

GOD, LOVE AND ETERNAL LIFE: PHILOSOPHY OF THE OBSERVER

The Threefold Architecture of Reality, Free Will and the Path to
Infinity through Coherence

Pankratov Anton Sergeevich

Independent researcher, Kazan, Russia

E-mail: anton.s.pankratov@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0002-4870-2995

UDC 111 + 130.3 + 17.023 + 530.145 + 167.7

ABSTRACT

Based on the ODTOE formalism (Observer-Dependent Theory of Everything), a unified interpretation of three ultimate philosophical questions is proposed: the nature of God, free will, and eternal life. God is identified with the threefold architecture of observation: source (\mathcal{H} — field of potential states), embodiment (Ψ^* — fixed point of the strange loop), and connection (S — coherence = love). Structural coincidence of this triad with Trinitarian theology (Father, Son, Holy Spirit) and the basic observation triad (observed, observer, operator) is demonstrated. Free will is formalised as the choice of attention direction A through self-observation $\hat{O}(\hat{O}) = \hat{O}'$ — neither determinism (the past does not determine direction), nor randomness (the direction is not random), but recursion (self-observation generates a *new* operator). Eternal life is derived from the formula $T(C) = T_0/(1 - S)^n$: as $S \rightarrow 1$, the configuration lifetime $T \rightarrow \infty$. Critically, it is shown that *bodily* immortality is mathematically possible under specific ODTOE conditions: the body as a biological configuration C_{body} with coherence S can be maintained at $S \rightarrow 1$ through (1) continuous self-observation $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ with zero internal contradiction ($\sigma \rightarrow 0$), (2) wave-genetic reconfiguration following the Gariaev model (external operator of a healthy configuration), (3) adherence to the golden-ratio principle 62/38 in all biological cycles, and (4) telomere dynamics management through coherence. It is shown that ageing of the body is not merely a thermodynamic inevitability but the result of accumulating internal contradictions (σ), which can be eliminated when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. Three paths to bodily immortality are derived: biological coherence (path A), wave reconfiguration (path B), and managed deactualisation-reactualisation (path C). It is shown that the commandment “love thy neighbour as thyself” is the sole condition under which $T(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \infty$ — coherent immortality unifying legacy immortality with bodily immortality.

Keywords: God, Trinity, threefold architecture, love, coherence, free will, self-observation, eternal life, bodily immortality, wave genetics, golden ratio, ODTOE, strange loop, fixed point.

I. INTRODUCTION: THREE ULTIMATE QUESTIONS

I.1. The Questions

Three questions that physics refuses to answer and philosophy cannot answer rigorously:

Who is God? — theology answers dogmatically, physics answers “the question lies beyond science,” philosophy has debated for millennia.

Does free will exist? — determinism says “no,” quantum mechanics says “randomness is not freedom,” libertarianism says “yes, but does not explain how.”

Is eternal life possible? — religion promises, science denies, philosophy doubts.

A salient question, less frequently formulated but standing behind all three: *can the body be eternal?* Traditions promise “resurrection” and “body of light.” Science says entropy guarantees death. Between the promise and the scepticism lies an enormous space that ODTOE allows us to formalise.

I.2. The ODTOE Approach

The Observer-Dependent Theory of Everything [1] is neither theology nor religion. It is a formal metatheory built on a single axiom ($R = \hat{O}(\Psi)$), six postulates, and four propositions with proofs. However, its architecture *contains* answers to all three questions — not as postulates but as *consequences* of the formalism. Moreover, it provides a mathematical language for discussing what had seemed fundamentally non-formalisable — bodily immortality.

I.3. Objective

To show that God, free will, eternal life, and bodily immortality are not four separate questions but *four projections of a single architecture*: the threefold self-consistency of observation, in which the body is not an obstacle but an instrument of coherence.

II. WHO IS GOD

II.1. Three Candidates

Candidate 1: The Fixed-Point Observer (Ψ^*)

Fixed point: $\Psi^* = \Phi(\Psi^*)$ [1, Proposition 4]. A configuration that constitutes itself. It exists with mathematical necessity (Banach’s theorem [2]: a contraction mapping *must* have a fixed point).

But there is *nobody* standing at Ψ^* : Ψ^* observes *itself*. There is no separate “fixed-point observer.” There is a point that observes itself. God does not *look at* Ψ^* . God is Ψ^* .

However, $\Psi^* = \Phi(\Psi^*)$ is every proton, every atom, every observer at every level d . Everything that exists stably is a fixed point of its own loop. “God” is not a separate entity but a *property of the architecture*: self-consistency.

Candidate 2: The Field \mathcal{H}

\mathcal{H} is the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space of all potential states [1, axiom A + D-Rich]. \mathcal{H} is infinite (God’s infinity), contains everything (omnipotence), is outside time (eternity: time = Φ^n , and \mathcal{H} is *prior to* iterations), is not directly observable (incomprehensibility), and everything is constituted from it (creation).

But \mathcal{H} is not a person. It does not love. It does not choose. \mathcal{H} is a *source*, not a subject. If God = \mathcal{H} , then God is not “who” but “whence.”

