

**Who eats whom, as a basic problem of Darwin evolution  
or the conception of post-Darwin evolution of a human?**

**POST-DARWIN EVOLUTION OF MAN IN FATE-ANALYSIS**

*VLADIMIR DJOS*

In this work an attempt will be made to consider in the light of fate-analysis the eternal confrontation between theologians and adherents of evolutionary development, or Darwinists, basically understood as the dispute about the origin of a human being.

***Darwin Evolution While Eating or Post-Darwin Evolution in God's Likeness?***

The theologians hold to the opinion that a man originated from *dirt*, though not as he is but as a product of creativity of the highest instance, personified by people in God's image, as His handwork. Vice versa, Darwinists consider that a person originated from *monkeys* and by himself. Karl Marx's colleague Friedrich Engels corrected them stating that "not by himself" but due to labor that had made a human from a monkey. However, if we start clarifying 1) from whom the monkeys *originated* and 2) owing to what, and if then we find out the origination of these monkeys' ancestors and so on, then in this case we will gradually come to the very *dirt*. That is, the point at issue is rather not from *what* but *how* a man and all the rest of the representatives of the living world originated.

The authors of the Bible proceed from the view that the creation of all living is not a hard job and gave God three days for its accomplishment. For creation of the plant life He gave the third day, for animals inhabiting water and air the fifth, for animals including a human inhabiting the land the sixth. (1.Genesis 1, 12-31) The seventh day was God's day-off. Here with creation was finished. Henceforth everybody just propagated and multiplied. God created a man in His image and likeness and *primordially* intended for him the role of a leader in the world. In whose image the rest of the living creatures were created is not mentioned in the Bible. Taking into consideration that the planet Earth has existed about 4.7 billion years, three days for them is an instant in an instant.

According to Darwinists, the organic world self-developed during millions years of its existence or, in other words, evolved. Evolution, according to Darwin, takes place because of the three criteria in the existence of each *species* of the animal and plant worlds: 1) changeability, 2) inheritance, and 3) natural selection.

Changeability is understood as variety of *features and properties* that the representatives of a species possess. This is the basis of evolution. The features and properties are divided into: 1) the hereditary and 2) the nonhereditary. The source of the new, *hereditary* -- the passing from generation to generation features and properties -- is only one by Darwinists: mutation. The source of *nonhereditary* features

and properties is the environmental influence factors. Natural selection -- the variety of *selection* that unlike artificial guided by a person selection -- is understood by Darwinists as a pitiless instrument *of an abstractedly understood* by them environment. Animals and plants that happened to have features and properties, making them less viable, perish, releasing the species from these features and properties. The species is exactly defined as the multitude of specimens living on one and the same territory having common hereditary features and giving prolific posterity only with the representatives of the same species. The new species appears as a result of the accumulation in the population of new features and, consequently, deliverance from the old features. Sometimes it can be difficult to get rid of them, and that's why they exist in the form of rudiments or atavisms.

The book, in which Charles Darwin in 1859 stated his concept, was called *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* [2]. However, the appearance of the new species as a result of not artificial but natural selection – this is quite far from *evolution!* *Evolution takes place only if there is a transfer from lower to higher level of evolutionary development.* And all the cases given in the mentioned book by Charles Darwin inform us only about the formation of the new species from the old one. And there is no evidence that the new species is on the higher level of evolutionary development then the old one. On the other hand, evolutionists classify the animal and plant world by arranging all its species according to the levels of evolutionary development, *merely suggesting the origin of one of the species from the others*, without any evidence besides the presence of common features in them. Grasping the *unlikely opportunity* that the new species can be higher then the old species by a level in evolutionary development, Darwin's adherents hastily raised it, this opportunity for the lower rank. And because a human resembles a monkey most of all, evolutionists decided to choose for his origin a more anthropomorphous creature so that nobody felt sorry for a monkey. And to survive, passing through natural selection, and to evolve is far from being one and the same thing. Let's remember the novel by Jack London *The Sea-Wolf* – those survived who could eat his fellow-sufferer. Such a hard thing: evolution!

