1 EARTH AS A CLUSTER OF OBSERVERS: RECONCILING UNIVERSES IN ODTOE

1.1 Recursion, Collective Coherence, and the Mechanism of "Here and Now"

Pankratov Anton Sergeevich

Independent researcher, Kazan, Russia

E-mail: anton.s.pankratov@gmail.com · ORCID: 0009-0002-4870-2995

UDC 530.145 + 167.7 + 111.1

1.1.1 ABSTRACT

Within the framework of observer-dependent theory of everything (ODTOE), we investigate the fundamental question: if each observer contains within itself a recursive universe (Assertion 4, monadological principle), how do multiple such self-contained universes reconcile with one another to generate a shared reality? We demonstrate that the reconciliation mechanism is realized through configuration overlaps when S > S_threshold (P5), and "here and now" represents the region of maximum overlap—the point where configurations of the greatest number of observers coincide. Earth is formalized as a planetary coherence cluster—a configuration whose stability is determined by the number and coherence of observers co-constituting it. We introduce a hierarchy of clusters: from atomic to cosmological, where each level is a fixed point of self-observation at the corresponding scale. A model of "resonance bridges" is proposed as the mechanism for communication between observers. Experimentally testable predictions are formulated.

Keywords: collective observation, coherence, recursion, observer cluster, monadology, Earth, spacetime, reconciliation of realities, ODTOE.

1.2 I. PROBLEM STATEMENT: THE PARADOX OF NESTED UNIVERSES

1.2.1 1.1. Recursion within the observer

According to Assertion 4 [1], there exists a self-consistent configuration—a fixed point of the self-observation mapping:

$$\Psi^* = \Phi(\Psi^*) = \iota(\hat{O}_{\Psi^*}(\Psi^*)) \tag{1.1}$$

The field of potential states generates an observer, who actualizes that same field. The observer and the observed are constituted by a single act.

By connection with Leibniz's monadology [1, section 6.12]: each monad contains an "enfolded Universe" (Monadologie, §63). In ODTOE terms: each observer O_i contains within itself the complete field of potential states H, from which it constitutes its own configuration R_i = O_hat_i(Psi).

By assumption D-Prot [1, section 4.2]: the hierarchy of dimensionalities d = 1, 2, 3, 4, … specifies nested levels of observation; nesting depth is unbounded above.

1.2.2 1.2. The Paradox

If each observer contains an entire universe, how can we explain the following:

(a) We are in one and the same place and time (shared "here and now").

(b) We see the same stars, one and the same Earth, the same people.

(c) We can communicate—my signal reaches you and changes your configuration.

(d) There exists Earth—a stable planetary configuration that is co-observed by 8 billion humans (and countless non-human observers).

For Leibniz, the answer was pre-established harmony: monads "have no windows," and concordance is established by God from outside. In ODTOE, the answer must be different: concordance emerges *dynamically*, through collective observation (P5) and coherence channels [1, section 4.4].

1.2.3 1.3. Structure of the article

Section II formalizes the mechanism of configuration overlap. Section III defines "here and now" as the region of maximum overlap. Section IV describes Earth as a planetary coherence cluster. Section V constructs a hierarchy of clusters from atomic to cosmological. Section VI describes communication mechanisms between observers. Section VII formulates testable predictions. Section VIII concludes.

1.3 II. RECONCILIATION MECHANISM: CONFIGURATION OVERLAP

1.3.1 2.1. Region of overlap of realities

According to [1, remark on P5]: "P5 operates in the region of overlap of realities, determined by coherence S. When S → 1 all observers share a common reality. When S → S_min realities diverge and P5 applies only within local clusters with S > S_threshold."

Let us define formally. Let C_i be the configuration constituted by observer O_i. The overlap region of two observers:

$$\mathcal{O}_{ij} = \mathcal{C}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_j \tag{2.1}$$

The intersection is non-empty if and only if S_{ij} > S_threshold.

The overlap region of n observers:

$$\mathcal{O}_n = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{C}_i \tag{2.2}$$

This region is the shared reality of n observers. It is non-empty when S_cluster > S_threshold.

1.3.2 2.2. Why overlap is non-empty

The key question: why do configurations of different observers intersect at all? Why don't 8 billion completely disjoint universes exist?