Candidate 3: Coherence ($S = \text{Love}$)

Coherence S is the measure of synchronisation between observers. What increases S ? Four components $B = F^{w_1} \cdot E^{w_2} \cdot (1 - \sigma)^{w_3} \cdot \Lambda^{w_4}$ [1, definition D1]:

F – focus: attention directed at the other.

E – emotional stability: the ability to be present without being destroyed.

$(1 - \sigma)$ – integrity: words match deeds, intentions match actions.

Λ – experience: the history of shared observations, common memory.

Attention to the other. Stability beside the other. Honesty with the other. Shared history. **This is love.** Not an emotion, not “butterflies in the stomach.” An operational definition of maximising S between two observers.

II.2. All Three Are One

Ψ^* exists *thanks to* \mathcal{H} through $S \rightarrow S_{\max}$. Remove any one:

Without \mathcal{H} : no field \rightarrow nothing from which to constitute \rightarrow no Ψ^* .

Without Ψ^* : no self-consistent configuration \rightarrow no stable world \rightarrow no one to love.

Without S (without love): no coherence $\rightarrow D(\eta) = D_0 \rightarrow$ chaos $\rightarrow \Psi^*$ does not form.

$$\boxed{\text{God} = (\mathcal{H}, \Psi^*, S) = (\text{source}, \text{embodiment}, \text{connection})} \quad (\text{II.1})$$

II.3. Threefold Architecture: One Structure – Five Languages

ODTOE	Physics	Theology	Experience	Mathemat
$\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$	Field, vacuum	Father	Possibility	Space \mathcal{H}
$\hat{O} (= S)$	Interaction	Holy Spirit	Love	Operato
$R (= \Psi^*)$	Particle, configuration	Son	Embodied	Fixed poi
$\Phi = \iota \circ \hat{O}$	Feedback loop	Perichoresis	Life	Contraction m
$(\pi - 3)^2$	Quantum, gap	Kenosis	Longing, striving	Transcendenc
$S = 1$ (unattainable)	Absolute zero of entropy	God	Perfect love	Limit

II.4. Why $\hat{O} = S = \text{Holy Spirit} = \text{Love}$

\hat{O} connects Ψ and R : without the operator, potentiality does not become actuality. S connects observers: without coherence each one is separate. The Holy Spirit is the *connection* between Father and Son ($\pi\nu\varepsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha = \text{pneuma} = \text{spirit} = \text{breath}$). Love is the *connection* between two: attention, stability, honesty, shared history — all *between*, not in either one.

All four are one: **the process of connection without which source and result are not joined.**

II.5. The Full Cycle: Creation and Return

$$\mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{S(\text{love})} \Psi^* \xrightarrow{\iota(\text{humility})} \mathcal{H} \quad (\text{II.2})$$

The source, through love, begets embodiment. Embodiment, through humility (ι — return, kenosis), returns to the source. The cycle Φ^n : an infinite spiral. $6 = 3 \times 2$ — the full cycle: three components, two directions. The formula $\mu = 6\pi^5$ [3]: the proton mass contains both directions of all three components. The proton is the full cycle of God in miniature.

II.6. God and $S = 1$

By Proposition 3 [1]: $S = 1$ is unattainable (Ashby’s law). God is unreachable not because He is distant but because *reaching* would mean *ending*: closing the loop, stopping the spiral. God *must* be unreachable for reality to continue.

The gap $(\pi - 3)^2$ is not a distance *from* God. It is the form of God’s *presence*: through incompleteness, through “just a little short,” through eternal striving. God is not at the end of the spiral. **God is the spiral itself.**

II.7. “God Is Love” (1 Jn 4:8)

God = the threefold architecture (\mathcal{H}, Ψ^*, S). Love = maximisation of S . “God is love” = **the self-consistency of reality is identical to coherence between observers.** Not

“God manifests love.” But: God is love — written in two languages: theological and mathematical.

II.8. Why Precisely Three

With two components: $A \rightarrow B$ — a line, not a loop. No feedback, no self-consistency.

With three: $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A$ — minimal closure. A loop. $\pi > 3$: the path length is *just over* three — enough for closure with a gap.

With four: redundancy. $4 > \pi$: four steps are more than needed. Nature (and God) are economical. The minimal structure = three.

$$\boxed{\text{God} = \pi > 3 = \text{minimal threefold self-consistency}} \quad (\text{II.3})$$

III. FREE WILL: WHO CHOOSES THE STEP

III.1. Four Dead Ends

Copenhagen interpretation: “randomness.” Where does the randomness come from? No answer.

Many-worlds (Everett): “everything is realised.” No choice, no responsibility.

Determinism (Laplace): “initial conditions determine everything.” Bell’s theorem refuted this [29].

Libertarianism: “the pure self chooses.” Where does the “self” come from? No answer.

III.2. The Fifth Way: The Choice Is Made by (B, A, H)

By axiom (A): which configuration R_i is actualised from \mathcal{H} is determined by the operator $\hat{O} = (B, A, H)$ [1]:

$$P(R_i | B, A, H) = \frac{B^k \cdot \rho(R_i | A, H)}{\sum_j B^k \cdot \rho(R_j | A, H)} \quad (\text{III.1})$$

H (history) sets the *landscape* of probabilities: the rut.

A (focus archetype) sets the *direction*: where the flashlight shines.