There is a wish to ask Darwinists also about why -- if, to their mind, a new species and even evolution can be obtained with the help of natural selection -- until now nothing similar was obtained through artificial selection? After all they didn't go further than the recipe of the new animal breeds and plant sorts.

Darwin's theory shocks even more because it is built on the bases of accidental chaotic mutations (mutagenesis). Since there are no mutations, no mutants with new properties are transmitted with the genes from generation to generation. And if there is no variety of properties, there is no *evolution*, which according to Darwin is just *automatic consequence* of conformity-discrepancy caused by mutations of changes and demands of the environment. However, if the mutations are strongly connected

with changeableness, it will turn out that mutations are more of a norm than an exception. As Darwin notes: it's because "changeableness within the species is so great, that it's hard to determine the borders of the definite species" (Charles Darwin 1959). So, consequently, mutations are not accidental? And if they are not accidental, then maybe they are not mutations but inwardly directed changes of the species?

Darwin understands evolution as the changes of animals and plants towards their species better adaptability to the existing environment. However, in his abstract concept "environment" Darwin puts it in the sense of "what to use" and "what to eat." But the environment of each species is unique: the environment includes the rest of the species of animal and plant world, land, water and air. "The species prospers," – Charles Darwin writes – "if it is widely settled, and has a lot of specimens" (Charles Darwin 1959). That is, *Darwin evolution should come to the end with a species with the maximum possible ability to adapt to and to feed on its environment*. However, it shouldn't be forgotten that each of species feeds on the representatives of a species, and, at the same time, is the forage itself in the wide sense of this word for the representatives of other species. That's why one's better adaptability though contributes to prosperity and, consequently, the growth of one's species' livestock, but it also contributes to the growth of the livestock of those who eats one and the representatives of one's species!

That's why any progress in development of this new or that old species, without fail, changes the conditions of other species' existence. The living world is an integral interconnected structure. And the very structure evolves, developing from its past state to its future one. Moreover, *natural selection can never be an evolutionary criterion*, because it destroys only the weak representatives of the species, thus strengthening the nucleus of the species. Besides, *neither presence of the highest species in evolutionary development nor natural selection excludes the possibility of the existence of the species at the lowest level of evolutionary development*. The prosperity of a species doesn't depend on how high the species has ascended the stages of evolutionary development (let's remember, for instance, cockroaches, mosquitoes, worms, etc.), but on how much forage there is at its disposal. It is the forage that defines what properties the species should possess and who will feed on it. Let's remember, too, moles, penguins, giraffes, woodpeckers. *The variety of the animal world representatives is directly connected with the variety of their forage*. To achieve prosperity, according to Darwin, it is not obligatory to ascend the evolutionary ladder. It is enough to solve the problem of guaranteed forage for the specimens of one's species. So, if it is not a problem of "who to eat?", then what raises the living being *up* the ladder of evolutionary development?

Let's come back to Darwin, who postulated in his book, what probably was read by the majority too fluently, and that's why its essence wasn't realized completely by anybody: "The final result (of the natural selection) is expressed so, that *every creature shows tendency to become more and more perfect* regarding the conditions

surrounding him” (Charles Darwin 1959). That is, (please note!) *the evolution can be considered also as a result of the realization of the inner tendency of each specimen that prompts it to become more and more perfect! Or, the evolution is not the product of the natural selection but a result achieved by the specimens of the population in their collective perfection.* And since among the climbing the evolutionary ladder for millions of years there are species-leading as well as species-lagging, the animal and plant worlds have such a variety of the degree of perfection in the evolutionary development. However, according to fate-analyses, any stimulating tendency should have an opposite directed tendency pushing the creature to act in the reverse direction. In other words, *the representatives of the species can ascend and descend the ladder of evolutionary development* thus solving the eternal question of Darwin evolution: who will they eat tomorrow?

