And it seems to be working—many people like it, although some, even on Slavyansk, write that Levashov isn’t an artist at all. I don’t claim to be an artist—I simply do what I do. And for some reason, many people really like my paintings. I don’t understand Malevich’s *Black Square*, but in their view, it’s considered very high, supreme art—astonishing.

One example made me laugh. While I was in the States, I read in a newspaper that a collection of paintings by a famous artist, whose name I don’t remember, had been brought to New York. I remember his voice, I remember his face, but names and surnames have always been a problem for me. So, the article said that a month after the exhibition opened, the late artist’s son came to visit it, his father had already passed away and become a “classic.” As he walked through the gallery, he came to one painting and said: “Why did you hang this painting upside down?”

You see? The painting had been hanging upside down for an entire month. Hundreds of thousands of people visited the exhibition during that time. Art critics, connoisseurs, and scholars came, stood in front

of it, and said: "What a deep meaning this painting conveys." Everyone nodded in agreement, everyone expressed admiration and reverence—and only a month later it turned out that the painting had been hanging upside down the whole time.