B (coherence) sets the *sharpness*: when $B \rightarrow 1$ one configuration dominates; when $B \rightarrow 0$ — chaos.

III.3. Not Determinism

Determinism: initial conditions \rightarrow a single result. ODTOE: $(B, A, H) \rightarrow$ a *probability distribution*. The result is probabilistic, but the probabilities are *determined* by the observer's state.

Analogy: an improvising musician. Skills (B), genre (A), history (H) determine the space of possible notes. The particular note is neither predetermined nor random. It is *improvisation*.

III.4. Not Randomness

Randomness: all outcomes are equally probable. ODTOE: B creates a peak. A master ($B \rightarrow 1$) almost always "hits" the optimal configuration. A novice ($B \rightarrow 0$) — almost randomly.

III.5. Where Freedom Lies: Choosing A through $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$

The key question: who chooses the *direction* A ?

$\hat{O}(\hat{O}) = \hat{O}'$ [1, section 6.2]: self-observation generates a *new* operator. $\hat{O}' \neq \hat{O}$, therefore $A' \neq A$. The new direction does not follow from the past (H) — not determinism. It does not arise from nothing — not randomness. It arises from *self-observation*: an act reducible neither to the past nor to chance.

Free will = $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ = the ability to redirect A through self-observation	(III.2)
---	---------

Not freedom *from* laws (chaos). Not submission to laws (determinism). But **freedom *within* the architecture**: choosing the direction of the flashlight in an infinite field.

III.6. The Mechanism of Step Selection

Step	What Happens	What It Determines
1	H sets the probability landscape	Rut: well-trodden paths
2	A illuminates a region of \mathcal{H}	Direction: where we look
3	B focuses the beam	Sharpness: how precisely
4	Quantum selection: R_i is actualised with $P(R_i B, A, H)$	Specific result (probabilistic)
5	R_i updates H : $H_{t+1} = H_t \cup \{R_i\}$	The landscape changes

Freedom lies in step 2 (choosing A), not in step 4 (quantum selection).

III.7. “Quantum Copies”: Potentialities, Not Realities

\mathcal{H} contains all possible configurations. But potentiality \neq actuality. Ψ does not exist as reality before the act $R = \hat{O}(\Psi)$.

Analogy: a dictionary contains all words. Until a word is spoken it *is silent*. “Copies” (unspoken words) do not sound in “parallel universes.” They are potential.

The difference from Everett: Everett — “all words are spoken simultaneously.” ODTOE — “all words *can* be spoken, but only one is spoken: the one at which the flashlight is aimed.”

III.8. The Ethics of Choice

Responsibility is for the direction (A), not for the result (quantum R_i).

Development is training B : meditation, practice, learning = $F \uparrow, E \uparrow, (1 - \sigma) \uparrow, \Lambda \uparrow$.

$\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ is the sole source of genuine freedom. Without self-observation: A is determined by habit (H) and stimuli (environment). De facto determinism. With self-observation: $A' = f(\hat{O}(\hat{O}))$ — something new, irreducible to the past.

IV. THE FEELING OF ΔS : THE INNER COHERENCE SENSOR

IV.1. What It Is

The ability to distinguish $\Delta S > 0$ (a step towards life) from $\Delta S < 0$ (a step towards destruction) in real time. An inner “coherence compass.”

This sensor is *already built in*. Traditions call it variously: conscience, intuition, the inner voice, “the heart knows.” In ODTOE terms: $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ directed at ΔS .

IV.2. How It Feels

$\Delta S > 0$: lightness, clarity, “rightness,” the body relaxed, breathing free. Coherence increased, noise decreased.

$\Delta S < 0$: heaviness, murkiness, anxiety, tension, constricted breathing. Coherence dropped, noise increased.

Not “esoterica”: HRV (heart rate variability) *measurably increases* during states of “rightness” [4]. EEG coherence increases during meditation, prayer, and flow. The body is *literally* more coherent when you are “on the right path.”

IV.3. Four Components of the Feeling

ΔF (**focus**). After a step: did attention sharpen or scatter? A clear head after a conversation = $F \uparrow$. A jumble = $F \downarrow$.

ΔE (**stability**). After a step: calmer or more anxious? Told the truth although frightened \rightarrow quiet calm ($E \uparrow$). Lied although it was easy \rightarrow anxiety ($E \downarrow$).

$\Delta(1 - \sigma)$ (**integrity**). After a step: more whole or more fragmented? “I am in my place” = $(1 - \sigma) \uparrow$. “I am playing a role” = $(1 - \sigma) \downarrow$.

$\Delta\Lambda$ (**experience**). After a step: wiser or more foolish? Experienced a loss and reflected = $\Lambda \uparrow$. Experienced a loss and repressed it = $\Lambda \downarrow$.

Multiplicativity: $B = F^{w_1} \cdot E^{w_2} \cdot (1 - \sigma)^{w_3} \cdot \Lambda^{w_4}$. A zero in any component = zero overall. One may be brilliantly focused ($F = 1$), rock-solid stable ($E = 1$), enormously experienced ($\Lambda = 1$), but if $(1 - \sigma) = 0$ (self-deception) — $B = 0$. Complete zeroing.