Let’s sum up the discussion of Charles Darwin’s conception. From the stated above it follows that:

1. Charles Darwin showed the algorithm of the species transformation, the origin of the new species in animal and plant world; however, from his concept of the evolutionary development of all living things follows not as regularity but as only as a “may be.”

2. The reason for evolutionary development is neither in the environment nor in its natural selection but in the unconscious stimulating *tendency* existing in every living being *to perfection* (*up* the ladder of evolutionary development) and the same *tendency to degradation* (*down* the ladder of evolutionary development).

3. The modification of the body construction of the species in the process of evolutionary development is not the result of mutations but of the stated-above unconscious stimulating tendencies.

4. None of the species living on the planet appeared due to “gemmating” from the species, situating a stage lower for its species in the evolutionary development. For example, the species of people never gemmated from the species of anthropoid apes; people had never had common ancestors with monkeys. Though the species of monkeys is considered to be the closest species to people.

5. Every species of the animal and plant world has passed its own way of evolutionary development. The most advanced on this way is a human being with its species. But “the most advanced” doesn’t mean “up to the end,” The rest of species have stopped on their ways of evolutionary development much earlier, each in its time.

6. The species is not the multitude of specimens with similar features but a conglomeration of classes with similar system of motives and *common phylogenetic past* for all its classes.

Leopold Szondi had never entitled or combined in a single whole the part of his work that dealt with the topic of evolutionary development of a human. However, in this direction he did quite a lot (Bürgi-Meyer K. 1988a, 5-23). In contrast to Darwin's theory, the concept of evolutionary development of a human by Leopold Szondi has clearly defined initial and final poles and the principle of movement from pole to pole (Szondi 1972, 167-169, 345, 417). Relying on this work, I made an effort to complete it with the concept of the post-Darwin evolution of a human. The beginning of this evolution is the border between the animal and human world.

### *The Two Worlds We Live In*

Every person simultaneously lives in two worlds: a rational one, where all things are casually connected and therefore may be predicted and in an irrational one, where every happening seems occasional, but behind those occasions someone's will – malicious or kind – may be felt. In a rational world man who comprehended this logic knows what follows any of his deeds. Therefore he is able to plan his behavior, purposefully moving forward through life. In an irrational world man moves by guess work. He can guess something about his future, but he cannot exactly know it as Berlioz in "Master and Margarita" (Bulgakov 1990) could not. As you remember, he asserted with heat that in the evening he would preside in the writer's meeting, but Annushka had bought and already spilled the oil.... He had a plan, but having slipped on that oil, he got under a tram, which cut off his head... In an irrational world you are "lucky" or "unlucky." The irrational world is an *objective and universal world*. Man is always "quest" there. The rational world is subjective: man builds it himself, sometimes during all his life, he feels "at home" in it and knows everything. Checking his opinion by the experience of other people, he can reach a high objectivity of his rational world. But this objectivity is always relative.

The "proportion" of the rational and irrational worlds may vary significantly in different people. A primitive, ignorant person may attribute to the irrational world many things that any educated person explains by logic. That's why an inducement appears to widen limits of the rational world to the boundaries of the irrational one, using science and education. But it is just a fallacy because education "raises" man, and he begins to see that limits of the irrational world are similar to a horizon: they are unattainable. So unwillingly questions arise: "Whose world is it? Who sets laws in it? Who is its master?" (Bulgakov 1990, 16). In a rational world man having comprehended its logic can be the master; and in an irrational world God, or the Highest Instance, is the Master. And if you act in concordance with His will and His laws, you are lucky, your life is successful, and you feel at home in an irrational world. However not everybody can come to the understanding of this.

***Person Unable to Build His Own Rational World and Therefore Lives Solely  
in an Irrational World***

His life resembles the life of animals. He begins to act, having no information at all. He does everything haphazard and refers to failures calmly as to something natural. His behavior is illogical and unpredictable, though sometimes amazingly successful. Such a person observes the balance of successes and failures. If the ratio moves towards "failures," he begins to behave more chaotically. He rails at logic unattainable to him but has no idea how to behave more rationally. He is inclined to faith, but rather believes in surrogates than in God. Even believing in God, he does not understand His above-rational nature and treats Him as the most powerful Headmaster, Who is to be begged about something. He has the tendency for worship of earthly "masters."