The answer follows from three elements of ODTOE:

(a) Common field H. All observers draw from the same field of potential states (assumption D-Hom [1]). This is not "pre-given reality," but a shared resource of potentiality. Analogy: all musicians play instruments that extract sounds from one and the same acoustic field—but each extracts their own.

(b) Formula of collective probability (P5.1). $P_{coll}(E) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n}(1 - B_i^k)$. With large n and non-zero B_i, collective probability tends to unity—certain configurations become *inevitable* with a sufficient number of co-observers.

(c) Adaptive attractor [1, section 7.1]. The configuration toward which the system of observers converges as S → 1 represents an adaptive attractor—not the "true" reality, but a configuration that maximizes collective coherence. Observers *converge* to a shared configuration not because it is "objective," but because it is *stable*.

1.3.3 2.3. Formula for overlap size

The size of the overlap region depends on cluster coherence. By the multiverse cardinality formula [1, P1.2]:

$$|M_{eff}| \leq K^{N \cdot (1-S)} \tag{2.3}$$

When S → 1: |M_eff| → 1—one shared configuration. When S → 0: |M_eff| → K^N—complete disjointness.

The reciprocal quantity—the fraction of shared reality:

$$\rho(S) = \frac{|\mathcal{O}_n|}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sim K^{-N(1-S)} \tag{2.4}$$

When S → 1: ρ → 1 (complete overlap). When S → 0: ρ → 0 (disjointness). Shared reality is a continuous function of coherence.

1.4 III. “HERE AND NOW”: THE POINT OF MAXIMUM OVERLAP

1.4.1 3.1. Definition

“Here and now” (HaN)—the region of configuration space in which the number of co-observing observers is maximum:

$$\text{HaN} = \arg\max_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \; n(C) \tag{3.1}$$

where n(C) is the number of observers for whom configuration C is in the overlap region.

1.4.2 3.2. Why HaN seems “objective”

“Here and now” is experienced as objective reality not because it exists “independently of the observer,” but because:

(a) Maximum n. The more observers co-constituting a configuration, the higher P_coll by P5.1 and the higher T(C) by P3.1. “Here and now” is the configuration with maximum lifetime and maximum probability.

(b) Minimum dispersion. According to [1, section 8.3]: dispersion decreases as D(eta) = D_0 * (1 - S). At high S fluctuations are minimal—reality is “solid.”

(c) Self-reinforcement. Observers co-constituting one configuration *increase* its S, which *increases* T(C), which *attracts* more observers. Positive feedback: a stable configuration becomes *even more stable*.

1.4.3 3.3. Time as a sequence of HaN

Time in ODTOE is not an external parameter, but a sequence of reconfigurings [5]. “Here and now” is not a static point, but a *wave front* of collective observation:

$$\text{HaN}(t+1) = \hat{O}_{coll}(\text{HaN}(t)) \tag{3.2}$$

Each “moment” is a new act of collective observation, constituting a new configuration from the previous one. Velocity by P2.1: v = alpha / (I(C) + epsilon). The higher the inertia of “here and now” (the more observers bound to the current configuration), the *slower* time flows. This accords with subjective experience: “time flows more slowly when nothing changes.”

1.5 IV. EARTH AS A PLANETARY COHERENCE CLUSTER

1.5.1 4.1. Definition

Earth is a stable configuration C_Earth, co-constituted by a cluster of observers with S_cluster > S_threshold:

$$C_{\text{Earth}} = \bigcap_{i \in \text{cluster}} \mathcal{C}_i \quad \text{when} \quad S_{\text{cluster}} > S_{threshold} \tag{4.1}$$

The cluster includes:

Observer Type	Number	d (dimensionality)	Contribution to S
Atoms and molecules	~10^50	0	Basic stability of matter
Cells	~10^15 (per human)	1-2	Biological coherence
Organisms (non-human)	~10^12	2-3	Ecosystem coherence
Humans	~8*10^9	3-4+	Cultural, scientific coherence

1.5.2 4.2. Stability of Earth

By P3.1: T(C) = T_0 / (1 - S)^n. With S_Earth sustained by ~10^50 atomic observers, T(C_Earth) » T_0—the lifetime of the planetary configuration is colossal. This is not "Earth exists objectively," but "Earth is a configuration with such a number of co-observers that its lifetime exceeds the age of any individual observer."

Earth is "solid" not because matter is "real," but because 10^50 atomic observers coherently co-constitute the same configuration.