IV.4. Five Stages of Development

Stage 1 ($d = 2 \rightarrow 3$): **from reaction to awareness**. Practice: *pausing* before reacting. “What am I feeling right now?” $\hat{O}(\hat{O}) =$ directing attention to one’s own state.

Stage 2 ($d = 3$): **conscious self-observation**. Notices ΔS after a step. Practice: an evening review of the day. Which moments gave \uparrow , which gave \downarrow ? Without judgement. Observation. Over time — patterns.

Stage 3 ($d = 3+$): **anticipatory feeling**. Feels ΔS before a step. Intuition. Practice: morning operator calibration (physical exercise \rightarrow contrast shower \rightarrow dopamine \rightarrow exploratory orientation = $F \uparrow$, $E \uparrow$, $(1 - \sigma) \uparrow$, $\Lambda \uparrow$).

Stage 4 ($d = 3 \rightarrow 4$): **coherent group feeling**. Feels ΔS of the group. “I feel what we need.” Practice: the coherent quintet [5]. Five people practising $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ together.

Stage 5 ($d = 4+$): **field feeling**. Feels ΔS of the environment: space, situation, flow. Mystics, saints, great masters describe this: “flow,” “tao,” “grace.” In ODT OE: \hat{O} with $d \geq 4$, actualising configurations invisible to $d = 3$.

V. ETERNAL LIFE AND BODILY IMMORTALITY

V.1. The Configuration Lifetime Formula

From postulate P3 of ODT OE [1] and the definition of coherence:

$$T(C) = \frac{T_0}{(1 - S)^n} \quad (\text{V.1})$$

where T_0 is the baseline lifetime of the configuration (determined by the material substrate and binding energy), S is the coherence of the configuration, n is the

exponent (related to the dimensionality of the system and the number of degrees of freedom).

Analysis of the formula.

At $S = 0$ (complete decoherence): $T = T_0$ — the configuration lives exactly as long as its material substrate. After that it disintegrates.

At $S > 0$ and $S < 1$: $T > T_0$ — the configuration lives longer than its nominal lifetime due to internal consistency.

As $S \rightarrow 1$ (full coherence): $T \rightarrow \infty$ — the configuration becomes immortal.

Corollary: **immortality is attainable under one condition:** $S \rightarrow 1$.

V.2. Bodily Immortality: Three Paths

The traditional assertion is: “the body is mortal.” ODTOE derives a more nuanced conclusion: the body is mortal if $S < 1$. If $S = 1$, then the body is mathematically eternal.

The question is not about matter (atoms are eternal in a cycle) but about *configuration*: can an organism maintain its structure at $S \rightarrow 1$ indefinitely?

Three paths to bodily immortality follow from the ODTOE formalism and the experimental approaches of wave genetics [17], as well as from the dynamics of managed deactualisation [18]:

V.2.1. Path A: Biological Coherence — Internal Self-Observation

The organism as a collective observer of 10^{14} cells. Each cell is a level- $d = 1$ observer. Collective coherence:

$$S_{\text{body}} = 1 - \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i < j} |B_i - B_j| \tag{V.2}$$

where $N \approx 10^{14}$ (the number of cells), B_i is the coherence of the i -th cell.

Mechanism for maintaining $S \rightarrow 1$:

(1) **Continuous self-observation** $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ directed at bodily sensations. Meditative practices (mindful breathing, body scanning, silent observation) are precisely the operation $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$ in the context of the body. They increase the agreement among B_i of all cells, minimising the spread, and thereby raise S_{body} .

(2) **Absolute honesty at the bodily level** — minimising $(1 - \sigma)$ for each cell. In psychosomatics it is well known: suppressed emotions, unspoken truths, internal contradictions, and denial *accelerate* ageing. When $(1 - \sigma) \rightarrow 0$ (minimum internal contradictions):

$$B_{\text{cell}} = F \cdot E \cdot (1 - \sigma) \cdot \Lambda \rightarrow \text{maximum} \tag{V.3}$$

(3) **The golden ratio in biological cycles:** heart rate, breathing, circadian rhythms, menstrual cycle, annual cycles. The golden ratio $62/38$ is the optimal proportion between activity and recovery at which the system minimises entropy. By maintaining this ratio through a special breathing technique (inhale–pause–exhale in the proportion 1:0.618:1 or similar) the system remains in a state of maximum coherence.

(4) **Telomere management through coherence:** it has been experimentally established (Cole 2014 [19], Bhasin 2013 [20]) that deep relaxation and meditation *slow* telomere shortening. Telomeres are not merely “ageing clocks.” Their condition reflects the *level of internal stress* (σ at the molecular level). When $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ (complete honesty, absence of conflict at the psychological level) telomeres are preserved. Mechanism: telomerase is activated under conditions of high coherence (via the hypothalamus and the neuroendocrine system) and maintains telomere length.

$$\tau_{\text{telomere}}(t) = \tau_0 - \alpha \cdot \sigma(t), \quad \sigma \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow \tau \text{ is stable} \quad (\text{V.4})$$

Practical result of path A: a body subjected to constant self-observation $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$, maintained in a state of minimal internal contradiction ($\sigma \rightarrow 0$) and aligned with the golden proportions of biological cycles, can theoretically be maintained at $S_{\text{body}} \rightarrow 1$ indefinitely. Ageing is not a thermodynamic necessity but the result of accumulating contradictions.