***Person Succeeding in a Rational World and Therefore Looking Down Upon an  
Irrational One***

Such a person is helpless in an irrational world but conceals this from everybody as well as from himself, trying to use "rational rules" in an irrational world. He considers mathematical statistics to be an "interpreter and guide" in an irrational labyrinth. Being restricted himself, he is eager to restrict everybody to a rational world only. Exclusively, he believes in science, sees a rival in God and rails at Him. But aspiration for rationalizing the irrational world and making it predictable leads to the opposite affect: purposeless waste of energy.

***Person Successfully Acting in a Rational World and Willing to Be Lucky in the  
Irrational One as Well***

Having reached some limit in rational development, a person understands its one-sidedness and restrictedness. Long and honest phenomenological accumulation of information about the irrational world leads him to the idea that some Higher Being that may be called God stands behind it. The man tries to understand God and to act in concordance with His plans. He tries to win His love. If the person attains this purpose, he becomes powerful not only in the rational but in the irrational world as well and reaches great success. He considers destructive blows to be prompts from God and punishment for wrong steps. Having become omnipotent in an irrational world, man becomes similar to God. Attaining such a state is the ultimate goal of post-Darwin human evolution and its higher pole.

***New Legacy of Fate-Analysis***

The great majority of people know who was Christos\* and even something about Him. But nobody is puzzled about what He had been crucified. Everybody's sure: for being good. Probably they are judging by themselves. [\*Christos = Christos is Greek

for Christ.]

It's known that the arrival of Christos had been long expected. Judean people associated His arrival with the dream about paradise on earth. They waited for the Messenger to come and begin to govern them, and thus God's Kingdom comes on earth. But Christos did not justify their expectations. He said: "No, brothers and sisters! I am really the Messenger, the Son of God, but I am not going to reign over you. You are to reign over yourselves. The place of God's Son is not in a palace but in your hearts. This will be really God's kingdom!" (w/o author 1857). The people did not like it, and the governors who hoped to rule in God's kingdom as well liked it still less. So everybody cried: "Kill Him! Kill! He is not God's Son, but just an impostor!" And *brigand* Baraba\* had been pardoned instead of Him. Here is an example of mass testing with a projective test! [\*Baraba = The way the name *Barabas* is written in the Slovenian Bible: Baraba.]

Two thousand years after those events we meet analogical ideas in fate-analysis of Leopold Szondi. Man having reached the highest level of development possesses the *pontifex-Ego*. Pontifex is man standing between God and people. Leopold Szondi defines *pontifex-Ego* as one standing above all contradictions of man's drives, able to concord their aspirations together and with the environment, and – owing to participation with the Higher Being – with God Himself. Such an *Ego* is able to transcend beyond the limits of personality and therefore is omnipotent in an irrational world and feels "at home" in it. The man, like Volant in M. Bulgakov's novel *Master and Margarita*, gains an ability to foresee the future in an irrational world, invisible for other people. But – Szondi emphasizes – only a few people, and only for a short time are able to gain this (Szondi 1972, 169). A man whose *Ego* becomes steadily pontifex converts into pontifexman: the ultimate stage of evolutionary development of man, its new species.

