1 HONESTY IN ODTOE: SEPARATE PARAMETER OR CONSEQUENCE OF COHERENCE?

1.1 Formal Analysis and Reducibility Theorem

Pankratov Anton Sergeevich

Independent researcher, Kazan, Russia

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

UDC 530.145 + 167.7 + 17.022

1.1.1 ABSTRACT

The paper investigates whether honesty should be introduced as a separate parameter in the ODTOE formalism. A decomposition analysis of honesty into three dimensions is performed: internal (consistency between declared and practiced), inter-observer (projection of true vs. false configuration), and temporal (stability of configuration over time). It is shown that all three dimensions reduce completely to existing formalism components: σ (internal contradiction), S (coherence), Λ (empirical support), and $T(C)$ (configuration lifetime). A reducibility theorem is proven: introducing honesty as a fifth component H_{hon} in formula (D1.1) does not increase the explanatory and predictive power of the formalism. It is established that honesty is a *consequence* of love (= coherence, $S \to 1$), not its prerequisite: the optimal operator mode ($B \to 1$) *necessarily* includes $\sigma \to 0$, which is identical to absolute honesty. Dishonesty is formalized as "phantom coherence"—a state in which the observable S_{phan} differs from the true S_{true}, leading to catastrophic configuration collapse at $T \ll T_0$.

Keywords: honesty, internal contradiction, phantom coherence, reducibility, love, observation operator, configuration lifetime, ODTOE.

1.2 I. PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.2.1 1.1. The Question

The ODTOE formalism [1] describes an observer through four components of belief: F (focus), E (emotional coherence), σ (internal contradiction), Λ (empirical support). Honesty—a fundamental ethical concept—is not mentioned explicitly. The question arises: should formula (D1.1) be expanded to five components by introducing honesty $H_{\text{hon}} \in [0, 1]$?

1.2.2 1.2. Criterion for Answer

The introduction of a new parameter is justified if and only if there exists an observable phenomenon *not described* by existing parameters. If honesty reduces completely to

$(F, E, \sigma, \Lambda, S)$, the new parameter is redundant and violates Occam's razor.

1.3 II. HONESTY DECOMPOSITION

1.3.1 2.1. Three Dimensions of Honesty

Honesty is not a one-dimensional concept. Three structural dimensions are distinguished:

(H-1) Internal honesty. Consistency between what the observer *knows* (implicit state) and what they *declare* (explicit state). Self-deception = rupture between belief and behavior.

(H-2) Inter-observer honesty. Consistency between the configuration R that the observer *projects* to others and the configuration R_{true} that they *project* for themselves. Lie = $R_{\text{decl}} \neq R_{\text{true}}$.

(H-3) Temporal honesty. Stability of the projected configuration to empirical verification. An honest configuration is confirmed by experience ($\Lambda \to 1$); a dishonest one is refuted ($\Lambda \to 0$).

1.3.2 2.2. Question: Are All Three Dimensions Covered?

1.4 III. H-1: INTERNAL HONESTY = σ

1.4.1 3.1. Direct Identification

$\sigma(O, C) \in [0, 1]$ is defined in [1, D1.1] as "internal contradiction (entropy of doubt)," measurable through "discrepancy between explicit declarations and implicit attitudes" [1, section 8.2]. Operational procedure: modified Implicit Association Test (IAT) [2].

Internal dishonesty is *identical* to high σ: the observer knows one thing, declares another—discrepancy between implicit and explicit is maximal. Internal honesty is *identical* to $\sigma \to 0$: declared coincides with practiced.

1.4.2 3.2. Formal Identity

$$\text{H-1}(O) = 1 - \sigma(O, C) \tag{III.1}$$

Internal honesty is the $(1 - \sigma)$ factor of formula (D1.1). It is *already present* in the formalism.

1.4.3 3.3. Consequences of Self-Deception

At $\sigma \to 1$: $(1 - \sigma)^{w_3} \to 0$, hence $B \to 0$ (the "weakest link" property [1, Property 1]). By postulate P4: $P(E|0) = 0$. *An observer dishonest to themselves constitutes nothing.* Their operator $\hat{O}$ is effectively turned off.