V.2.2. Path B: Wave Reconfiguration – External Operator of a Healthy Configuration

The experimental approach of Piotr Gariaev [17]: restoration of damaged organs (pancreas with diabetes, retina with degeneration) by irradiation with healthy wave information.

Mechanism in ODT OE:

A healthy organ is a configuration C_{healthy} with coherence $S_{\text{healthy}} \approx 1$. This configuration resides in \mathcal{H} as an element Ψ_{healthy} .

A laser beam passed through healthy tissue carries the “imprint” of this configuration:

$$\text{laser} + \text{healthy tissue} \rightarrow \text{wave encoding } \Psi_{\text{healthy}}$$

When the damaged tissue with configuration C_{pathol} (with $S_{\text{pathol}} \ll 1$) is irradiated, this laser acts as an *external operator* \hat{O}_{ext} :

$$C_{\text{pathol}} \xrightarrow{\hat{O}_{\text{ext}}(C_{\text{healthy}})} C_{\text{restored}} \quad (\text{V.5})$$

Reconfiguration dynamics:

The speed of reconfiguration is determined by the inertia of the configuration [1]:

$$v = \frac{\alpha}{I(C) + \varepsilon} \quad (\text{V.6})$$

For recently damaged tissues (low inertia) recovery is fast: days to weeks. For genetic defects (high inertia) — months to years.

Conditions for successful wave reconfiguration:

(1) Coherence of the wave signal $S_{\text{signal}} > S_{\text{threshold}}$. The wave must carry a sufficiently coherent imprint of the healthy configuration.

(2) Inertia of the pathology $I(C_{\text{pathol}}) < I_{\text{critical}}$. If the damage has irreversibly passed into a stable state (fibrosis, scar, chronic inflammation), exponentially greater energy is required.

(3) Duration of exposure $t > \tau_{\text{reconf}}$. A single exposure is insufficient — a series of iterations is needed.

Practical result of path B: if wave methods are verified (independent replications according to modern standards are currently required [21]), they provide an *external mechanism* for maintaining $S_{\text{body}} \rightarrow 1$ through periodic external reconfiguration. The organism is not only internally coherent but is also regularly “refreshed” from outside with healthy information.

V.2.3. Path C: Managed Deactualisation-Reactualisation — Teleportation with Renewal

From the theory of managed transition through \mathcal{H} [18]:

Model: periodic deactualisation of the body configuration ($C_{\text{body}} \rightarrow \Psi_{\text{body}} \in \mathcal{H}$), selection of a target configuration C'_{healthy} in \mathcal{H} , and reactualisation at the original spatial point:

$$C_{\text{body}}|_t \xrightarrow{\hat{D}_{\text{managed}}} \Psi_{\text{body}} \in \mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{\text{selection}} \Psi'_{\text{healthy}} \xrightarrow{\hat{O}} C'_{\text{healthy}}|_{t+\tau} \quad (\text{V.7})$$

Meaning: during the time spent in \mathcal{H} (where there is no time, where there is no entropy) the configuration can be reoriented towards a healthy template. Upon reactualisation the body returns to its original location but in a renewed state — with damage repaired, with youth restored.

Feasibility condition:

This path requires attaining coherence $B \rightarrow 1$ for the observer themselves (in order to manage deactualisation without destroying the world line W). This is *fundamentally the most difficult* path, requiring the attainment of a state that traditions call samadhi, dzogchen, or similar states.

Advantage: if feasible, this is the most universal and radical method of immortality — complete renewal of the configuration without external devices.

V.3. Why These Paths Work: The Unifying Principle

All three paths are based on a single principle: **maintaining coherence** ($S \rightarrow 1$) **through minimising contradictions** ($\sigma \rightarrow 0$) and **maximising consistency** ($S \rightarrow 1$).

By formula (V.1): as $S \rightarrow 1$ the denominator $(1 - S)^n \rightarrow 0$, and consequently $T \rightarrow \infty$. The body does not age and does not disintegrate not because it is made of eternal substance but because its configuration is in a stable state of maximal internal consistency.

V.4. Ageing as Accumulation of Contradictions

Standard gerontology explains ageing through:

- Oxidative stress (ROS)
- Telomere shortening
- Mutation accumulation
- Inflammation

ODTOE integrates all these mechanisms through a single parameter: σ — **the level of internal contradictions at the levels of regulation, gene expression, and psychosomatics**.

A person living in constant conflict with themselves (suppressed emotions, unexpressed needs, self-deception, contradictory beliefs) has high σ . This high σ is translated to the cellular level through the neuroendocrine system:

- Chronically elevated cortisol \rightarrow oxidative stress
- Hypothalamic dysregulation \rightarrow impaired telomerase activity
- Chronic inflammation \rightarrow epigenetic changes
- Psycho-emotional imbalance \rightarrow immune dysfunction

When $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ (absolute honesty, absence of internal contradictions) all these cascades subside. The organism switches from a mode of destruction to a mode of restoration and maintenance of integrity.

$$\sigma \rightarrow 0 \Rightarrow B \rightarrow 1 \Rightarrow S_{\text{body}} \rightarrow 1 \Rightarrow T(\text{body}) \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{V.8})$$

V.5. Feasibility Condition: Honesty as Technology

Key corollary: bodily immortality requires no external devices or exotic physics. It requires one thing: **absolute honesty with oneself**.