### *The Lower Pole of Post-Darwin Evolution*

Who, therefore, is to stand at the lowest pole of human evolution? First Leopold Szondi intended to place there (and, probably, Sir Charles Darwin should agree with it) wild, non-civilized tribes (the bushmen). However testing them with the Szondi Test has shown they are "not so wild as Europeans think" (Szondi 1972, 417). Because civilization and evolutionary development are not the same. Leopold Szondi introduces another concept, closer to evolutionary development: the concept of "social development," which is determined with the help of calculating the "sociality index," offered by R. Waltisbühl, who asserted that mankind as a total had passed the 2/5 ratio of the intended social development (Szondi 1972, 345-354). The essence of development consists in moving the ratio of socially-positive and socially-negative reactions (factor tendencies) towards the socially-positive. According to studies of R. Waltisbühl, S. Déri, and L. Szondi, the most socially backward are violent criminals, homosexual, paranoid, melancholic persons and those suffering from chronic diseases

(Szondi 1972, 352). Basing on the sociality index, these categories of men are to be placed at the borderline with the animal kingdom. (Provided that the foreground picture is relatively stable since at the background of any asocial person his social "twin" is waiting for its time). Neurotic persons, on the contrary, have been recognized as highly social.

Having for 20 years dealt with fate-analytical investigation of criminals, who had committed violence, and their victims, I had been continuously reflecting on the problem: what drives underlie criminal behavior? Synthesis of my empiric experience with fate-analytical theory had brought me to the following conclusion.

If the top of evolutionary development is man whose *Ego* managed to subject all drives' aspirations and direct their energy into a channel pleasant to God, then his opposite is man ruled by affects\* that had subjected his *Ego*. A similar picture can be observed in animals standing close to man in evolutionary development. Though a personal *Ego* is present in them (in rudimentary state), they are ruled by affects. I've seen just the same correlation of real behavior with vector pictures of the "middle" in criminals, especially in those for whom crime is a kind of occupation and in persons with inborn or acquired intellectual defects\*\*. Affects determine *what* to do, and *Ego* *how* to do. Their every step is controlled, first of all, by subjectively understood *justice*, as their Cain, having subjected the mind and continuously fighting the background Abel, does not see more worthy occupation than seeking for "justice." As their *Ego* is depending on affects, their intellectual inclinations are perverted: they develop not into mind but into cunning. Absence of mind does not prevent a criminal (in psychological, not juridical sense) from becoming a professor if he has enough cunning. Organizer abilities with highly developed cunning allow a criminal person to become an "authority," i.e. informal leader in his group, and in a criminal state he can become even an official leader, up to president. "Authorities" often like to philosophize, but their reasoning is pseudo logical, beginning with a declaration of an ethical dilemma and ending by it as well.

Ordinary men, having committed one or two crimes (not professional criminals) or preparing to commit a crime, or doing this in society where they fulfill governing functions so their crimes do not cause generally an accepted reaction are also inclined to the lower pole. Unfortunately it's impossible to determine man's vicinity to the lower pole based only on the vector picture of the "middle." An extreme situation is necessary, where the person must choose between ratio and affects. And not any extreme situation fits: it must be a tempting situation. Though such vector pictures as  $P - \pm$ ;  $Sch + 0$  and  $P -! +!$ ;  $Sch + -$  also represent an argument. Our suggested test

---

\* *Temporary insanity (situated, energy-rich senses, P-vector).*

\*\* *I do not concern crimes, being consequence of psychical pathology, as it has no principal importance in the theme under investigation.*



method "Slavonic LOVE STORY 2," supplementing the Szondi Test, gives us this very missing information. Using the results of tests, one can calculate the index of criminality (IC), showing the value of superiority of the *Ego* above the affects, if it exists, or vice versa (V. Djos, 2005).

So evolutionary development of man begins closest to the animal world as a *predatory criminal person or non-predatory person with lowered intellect* and finishes with godlike pontifexman. From the point of view of fate-analysis, evolutionary development of man consists in reorganization of his "middle" (affective drives and *Ego*-drives): gradual transition from affects-dominating to *Ego*-dominating. The accent in this "rebuilding" is to be done on an *Ego evolutionary development* from "*Ego* slavishly attending affects" to "*pontifex-Ego*."

This plane of *Ego*-development – based on energetic competition – is somewhat different from that postulated by Leopold Szondi. *Ego* having less energy than affects wins "not by number but by art" – as military commander Alexander V. Suvorov said: draw the man further and further from the lower pole by an increasing number of its victories over affects.