This is a powerful prediction: self-deception ($\sigma \to 1$) *completely blocks* the observer's constituting ability, regardless of values of F, E, and Λ. You can have perfect focus ($F = 1$), deep emotional involvement ($E = 1$), rich experience ($\Lambda = 1$)—but if you lie to yourself ($\sigma = 1$), the product $B = 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 0 \cdot 1 = 0$.

1.5 IV. H-2: INTER-OBSERVER HONESTY = TRUE VS. PHANTOM S

1.5.1 4.1. Phantom Coherence

Lying—projecting $R_{\text{decl}} \neq R_{\text{true}}$—creates an *appearance* of coherence among observers. Let us call this *phantom coherence*:

$$S_{\text{phan}} = 1 - \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i<j} |B_i^{(\text{decl})} - B_j^{(\text{decl})}| \tag{IV.1}$$

where $B_i^{(\text{decl})}$ is the *declared* belief (what the observer reports to others). While *true* coherence is:

$$S_{\text{true}} = 1 - \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i<j} |B_i^{(\text{true})} - B_j^{(\text{true})}| \tag{IV.2}$$

Dishonesty creates a gap: $S_{\text{phan}} > S_{\text{true}}$. The system *appears* coherent but *is not* so.

1.5.2 4.2. Collapse of Phantom Configuration

By postulate P3 [1]: $T(C) = T_0/(1-S)^n$. Which S determines lifetime—S_{phan} or S_{true}?

Answer: S_{true}. Because lifetime is determined by the *actual* stability of the configuration, not the declared one. Formula P3 contains S as an *objective* measure of synchronization—discrepancy among true B_i, not declared ones.

Consequence: a configuration built on lies has:

$$T_{\text{fact}} = \frac{T_0}{(1-S_{\text{true}})^n} \ll \frac{T_0}{(1-S_{\text{phan}})^n} = T_{\text{expect}} \tag{IV.3}$$

The system collapses *earlier* than participants expect. This is the *mechanism of collapse of empires, Ponzi schemes, and ideologies based on lies*: phantom coherence masks real fragility, but T is determined by S_{true}, and collapse occurs "unexpectedly" (for those who believed in S_{phan}).

1.5.3 4.3. Is a New Parameter Needed?

No. The gap $S_{\text{phan}} - S_{\text{true}}$ is completely determined by the aggregate of individual σ_i:

$$S_{\text{phan}} - S_{\text{true}} = f(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n) \tag{IV.4}$$

When $\sigma_i = 0$ for all i: $B_i^{(\text{decl})} = B_i^{(\text{true})}$, $S_{\text{phan}} = S_{\text{true}}$, no gap. Inter-observer dishonesty is *entirely generated* by individual σ_i.

1.6 V. H-3: TEMPORAL HONESTY = Λ

1.6.1 5.1. Mechanism

Empirical support $\Lambda(O, C) \in [0, 1]$ is "accumulated confirmation experience" [1, D1.1]. An honest configuration is confirmed by observations: $R_{\text{obs}} \approx R_{\text{exp}}$, distance $\bar{d} \to 0$, Λ grows. A dishonest configuration (based on lies) when confronted with reality is refuted: $R_{\text{obs}} \neq R_{\text{exp}}$, $\bar{d} \to 1$, $\Lambda \to 0$.

By belief dynamics [1, D1.3]:

$$\frac{dB}{dt} = \gamma \cdot \tanh(\beta \cdot \dot{\bar{d}}) \cdot \bar{d} \cdot B(1 - B) \tag{V.1}$$

When $\dot{\bar{d}} > 0$ (observation moves away from expectation): tanh > 0, $dB/dt > 0$... The sign depends on convention. In [1]: upon refutation, B *falls*. Result: a dishonest configuration loses Λ, with it B, with that S, with that T—cascade collapse.

1.6.2 5.2. Identity

$$\text{H-3}(O) \sim \Lambda(O, C) \tag{V.2}$$

Temporal honesty is *resistance to empirical verification*, which Λ measures.