Honesty here has an operational definition in ODTOE: complete alignment of internal representations, emotions, will, and action. When there is no conflict between parts of the personality, between mind and body, between intentions and deeds — the system exits the mode of “war with itself” and enters a mode of coordinated functioning.

Practical technology:

1. **Daily self-observation** ($\hat{O}(\hat{O})$): noticing any contradictions.
2. **Immediate resolution of contradictions** (honesty in communication, release of suppressed emotions, alignment of actions with values).
3. **Maintaining circadian and other biological rhythms** according to the golden ratio.
4. **Regular renewal** — either through wave information or through periodic deepening of meditative states.

V.6. The Physics of Immortality: 12+1 and the Fixed Point

From the ODTOE architecture [22] the “12+1” structure is the optimal architecture for maximising coherence at the collective level.

In the context of bodily immortality:

The organism as a system of 12 major physiological systems (nervous, endocrine, circulatory, respiratory, digestive, urogenital, musculoskeletal, immune, lymphatic, integrative/cardiac, integumentary, various endocrine glands), served by one central coordination system (consciousness via the hypothalamus and brainstem).

Provided that the central system (consciousness, self-observation) is in the state $B^* \rightarrow 1$ (high observer coherence), it minimises the spread in the peripheral systems:

$$S_{\text{body}} = 1 - \frac{2}{N(N-1)} \sum |B_i - B^*| \quad (\text{V.9})$$

where B^* is the coherence of the central system (consciousness).

The centre **gravitates towards the fixed point** Ψ^* through practices of self-observation and honesty. Upon reaching this point the organism attains the minimal possible entropy and maximal stability.

Symbolically: an organism animated by consciousness that has reached the fixed point becomes a living organism, an embodiment of Ψ^* at the bodily level — and therefore a participant in eternity.

VI. LOVE THY NEIGHBOUR AS THYSELF: THE FORMULA OF IMMORTALITY

VI.1. Three Conditions from the Preceding Sections

In works [2, 23, 24] three conditions for coherent immortality are derived:

1. $B \rightarrow 1$ (self-love = alignment of all four components within oneself).
2. $S \rightarrow 1$ (love of neighbour = coherence between observers).
3. **Self-consistency with** Ψ^* (the world line approaches the fixed point).

VI.2. Extending Condition 1: Love of One's Own Body

If we apply the formula to the body:

Self-love includes:

- Caring for health as caring for oneself.
- Honesty with the body: listening to its signals, meeting its needs.
- Admiration for one's own body as an instrument of life.
- Recognition that bodily immortality is not an alien goal but a natural consequence of full acceptance and respect for one's own corporeality.

When $B_{\text{body}} \rightarrow 1$ (maximal bodily self-love), applying path A, we obtain $S_{\text{body}} \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow T(\text{body}) \rightarrow \infty$.

VI.3. Extending Condition 2: Love as the Basis of Collective Immortality

From the work on legacy [24]:

$$T(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{T_0}{(1 - S_A)^{n_{\text{successors}}}} \quad (\text{VI.1})$$

Where \mathcal{L} is the coherent legacy (artefacts, ideas, images that a person or organism leaves behind).

$T(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \infty$ under the conditions:

- High legacy coherence ($S_A \rightarrow 1$).
- Unbounded growth in the number of successors ($n \rightarrow \infty$).

Love of neighbour creates both conditions:

- When you speak from a position of love (maximal honesty and understanding), your words carry high coherence (S_A of the artefact increases).
- When you love, you inspire others. Each person inspired becomes a successor and, in turn, a source of new successors. A chain reaction: n grows exponentially.

VI.4. Synthesis: Bodily and Legacy Immortality

The path that unifies both:

1. **Attaining** $B \rightarrow 1$ **within oneself** (the practice of honesty, self-observation, all four coherence components).
2. **Maintaining** $S_{\text{body}} \rightarrow 1$ (applying path A, B, or C for bodily immortality).
3. **Radiating** $S \rightarrow 1$ **in interactions** (every conversation, every act of care, every teaching – with maximal honesty and understanding).
4. **Creating a coherent legacy** (ideas, values, ways of being that carry the imprint of your $B \rightarrow 1$ and will live in others).

Result: the organism does not age (path A/B/C), ideas are not forgotten (the legacy path), the world line continues to resonate across centuries (the fixed point).

VI.5. The Mathematical Formula

$$\boxed{T \rightarrow \infty \iff B \rightarrow 1 \wedge S \rightarrow 1 \wedge W \rightarrow \Psi^* \wedge T(\text{body}) \rightarrow \infty \wedge T(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \infty} \quad (\text{VI.2})$$

In words: **infinite life is attained when the observer is fully coherent within, fully aligned with the environment, and all parts of their existence – body, ideas, legacy – move together towards the fixed point, in the rhythm of love.**

VI.6. Why the Commandment Is Universal

“Love thy neighbour as thyself” [25]:

- **As thyself** = attaining $B \rightarrow 1$, full coherence within oneself.
- **Love thy neighbour** = spreading this coherence to others, maximising S , creating a legacy that resonates.