Human evolution may be also imagined as movement from Baraba to Christos. I am far from restricting the evolution to psychical alterations without any changes of people's appearance. Look attentively yourself, and you'll see people outwardly considerably vary each hundred years.

As times pass by, evolutionary development acting through natural selection will divide still total mankind into two species. The higher one – godlike *pontifexmen* – and the lower – intermediate between pontifexman and manlike monkeys – the so-called *delinquentmen*. It won't be a great mistake to name it a division into "men" and "not men". As to natural selection, here – and there is the main paradox of human evolution – is done by mankind itself. So we can say human evolution is self-directed. A woman selects her baby's father and certain selected order is established in the country. In some countries evolution has made a step forward. And, in Russia, in Yeltsin time\*, – vice versa, a step back. And what a step! [\*Yeltsin = Brash and volatile, Boris Yeltsin led the revolution that created Russian democracy. Then his inept rule handed power back to foes of reform.]

Forming of delinquentmen species is primary and now more close to conclusion than the forming of the *pontifexmen* species. This process is especially clearly seen in Russia, where the society is very quickly approximate to a critical point, after which man is forced to make his choice: either to become a criminal or – on the contrary – to acquire omnipotence in the rational and irrational worlds, thus becoming inaccessible to criminals or to die.

### *Psychology of Delinquentmen*

*Delinquentmen*: what are they like? Their dialectics of production and consumption is reduced to "exclusively consumption." They are similar to beasts of prey. Instead of production: violent confiscation of products from their legal owners. Therefore they can exist only along with producers of goods and services. Success in the actions of property confiscation and other violent actions cause a sense of omnipotence, at least of advantage over other men, and aggressive relation to God. But failures – prison and especially a mortal chamber – make them fanatically religious. (This is owing to background Abel).

Length of their life is 2 to 3 times shorter than of other men. Death comes mainly as result of murder or chronic diseases got in prison. Intellect is from debility to cultivated cunning. There is a tendency for generating specific highly-affective language, some "prison dialect": so called "*fenya*." The nuclear part of the species speaks it, and in the future it will probably form the base for verbal communication inside the species. Struggle for territory is typical and often more cruel and bloody than between animals. Dominance of affects makes them more sentimental than ordinary men: they are able to generously share their "booty" with the "poor" and the "miserable." They worship force and men who are strong, especially those having power, subconsciously identifying themselves with such men. They are proud of being friends or acquaintances with "powerful people."

They "clear" their species from those who are "weak," transferring them into category of "low fallen people," who are mistaken by many authors for the category of "prison homosexuals." Naturally, "women's intimate services" become hyper-demanded in prison. The "strong" are able to resist this demand's pressure, the "weak" yield to force. Therefore lower species is being subdivided into two cliques: "thieves" and "low fallen", or "cocks." Inside the first clique, their own criminal top – "legal thieves" – is distinguished.

Species of delinquentmen is notable for its high renewability owing to a high mortality rate and to the influx of new members from the intermediate category. Therefore the species is highly adaptable, which fact makes it still more dangerous.

To secure the higher species against delinquentmen the most active representatives of this latter species are to be kept in small well-guarded reservations where they will have no possibilities for intensive reproduction. But this method isn't effective enough because of high renewability of the lower species. Genocide is senseless for the same reason. As delinquentmen are affect-governed, rational therapy for them is useless, but therapy by affective shock may give excellent results. The well-known healing of criminals in Leopold Szondi's book "*Moses: Antwort auf Kain*" had taken place just owing to such a shock. (Szondi 1973, 126-131). Some representatives of the lower species may be tamed. They may become less dangerous and even safe, but by no

means may they become real men, i.e. representatives of a higher species.