1.5.3 4.3. Why we see one and the same Earth

Each human contains a universe within themselves—but the overlap region of their configuration with the configurations of other humans includes Earth. We see *the same* Earth not because it is "objective," but because Earth is the *common part* of all our individual universes:

$$C_{\text{Earth}} \subset \mathcal{O}_n = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{C}_i \tag{4.2}$$

But each sees *their own* version of Earth—hence differences in perception, beliefs, "realities." The overlap region is not identity but *intersection*: the common part exists, but the remainder is individual for each.

1.5.4 4.4. Earth in the Universe

The Universe is not "a container in which Earth flies." The Universe is a *hierarchy of clusters* with decreasing coherence:

Cluster	Approximate S	Stability	What we see
Atom	~1	Maximum	"Solid" matter
Molecule	~0.95	Very high	Chemical properties
Organism	~0.8	High	Living body
Ecosystem	~0.5	Moderate	Biosphere
Planet	~0.3	Moderate	Earth

Cluster	Approximate S	Stability	What we see
Solar system	~0.1	Low	Orbits, laws
Galaxy	~0.01	Very low	Milky Way
Observable Universe	~S_min	Minimal	Cosmological horizon

The farther from "here and now"—the lower S, the greater |M_eff|, the more "versions of reality" are allowed. Nearby—matter is solid, reality is "one." Far away—quantum uncertainty, multiplicity of interpretations, dark energy as *divergence of configurations* at cosmological scales.

1.6 V. HIERARCHY OF CLUSTERS: FROM ATOM TO COSMOS

1.6.1 5.1. Recursive self-similarity

According to [3]: the atom is an elementary strange loop with threefold architecture (proton—electron—neutron). Each level reproduces the pattern:

$$\Psi_d^* = \Phi_d(\Psi_d^*) \tag{5.1}$$

At each dimensionality level d—its own fixed point, its own cluster, its own overlap region.

1.6.2 5.2. Nested clusters

```
Universe (S → S_min, |M_eff| → max.)
  └── Galaxy (S ~ 0.01)
        └── Solar system (S ~ 0.1)
              └── Earth (S ~ 0.3)
                    └── Biosphere (S ~ 0.5)
                          └── Community of humans (S ~ 0.6)
                                └── Family (S ~ 0.8)
                                      └── Human (S ~ 0.9)
                                            └── Cell (S ~ 0.95)
                                                  └── Molecule (S ~ 0.98)
                                                        └── Atom (S → 1)
```

Key observation: **coherence increases inward and decreases outward**. Inside an atom S → 1 (perfect agreement of quarks, gluons). Inside a family [7] S is higher than in society. Inside the observable Universe S → S_min—at cosmological scales observers are minimally coordinated.

This is a *recursive* structure: each level is a fixed point containing within itself levels with higher coherence. Each monad contains an "enfolded Universe"—but enfolded *layer by layer*, from a highly coherent core to a weakly coherent periphery.

1.6.3 5.3. Cluster boundaries

A cluster boundary is a surface on which S = S_threshold. Beyond this surface configurations *diverge*: observers on opposite sides of the boundary live in *different* realities (with varying degrees of difference).

Physical examples of boundaries:

Boundary	Physical phenomenon	ODTOE interpretation
Black hole event horizon	Light does not escape	S = 0 on the horizon: configurations inside and outside are completely disjoint
Cosmological horizon	Objects beyond the horizon are unobservable	S < S_threshold: no overlap of configurations
Biological cell wall	Membrane separates interior from exterior	S_interior » S_on_membrane: cell cluster is clearly bounded
Community boundary	“Ours” vs. “theirs”	S_interior > S_threshold > S_between: cultural cluster

---

1.7 VI. COMMUNICATION MECHANISM: RESONANCE BRIDGES

1.7.1 6.1. How observers “contact”

For Leibniz, monads “have no windows.” In ODTOE—they do. The contact mechanism is the *resonance bridge*: a channel through which the configuration of one observer influences the configuration of another.

According to [1, section 4.4]: “the channel must ensure the growth of collective coherence S_cluster. The specific nature of channels is determined by the type of observer.”