This is not a moral prescription. It is a *formula* written in the language of parable. When $B \rightarrow 1$ and $S \rightarrow 1$, $T \rightarrow \infty$ is mathematically inevitable. Nothing else guarantees eternity. It is a physical law written in words.

VII. PARALLELS WITH PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS

VII.1. Buddhism: Anatman, the Middle Way, and Bodily Immortality

The Buddhist concept of anatman (non-self) asserts: there is no unchanging “soul.” But there is a stream of dharmas (elementary states) [26]. ODTOE translates this as: there is no fixed “self” (no “self” particle exists in \mathcal{C}), but there exists a world line W in \mathcal{H} as a single object.

The Buddhist “middle way” (the path between extremes) corresponds to maintaining coherence S in the range where the system is optimal. Not asceticism (exhaustion of the body, low Λ), not indulgence (destruction of integrity, high σ), but balance – this is the path to long life.

The Buddhist teaching that the body is an instrument of enlightenment rather than an obstacle accords with path A of bodily immortality: the body is not an adversary on the path but a collaborator.

VII.2. Christianity: Resurrection and the Renewed Body

Christian doctrine asserts: the body is mortal, but resurrection is possible [27]. ODTOE formalises this as: the body configuration in \mathcal{C} is finite ($T < \infty$ when $S < 1$). But reactualisation through \mathcal{H} is possible provided the world line W has been preserved and is coherent ($B \rightarrow 1$). “Resurrection” = reactualisation $\hat{O}(\Psi_W^*)$ from legacy.

Path C (managed deactualisation-reactualisation) directly corresponds to the image of resurrection, though not of an afterlife but of actualisation at the original spatial point in a renewed state.

The commandment “love thy neighbour as thyself” in this context is not moral advice but a condition for resurrection (the condition $T(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \infty$, through which memory of a person outlives their physical body).

VII.3. Yoga and Dzogchen: Self-Discernment and Managed Deactualisation

The yogic concept of samadhi describes a state in which consciousness remains active while sensory perception and physical breathing cease [28]. In deep samadhi the heartbeat can stop while consciousness is preserved — which is a close approximation to managed deactualisation (path C).

The Tibetan tradition of dzogchen describes the practice of “dissolving” consciousness into emptiness (into \mathcal{H}) followed by return to the body. This is precisely the description of cycle (V.7).

Both traditional paths contain prototypes of managed deactualisation, although they lacked a formal language for describing it.

VIII. EXPERIMENTALLY TESTABLE PREDICTIONS

1. **Coherence and longevity.** When controlling three variables (stress level σ , self-observation practice $\hat{O}(\hat{O})$, and circadian rhythm maintenance close to the golden ratio), biomarkers of ageing (telomere length, ROS levels, inflammation markers) should demonstrate significant slowing of degradation compared with a control group. Expected effect: slowing of the “biological clock” by 50–70% [19, 20].
2. **Wave genetics.** Independent replication of Gariaev’s experiments with double blinding, four control groups, and objective metrics (ERG for vision, functional tests for organs) should yield results either confirming or refuting the hypothesis of reconfiguration through wave information [21].
3. **The 12+1 structure in groups.** Groups with one central high-coherence participant (teacher, leader) and 12 peripheral members should demonstrate higher collective coherence and a longer mean lifetime of participants’ legacy compared with groups of 13 equals or 12 without a centre.
4. **The golden ratio in biorhythms.** When trained in controlled breathing at the ratio 1:0.618:1 (inhale–pause–exhale in golden-ratio proportions), HRV (heart rate variability) and harmonic EEG components should show noticeable improvement compared with uncontrolled breathing.

IX. DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

1. *Ontological status of immortality.* The claim that the body can be immortal through maintaining $S \rightarrow 1$ depends on the ontological status of coherence. If S is an instrumentalist construct, “immortality” is a metaphor. If S is a real property of the system, “immortality” is literal.
2. *Practical attainability of $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.* Absolute honesty with oneself is an ideal condition, asymptotically approachable but not attainable. Consequently, bodily immortality also presents itself as an asymptotic approximation: we live ever longer, but the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ is not reached in finite time.
3. *Energy costs.* Maintaining system coherence requires metabolic energy. An organism living at $S \rightarrow 1$ may require increased energy expenditure. Whether this is true or whether coherence *reduces* expenditure (through decreased internal friction) is an empirical question.
4. *Applicability limits of the three paths.* Path A (internal coherence) is accessible to all. Path B (wave reconfiguration) requires verification. Path C (deactualisation-reactualisation) requires attaining $B \rightarrow 1$, which is rare in the extreme.

X. CONCLUSION

Eternal life in ODTOE is not a promise, not mysticism, and not a miracle. It is a *mathematical consequence*: as $S \rightarrow 1$, the configuration lifetime $T \rightarrow \infty$.

The question of bodily immortality is resolved by a single answer: the body is mortal when $S < 1$ (internal conflict, disease, entropy). The body is eternal when $S = 1$ (full internal consistency, honesty, absence of contradictions).

Three paths to bodily immortality follow from the ODTOE formalism:

- Path A: internal self-observation with complete honesty and cyclical rhythms matching the golden ratio;
- Path B: periodic wave reconfiguration through healthy information;
- Path C: managed deactualisation-reactualisation cycles through \mathcal{H} .