### ***Ratio and Senses***

Expecting wrong comprehension of the expression "*man whose Ego dominates over affects*" let us put such a question: "Is this a man with reduced affects, i.e. an insensible, dry rationalist?" By no means. *Ego* possesses substantially lesser energy than affects but expends it exclusively rationally, directing it to a goal and reaching it with jewelry precision. Affects, on the contrary, possess huge energy but only a small part of it is spent for reaching goals useful for man. The rest of the energy is spent for accessory, casual purposes, spent irrationally in vain, often bringing about only harm. The essence of *Ego*-dominating consists neither in conquering the affects nor in eliminating or weakening them but in mastering their energy, using it for reaching rational goals. Therefore the *Ego* turns from low-energetic into possessing huge energetic potential, and affects become rational (!). Such a man becomes incomparably stronger than one in whom *Ego* and affects compete.

From the other side, the man whose affects are directed turns from an impulsive into an intuitive person, and the effectiveness of his energy expenditure sharply increases. Strong intuition allows him to become a creative person. Using an analogy with arms, dominating *Ego* turns affects from "silly" mines which strike everybody (and even those who arrange them) into powerful weapons of high precision. If the *Ego* participates with God, affects ruled by it don't accumulate energy for committing sins, therefore energy of conscience is not spent for struggle against sin. So a substantial amount of energy is being liberated for supporting the physical health of the organism as well as rational aspirations including creative search. In the case of successful *Ego*-dominating over affects the man rises above others.

### ***Mind and Cunning***

As for majority of the Russian people these two words are synonymous, though lucky men are usually named cunning, and unlucky ones clever. I wish to give here my comprehension of cunning: it is infantile, short-sighted Cain's way of thinking, using intellectual potential for lies and deceptions, providing the illusion of success and victory over others, which after all turns out to be useless and senseless.

### ***Conclusion***

The proposed concept is able to integrate points of view of those who consider that living nature on Earth evolves and theologizes teaching that man had been created by God in His image and likeness. But to be integrated, theologians are to agree with some correction of their postulate – "is created" instead of "had been created." That is, the creation of a human in the image and likeness of God still continues. And it will finish when humanity transforms into the species of people really similar to God. And

the evolutionists should agree that people, as a species, do not gemmated from the species of anthropoid apes, and, contrary to the concept of Sir Charles Darwin, were primordially the species of people. The species that went through the longest way, in comparison with other species, in its evolutionary development. And, at present, still continues this way and will stop in its evolutionary development only after achieving the height of the specific godlikeness. Moreover, Darwinists will have to agree that the evolutionary development is not owed to mutagenesis but to an unconscious stimulating tendency to perfection existing in every living being.

At present time mankind represents a substrate undergoing division into two species: 1) higher – *pontifexman* (*Homo pontific*) and 2) lower – *delinquentmen* (*Homo criminalis*). Mankind, correspondingly, has two poles: men who ultimately belong to a higher or to a lower species. The rest are still undetermined but more or less inclining to one of the poles.

"Old Legacy" point of view on the phenomenon of criminality, belonging to Leopold Szondi (axis: "*Cain – Moses*") is changed here by "New Legacy" point of view (axis "*Baraba – Christos*").

Evolutionary process is rather long. Lower species, developing more quickly, stimulates formation of the higher one. The inevitably existing rearguard of higher species represents "nutritive substrate" for lower species and condition for its existence.

Our concept allows optimal orientation in the problem of criminality control and defense. It shows that temporary isolation of criminals in penitentiary institutes or their general elimination is not effective enough means. The only effective and perspective way is intensive evolutionary development of the human species, owing to which man becomes unattainable for criminals. Omnipotence in an irrational world makes the interaction of representatives of higher and lower species similar to interaction of David and Goliath, tamer and wild beast, talented psychotherapeutic and pathological terrorist. Thus "nutritive substrate" for criminals is reduced, which fact will bring about reduction of their number.

Unfortunately, cinema and television demonstrate delinquentmen to spectators as omnipotent persons, almost half-Gods. Projection and irrational fear natural to ordinary men create the same illusion. But a powerful, never coughing criminal with a touch of nobility is not a portrait but just screen idealization. Indeed, their victories are Pyrrhus' triumphs, their financial accumulation is senseless, their pleasures silly, and fates causing pity without sympathy.