1.7 VI. REDUCIBILITY THEOREM

Statement. Honesty $H_{\text{hon}}(O, C) \in [0, 1]$ reduces completely to existing ODTOE parameters. Adding H_{hon} as a fifth factor in (D1.1) is redundant: it does not expand either the set of describable phenomena or the set of generated predictions.

Justification.

From sections III–V:

$$H_{\text{hon}} = h(1 - \sigma,\ S_{\text{true}}/S_{\text{phan}},\ \Lambda) \tag{VI.1}$$

for some monotone function h. Each argument of h is already defined through ODTOE parameters. The expanded formula:

$$B' = F^{w_1} \cdot E^{w_2} \cdot (1-\sigma)^{w_3} \cdot \Lambda^{w_4} \cdot H_{\text{hon}}^{w_5} \tag{VI.2}$$

contains multiplicative dependence on H_{hon} which by (VI.1) is a function of already-present factors $(1-\sigma)$ and Λ. Introducing H_{hon} is equivalent to reweighting existing coefficients w_3 and w_4—an operation generating no new predictions.

By Occam's razor: do not introduce entities beyond necessity. H_{hon} is redundant. ■

1.8 VII. HONESTY AS CONSEQUENCE OF LOVE

1.8.1 7.1. Direction of Implication

Question: what is primary—honesty or love? ODTOE gives an unambiguous answer.

Love (= coherence) is defined as the state $\{B \to 1, S \to 1\}$ [3]. By (D1.2) [1]: $B = 1 \Leftrightarrow F = E = \Lambda = 1$ and $\sigma = 0$. But $\sigma = 0$ is *absolute internal honesty* (section III).

Consequently: Love $\Rightarrow$ Honesty.

$$B \to 1 \implies \sigma \to 0 \implies \text{H-1} \to 1 \tag{VII.1}$$

Love *necessarily includes* honesty. It is impossible to achieve $B = 1$ with $\sigma > 0$: the multiplicativity of formula (D1.1) blocks this.

1.8.2 7.2. Reverse Implication: Honesty $\not\Rightarrow$ Love

Honesty ($\sigma = 0$) is necessary but insufficient. An observer can be absolutely honest ($\sigma = 0$) but with zero focus ($F = 0$) or zero emotional coherence ($E = 0$). In this case $B = 0$ despite honesty. Example: a person honestly acknowledging they "don't care" ($F = 0$)—their honesty does not generate constituting ability.

$$\sigma = 0 \not\implies B \to 1 \tag{VII.2}$$

1.8.3 7.3. Structural Hierarchy

$$\text{Love} = \{F \to 1\} \cap \{E \to 1\} \cap \{\sigma \to 0\} \cap \{\Lambda \to 1\} \cap \{S \to 1\}$$

Honesty ($\sigma \to 0$) is one of four components, not the entire formula. Love is complete coherence, including honesty as *necessary but insufficient* component.

Analogy from physics: temperature is necessary for burning but insufficient (oxygen and fuel are also needed). Honesty is the "oxygen" of love: without it burning is impossible, but oxygen alone is not enough.

1.9 VIII. DISHONESTY AS MECHANISM OF DESTRUCTION

1.9.1 8.1. Collapse Cascade

Dishonesty ($\sigma \to 1$) triggers a chain reaction of destruction at all levels:

Level 1 (internal). $\sigma \to 1 \Rightarrow (1-\sigma)^{w_3} \to 0 \Rightarrow B \to 0$. Observer loses belief.

Level 2 (inter-observer). $B_i \to 0$ for dishonest observers $\Rightarrow$ growth of $|B_i - B_j|$ in formula (4.5) $\Rightarrow S \to S_{\text{min}}$. Group coherence falls.

Level 3 (configurational). $S \to S_{\text{min}} \Rightarrow T(C) \to T_0$. Configuration lifetime is minimal.

Level 4 (empirical). Dishonest configuration is refuted by experience $\Rightarrow \Lambda \to 0 \Rightarrow B \to 0$ (reinforcing level 1). Positive feedback: dishonesty begets dishonesty.