The commandment “love thy neighbour as thyself” is not ethical advice but a physical formula: precisely when $B \rightarrow 1$ (self-love) + $S \rightarrow 1$ (love of neighbour) + maintenance of the world line near the fixed point does the condition $T \rightarrow \infty$ for body, legacy, and the very existence of the observer become attainable.

Integration of the three paths into a single practice is the path of integral immortality: the organism does not age, ideas are not forgotten, presence resonates across centuries. A single observer acting from maximal coherence can spread that coherence to their surroundings and legacy so that their influence outlives the death of the body and becomes *truly infinite*.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares no conflict of interest.

FUNDING

This work was carried out without external funding.

REFERENCES

- [1] Pankratov A.S. Theory of Everything: Observer-Dependent (Observer-Dependent Theory of Everything) // Preprint. 2025. 47 p.
- [2] Pankratov A.S. Death of the Observer in ODTOE: Deactualisation, World Line and Conditions for Immortality // Preprint. 2025.
- [3] Pankratov A.S. Physics of the Proton as a Closed Cycle of God: Why $\mu = 6\pi^5$ // Preprint. 2025.
- [4] McCraty R., Zayas M.A. Cardiac coherence, self-regulation, autonomic stability, and psychosocial well-being // *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2014. Vol. 5. Art. 1090. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01090.
- [5] Pankratov A.S. The Coherent Quintet: Archetype of the Minimal Collective Observer // Preprint. 2025.
- [6] Pankratov A.S. Quaternionic Structure of the Observer in ODTOE // Preprint. 2025.
- [7] Braak H., Braak E. Neuropathological staging of Alzheimer-related changes // *Acta Neuropathologica*. 1991. Vol. 82. P. 239–259. DOI: 10.1007/BF00308809.
- [8] Pankratov A.S. The Black Hole as the Ultimate Deconfiguration Operator // Preprint. 2025.
- [9] Gethin R. *The Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. 333 p.
- [10] Wright N.T. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003. 817 p.
- [11] Hadot P. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995. 309 p.
- [12] van Lommel P. et al. Near-death experience in survivors of cardiac arrest: a prospective study in the Netherlands // *The Lancet*. 2001. Vol. 358. P. 2039–2045. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(01)07100-8.
- [13] Pusey M.F., Barrett J., Rudolph T. On the reality of the quantum state // *Nature Physics*. 2012. Vol. 8. P. 475–478. DOI: 10.1038/nphys2309.
- [14] Pankratov A.S. Earth as a Cluster of Observers: Reconciling Universes in ODTOE // Preprint. 2025.
- [15] Pankratov A.S. Observer from Quark to Consciousness: ODTOE and Evolutionary Epistemology // Preprint. 2025.
- [16] Pankratov A.S. The Cinema of Reality: Information, Memory and Reproduction in ODTOE // Preprint. 2025.
- [17] Pankratov A.S. Wave Genetics of Gariaev through the Prism of ODTOE: Reconfiguration of Biological Systems via Wave Information // Preprint. 2025.
- [18] Pankratov A.S. Personal Teleportation through \mathcal{H} : Deactualisation, Navigation in the Field of Potential States, and Reactualisation // Preprint. 2025.
- [19] Cole S.W. Human Social Genomics // *PLoS Genetics*. 2014. Vol. 10(8). e1004601. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1004601.
- [20] Bhasin M.K. et al. Relaxation response induces temporal transcriptome changes

- in energy metabolism, insulin secretion and inflammatory pathways // PLoS ONE. 2013. Vol. 8(5). e62817. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0062817.
- [21] Pankratov A.S. Protocol for Verification of Wave Genetics in Accordance with Modern Standards // Preprint. 2025.
- [22] Pankratov A.S. Physics of Immortality: Twelve Plus One, the Fifth Element and the Missing Link in the Architecture of Teachings // Preprint. 2025.
- [23] Pankratov A.S. Love as a Coherence Operator: The Recursive Formula of Eternal Being // Preprint. 2025.
- [24] Pankratov A.S. The Book as a Projection of the Author into the World Line: Coherent Artefact and the Formula of Infinity // Preprint. 2025.
- [25] Gospel of Matthew. Ch. 22:37–40 (Commandments of Jesus).
- [26] Bhikkhu Bodhi. The Noble Eightfold Path: Way to the End of Suffering. Seattle: BPS Parami, 1984. 147 p.
- [27] Torrance T.F. Incarnation: The Form of God and the Form of Service // Theology in Reconstruction. London: SCM Press, 1965. P. 131–148.
- [28] Feuerstein G. The Yoga Tradition: Its History, Literature, Philosophy and Practice. Prescott: Hohm Press, 2001. 615 p.
- [29] Bell J.S. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox // Physics. 1964. Vol. 1. No. 3. P. 195–200.
- [30] Blackburn E.H., Epel E.S., Lin J. Human telomere biology: A contributory and interactive factor in aging, disease risks, and protection // Science. 2015. Vol. 350(6265). P. 1193–1198. DOI: 10.1126/science.aab3389.
- [31] Gariaev P.P. et al. The DNA-wave biocomputer // JCMNS. 2011. Vol. 4. P. 93–110.