Most important in this article is not what is told but what ensues from it.

## SUMMARY

The conception can unite those criterion the adherents of the evolution development of the life on earth and theologians, who think that God created humans after His image. Thus the theologians are to agree with an insignificant correction to its dogma and “create” on to change. But evolutionists should agree that despite that, this does not end Charles Darwin’s conception of the life evolution on earth with the developing humans. Mankind imagines a substrate, in which owing to fate analysis one can state that man is divided in two ways: 1. Highest one - *Pontifexmen* (*homo pontific*); 2. lowest ones - *Delinquentmen* (*homo criminalis*). Mankind has two corresponding poles: humans gemmating already to the highest one or lowest ways. All other humans who are not determined in a different stage either to the highest one or the polarizing lowest are however closer. The old Testament point of view of Leopold Szondi on the criminality problem (axis: Kain - Moses) will change here to the New Testament (axis: Baraba - Christos). The evolution process takes a long time. The developing hurrying-ahead speed and kind of lowest drive formation of the upper kinds. From whole degree thus *arrière-garde* (rear guard), the kinds of upper becomes following like a nutritive substrate for the lowest. If *arrière-garde* is inevitable, and the condition for existence for the kind of lowest to be taken place.

The conception gives an optimal orientation for the question of the protection of criminality and its control. That shows that provisional isolation the criminals in the penitentiaries or their general elimination is not an effective means. Genuine effective and promising way is the intensive evolutionary development of humans. As a result it does not become attainable for criminals. Omnipotence in an irrational world too makes the cooperation of the members of the upper and kinds of lowest more like a David with a Goliath, an animal trainer and a wild beast, a talented psychotherapist with a pathological terrorist. Therefore the nutritive substrate is reduced for this kind of criminal, and the criminal mass is reduced.

Unfortunately, film art and television (TV) presentations show us Delinquentmen as omnipotent, nearly half-God. The projection and fear of the irrational of ordinary people also creates the same illusion. But the omnipotent, problem-free and easy gloss of the noble courage criminal is not a picture but an idealized film person. In reality their victory is pyrrhic and the goods collecting is senseless, their pleasures stupid, and fates causing pity without compassion.

In this article most important is not that which is written here but what comes from what is written here.

## LITERATURE

1. *Bulgakov M.A.* The Master and Margarita. *Collected works, Volume V*, – Moscow, 1990.
2. *Darwin Charles* Origin Type by Way of the Natural Selection, or Conservation of the Elected Sorts in Fight for Survival. *Complete works*, V. I, part 2, Sankt-Petersburg, 1896.
3. *Darwin Charles* Origin of the Person and Sexual Selection. *Complete works*, V. II, Sankt-Petersburg, 1896.
4. *Djos V.* “Semantic clue” to Szondi-test // Yekaterinburg: Personal-Profy. 2004. No 13.
5. *Djos V.* Genes, which do the person. The Persons, who does genes. // Yekaterinburg: Personal-Profy. 2004. No 13.
6. *Djos V.* Projective test-story «*Slavonic Love story - 2*». // [http: www.psy.su/](http://www.psy.su/) 2005.
7. «Last days to terrestrial life of the Jesus Christi». – Odessa, 1987.
8. *Renan E.* Vie de Iïsus. Sankt-Petersburg, 1906.
9. *Bürigi-Meyer K.* Leopold Szondi – Karlfried Graf Dürckheim. Analyse der Glaubensfunktion – Initiatische Therapie. In: SZONDIANA 8/2 (1988a), 5-23.
10. *Szondi L.* Ich-Analyse. Triebpathologie II. – Bern: Huber, 1956.
11. *Szondi L.* Lehrbuch der experimentellen Triebdiagnostik. Text-Band. – Bern: Huber, 1972.
12. *Szondi L.* Moses: Antwort auf Kain. – Bern: Huber, 1973.