1.7.2 6.2. Types of channels

Channel type	Observers	Mechanism	Speed
Electromagnetic	Atoms, molecules	Photon = quantum of observation act [12]	c
Chemical	Cells	Signal molecules (hormones, neurotransmitters)	~100 m/s
Acoustic	Organisms	Sound, voice, chorus [9]	~340 m/s

Channel type	Observers	Mechanism	Speed
Semantic	Humans	Language, text, image	Variable
Emotional	Humans	HRV synchronization, mirror neurons [7]	Instantaneous (within cluster)

1.7.3 6.3. Resonance as a channel condition

A channel works when observers *resonate*—their configurations coincide at least partially (O_{ij} ≠ empty set). The higher S_{ij}, the wider the channel, the more information transmitted, the faster configurations *converge*.

This explains everyday experience: with a close person we "understand each other at a hint" (high S → wide channel). With a stranger—"as if in different languages" (low S → narrow channel). With a representative of another culture—S_threshold is not overcome, configurations do not intersect on key parameters.

1.7.4 6.4. Photon as an elementary bridge

According to [12]: photon = quantum of observation act. The minimal communication channel between two observers:

$$\hat{O}_1 \to \hat{O}_2 + \gamma, \quad E_\gamma = h\nu = \Delta E_{\hat{O}} \tag{6.1}$$

A photon is *not* a particle traveling from one to another. A photon is a *trace of reconfiguration* of the observation operator, propagating at speed c. Speed c is the maximum reconfiguration speed v_max by P2.1.

This explains why c is the limit: it is not the "speed of motion of an object," but the *speed of propagation of configuration change*. Configuration cannot change faster than this limit—and, consequently, observers cannot reconcile their configurations faster than c.

1.7.5 6.5. Quantum nonlocality as *pre-existing* overlap

EPR correlations [1] do not require "signal transmission." If two observers were *coherent* (S → 1) at the moment of entangled state preparation, their configurations already *overlap*. Measurement by one of them does not "transmit information" to the other, but *reveals* the overlap that already existed.

$$S_{AB}(t_{\text{preparation}}) \to 1 \implies \mathcal{O}_{AB} \approx \mathcal{C}_A \approx \mathcal{C}_B \tag{6.2}$$

Nonlocality is not a violation of causality, but a *consequence of high coherence*: observers that achieve S → 1 share *one and the same* configuration, regardless of spatial distance.

1.8 VII. TESTABLE PREDICTIONS

1.8.1 7.1. Coherence gradient

Prediction: fundamental constants (including the speed of light, Planck's constant) may have a *gradient*, correlating with the density of observers. In regions with maximum n (center of the planetary cluster) constants are *maximally stable*. At the periphery (cosmic vacuum, minimum observers)—fluctuations are allowed.

Test: precision measurement of fundamental constants in space vs. on Earth (already partially tested by spectroscopy of distant quasars).

1.8.2 7.2. Effect of collective coherence

Prediction: a group of observers with high S should demonstrate lower variance of results in quantum experiments [1, section 8.3].

Test: two identical interferometers—one serviced by a coherent group (e.g., meditating), the other—a control group. The variance difference D(eta) = D_0 * (1 - S) should be statistically significant.

1.8.3 7.3. Decline of "objectivity" with scale

Prediction: reproducibility of experiments declines with observation scale. Atomic experiments (high S)—perfectly reproducible. Cosmological observations (low S)—allow *fundamentally* different interpretations.

Test: meta-analysis of reproducibility of experiments as a function of scale (nano-, micro-, macro-, cosmo-). A monotonic decline is predicted.

1.8.4 7.4. Earth as a "coherence lens"

Prediction: Earth enhances the coherence of observations conducted on its surface, compared to orbital observations. Not for technical reasons, but due to a *larger number of co-observers*.

Test: comparison of precision of the same atomic experiment on ISS vs. on Earth under otherwise equal conditions. A systematic deviation is predicted.

1.9 VIII. DISCUSSION

1.9.1 8.1. Answers to the original questions

How do we reconcile? Through the common field H and dynamic convergence to an adaptive attractor. Observer configurations overlap in region O_n, determined by coherence S. Not "pre-established harmony" of Leibniz, but a self-organization process.

How do we gather "here and now"? "Here and now" is the region of maximum configuration overlap. The configuration with the maximum number of co-observers has maximum P_coll and T(C). We are "here" not because we came here, but because "here" is the *region of agreement* of our universes.

How do we contact? Through resonance bridges—channels linking overlap regions. The photon is an elementary bridge. Voice, language, emotion are bridges of higher dimensionalities. Contact is possible only when S > S_threshold—otherwise configurations do not intersect.