1.9.2 8.2. Lifetime Formula for Dishonest Configuration

$$T_{\text{dishon}} = \frac{T_0}{(1 - S_{\text{true}})^n} \approx T_0 \text{ when } S_{\text{true}} \to S_{\text{min}} \tag{VIII.1}$$

An empire built on lies ($\sigma_{\text{coll}} \to 1$, $S_{\text{true}} \to S_{\text{min}}$) lives $\sim T_0$—the minimum time. Compare: a configuration built on honesty and love ($\sigma \to 0$, $S \to 1$) lives $T \to \infty$.

1.9.3 8.3. Historical Examples

Ponzi scheme. $S_{\text{phan}} \gg S_{\text{true}}$: participants believe in returns (high declared coherence), but real value is absent ($S_{\text{true}} \approx 0$). Collapse is "unexpected" for participants but predictable by formula (IV.3): $T_{\text{fact}} \ll T_{\text{expect}}$.

Totalitarian regime. $\sigma_{\text{coll}} \to 1$: declared ($R_{\text{decl}}$: "prosperity," "unity") systematically diverges from practiced (R_{true}: repression, scarcity). Phantom coherence is maintained by coercion, but S_{true} falls and collapse is inevitable: USSR, $T \approx 74$ years—order of magnitude T_0.

Scientific falsification. Fabricated data ($\sigma_{\text{resear}} \to 1$) create phantom Λ: the paper is cited, reputation grows. But upon reproduction $R_{\text{obs}} \neq R_{\text{exp}}$, $\Lambda_{\text{true}} \to 0$, retraction follows. $T \sim$ years.

Bible (counterexample). The commandment "do not lie" ($\sigma \to 0$) + "love your neighbor" ($S \to 1$) = maximum honest coherence. $T > 3000$ years and growing.

1.10 IX. PHANTOM VS. TRUE COHERENCE: DIAGNOSIS

1.10.1 9.1. How to Distinguish?

Phantom coherence is unstable under *stress tests*: under external pressure S_{phan} falls to S_{true}, exposing the real discrepancy. True coherence under pressure does *not decrease* (or decreases minimally) since $B_i^{(\text{decl})} = B_i^{(\text{true})}$ and there is no gap.

Formally: introduce a *stress operator* $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$, increasing $D(\eta) = D_0(1 - S)$ by raising the stochastic term. Then:

$$S_{\text{phan}} \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{S}}} S_{\text{true}} \qquad (\text{rapid collapse to true value}) \tag{IX.1}$$

$$S_{\text{true}} \xrightarrow{\hat{\mathcal{S}}} S_{\text{true}} - \delta \qquad (\delta \ll 1, \text{ stable}) \tag{IX.2}$$

Crisis (war, pandemic, economic shock) is a natural stress test, exposing S_{true}. Institutions surviving crisis are *truly* coherent. Those that collapsed had phantom S.

1.10.2 9.2. Honesty Diagnostic Criterion

An observer (or institution) is *honest* if and only if:

$$\frac{S_{\text{phan}}}{S_{\text{true}}} = 1 \iff \sigma_i = 0 \ \ \forall\, i \tag{IX.3}$$

Any deviation $S_{\text{phan}}/S_{\text{true}} > 1$ is an indicator of dishonesty. The magnitude of the gap $\Delta S = S_{\text{phan}} - S_{\text{true}}$ is a *measure of collective dishonesty*.

1.11 X. DISCUSSION

1.11.1 10.1. Why Honesty is "Built In" to the Formula

The construction (D1.1) is not accidentally including $(1-\sigma)$ as a separate factor with weight w_3. The multiplicative form ensures: nullifying $(1 - \sigma)$ nullifies B entirely, *independently* of other components. This "weakest link" property is the exact formal analogue of the moral intuition "lies devalue everything."

The weight w_3 determines *how strongly* dishonesty suppresses belief. Calibration of w_3 is an empirical task [1, section 8.2]; but the formula structure guarantees: for *any* $w_3 > 0$ lies reduce B.

1.11.2 10.2. Why a Fifth Parameter is Not Needed

Honesty is *completely covered* by three mechanisms: $(1 - \sigma)$ for H-1, $S_{\text{true}}/S_{\text{phan}}$ for H-2, Λ for H-3. Introducing a fifth parameter H_{hon} would lead to: (a) violation of formalism minimality; (b) multicollinearity—H_{hon} is linearly dependent on $(1 - \sigma)$ and Λ; (c) necessity of a separate operational measurement procedure, which would coincide with existing ones (IAT for σ [2], Bayesian posterior for Λ [4]).