What is Earth? A planetary coherence cluster—a stable configuration, co-constituted by ~10^50 observers (from atoms to humans). Its "solidity" is a consequence of colossal S_cluster. It is not "objective"—it is *stable* (T → large) and *inevitable* (P_coll → 1).

1.9.2 8.2. Connection with previous ODTOE works

Paper	Connection
[1] ODTOE (main)	Formalism: P5, S, S_threshold, multiverse
[2] Number pi	Pi as an invariant of cyclic cluster structure
[3] Atom	Atom as an elementary cluster (d = 0)
[4] Quantum computer	Computation in H—before collapse into C
[5] Time	Time as a sequence of reconfigurings
[7] Family	Family as a high-S cluster
[9] Music	Chorus as a practice of increasing S through HRV synchronization
[12] Photon	Photon as an elementary resonance bridge

1.9.3 8.3. Philosophical implications

(a) Loneliness is impossible. Each observer *necessarily* intersects with others—otherwise a stable configuration would not exist (T(C) requires S > 0, and S > 0 requires n > 1). To exist means to co-observe.

(b) Distance is a measure of divergence. Physical distance between observers is not "emptiness between objects," but a measure of divergence of their configurations. Close people (high S) are "closer" regardless of physical distance. Strangers (low S) are "far" even in one room.

(c) Universe is not a container but a relation. Universe is not "a place where we are," but a *structure of relations between observers*. Space emerges *from* the divergence of configurations, not precedes it.

1.10 IX. CONCLUSION

Each observer contains within themselves an entire universe. But these universes are not isolated—they overlap through the common field of potential states H and converge to adaptive attractors through collective observation (P5).

"Here and now" is the region of maximum overlap: the point where the largest number of observers co-constitute one configuration. Earth is a planetary coherence cluster, stable due to ~10^50 co-observers. Communication is resonance bridges between overlap regions.

Coherence decreases outward: inside an atom—nearly perfect; inside a family—high; at the edge of the observable Universe—minimal. Space, time, distance are not pre-given containers, but emergent properties of the overlap structure.

Leibniz's pre-established harmony is replaced by dynamic convergence: monads *have windows*, and these windows are coherence channels through which the universes of observers *constantly reconcile* with one another.

$$R_{\text{shared}} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \hat{O}_i(\Psi) \quad \text{when} \quad S > S_{threshold}. \quad \text{We are the intersection of universes.}$$

1.11 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND TOOLS

In developing ODTOE theory and all papers based on it, artificial intelligence tools were used: Claude Sonnet / Opus 4.6 Extended (Chat & Code) (Anthropic), ChatGPT 5.3 (OpenAI), Google Gemini (Google DeepMind). AI systems were employed as assistants at all stages of work. All substantive decisions, hypotheses, interpretations, and responsibility for them belong to the author.

1.12 REFERENCES

1. Pankratov A.S. Theory of everything: observer-dependent (ODTOE) // Preprint. — 2025. — 47 p.
2. Pankratov A.S. Number pi as a structural invariant of self-consistent observation in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.
3. Pankratov A.S. Atom as an elementary strange loop in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.
4. Pankratov A.S. Quantum computer in ODTOE: computation in the field of potential states // Preprint. — 2025.
5. Pankratov A.S. Nature of time in ODTOE: from cesium-133 to heartbeat // Preprint. — 2025.
6. Pankratov A.S. Honesty in ODTOE: separate parameter or consequence of coherence? // Preprint. — 2025.
7. Pankratov A.S. Family in ODTOE: coherent cluster and generation of strange loops // Preprint. — 2025.

8. Pankratov A.S. Self-observation and AI expansion: diagnosis and prognosis through ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.

9. Pankratov A.S. Music as a coherence operator: frequencies, tuning, and resonance // Preprint. — 2025.

10. Pankratov A.S. Cinematography of reality: information, memory, and reproduction in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.

11. Leibniz G.W. Monadologie. — 1714.

12. Pankratov A.S. Photon as a quantum of observation act in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.

13. Wheeler J.A. Information, Physics, Quantum: The Search for Links // Proceedings III International Symposium on Foundations of Quantum Mechanics. — 1989. — P. 354–368.

14. Aspect A., Dalibard J., Roger G. Experimental Realization of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm Gedankenexperiment // Physical Review Letters. — 1982. — Vol. 49. — P. 1804–1807.

15. Moiseev V.I. Logic of open synthesis. — Vol. 1–2. — St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 2010.