1.11.3 10.3. Why Honesty is a Component of Love, Not Conversely

Love ($B \to 1$, $S \to 1$) is a four-dimensional state including honesty as one of four dimensions. Honesty ($\sigma \to 0$) is a one-dimensional condition, necessary but insufficient.

In the recursive formula of eternal being [3]: $\Phi = \mathcal{L}_{\text{self}} \circ \text{Creation} \circ \text{Resonance} \circ \mathcal{L}_{\text{other}}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{self}} = \{F \to 1, E \to 1, \sigma \to 0, \Lambda \to 1\}$. Honesty ($\sigma \to 0$) is the third element of the quartet triggering recursion. Without it recursion does not start ($B = 0$). But *alone* honesty is insufficient to start—all four are needed.

1.11.4 10.4. Limitations

(a) Formula (IV.4) is postulated but not derived; the exact functional dependence $S_{\text{phan}} - S_{\text{true}} = f(\{\sigma_i\})$ requires specification.

(b) Stress operator $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ is introduced phenomenologically; formal definition through dynamics (4.4) [1] constitutes an open problem.

(c) Historical examples (VIII.3) are qualitative illustrations, not quantitative verifications.

1.12 XI. CONCLUSION

Honesty does not require a separate parameter in ODTOE—it is *already built in* through three mechanisms:

Dimension	ODTOE Parameter	Formula
Internal honesty (H-1)	$1 - \sigma$	$B = F^{w_1} \cdot E^{w_2} \cdot (1-\sigma)^{w_3} \cdot \Lambda^{w_4}$
Inter-observer (H-2)	S_{true} vs S_{phan}	$T_{\text{fact}} = T_0/(1 - S_{\text{true}})^n$
Temporal (H-3)	Λ	$dB/dt \propto \bar{d} \cdot B(1-B)$

Honesty is a *natural component* of love, not a separate entity:

$$\text{Love } (B \to 1) \implies \sigma \to 0 \iff \text{Honesty}$$

$$\text{Honesty } (\sigma \to 0) \not\Longrightarrow B \to 1 \iff \text{Love}$$

Dishonesty is the mechanism of *accelerated destruction*: phantom coherence ($S_{\text{phan}} > S_{\text{true}}$) masks fragility, but lifetime is determined by S_{true}, and collapse is inevitable. The commandment "do not lie" is not a moral prescription but an *operator condition* for stability of the fixed point.

1.13 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 applied as assistants at all stages of work: formalization, formula verification, text audit, document generation and compilation. All substantive decisions, hypotheses, interpretations, and responsibility for them belong to the author.

1.14 REFERENCES

1. Pankratov A.S. Theory of Everything: Observer-Dependent (ODTOE) // Preprint. — 2025. — 47 p.

2. Greenwald A.G., McGhee D.E., Schwartz J.L.K. Measuring Individual Differences in Implicit Cognition: The Implicit Association Test // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. — 1998. — Vol. 74, No. 6. — P. 1464–1480. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464.

3. Pankratov A.S. Love as Coherence Operator: Recursive Formula of Eternal Being // Preprint. — 2025.

4. Jaynes E.T. Probability Theory: The Logic of Science. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. — 727 p.

5. Pankratov A.S. The Number π as Structural Invariant of Self-Consistent Observation in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.

6. Pankratov A.S. Atom as Elementary Strange Loop in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.

7. Pankratov A.S. Cinema of Reality: Information, Memory, and Reproduction in ODTOE // Preprint. — 2025.

8. Hofstadter D.R. I Am a Strange Loop. — New York: Basic Books, 2007. — 412 p.

9. Thayer J.F., Lane R.D. A Model of Neurovisceral Integration in Emotion Regulation and Dysregulation // Journal of Affective Disorders. — 2000. — Vol. 61, No. 3. — P. 201–216. DOI: 10.1016/S0165-0327(00)00338-4.