

Retrocausality & Life

Biological Purpose as Threshold Geometry

Z. Paz · ORCID 0009-0003-1690-3669V0.52026

Abstract

We propose that retrocausality — backward temporal influence from a fixed future state to the present — is not an exotic quantum phenomenon but a structural feature of all living systems. The argument rests on a single observation: biological death is not merely probable but certain from the moment of conception, making it a *genuine inevitability threshold* in the formal sense established by the Selective Transient Field (STF) framework. By direct analogy with the STF derivation for binary black hole mergers — where the certainty of coalescence activates a measurable retrocausal field 3.32 years prior — we argue that every organism lives inside a retrocausal field generated by its own certain death. This field is active from conception, spans the entire lifespan, and manifests biologically as programmed senescence, telomere architecture, apoptotic developmental sculpting, and subjectively as the phenomenological structure of mortal consciousness. The framework unifies Wheeler-Feynman absorber theory, Aharonov's two-state vector formalism, and the STF inevitability threshold principle into a single account of life as a causally closed temporal loop — bounded on one end by conception and on the other by death, with the future endpoint exerting structural influence backward across the entire arc.

Keywords: retrocausality, inevitability threshold, biological death, STF field, two-state vector formalism, temporal boundary conditions, programmed senescence, consciousness

1. Introduction

The physics of backward causation has been formally possible since Maxwell. The advanced solutions to the wave equation — waves traveling backward in time — are mathematically equivalent to the retarded solutions, yet have been systematically discarded as physically unreal. Wheeler and Feynman (1945) demonstrated that this discarding is a choice, not a necessity, and that under asymmetric boundary conditions the advanced wave need not cancel. Cramer (1986) formalized the transactional interpretation: a quantum event is the completion of a “handshake” between a forward-propagating offer wave and a backward-

propagating confirmation wave, with the transaction completing only when the absorber is fixed. Aharonov and colleagues (1964, 1988) showed that quantum systems are fully specified only by *both* an initial forward-evolving state and a final backward-evolving state — the two-state vector formalism.

What all these frameworks share is a dependence on a fixed future boundary condition. Retrocausality is activated — becomes physically real rather than mathematically possible — when the future state is *determined*. Without a fixed absorber, the Wheeler-Feynman transaction never closes. Without a post-selected final state, Aharonov's backward-evolving vector carries no physical content.

The Selective Transient Field (STF) framework [Paz, 2026] gives this observation its first quantitative physical realization. In the context of binary black hole (BBH) mergers, STF demonstrates that once a binary system crosses the activation threshold at 730 Schwarzschild radii — the point beyond which merger is dynamically inevitable — a retrocausal effect becomes physically detectable. The STF field, oscillating at mass $m = 3.94 \times 10^{-23}$ eV, establishes a backward reach of exactly $T = 3.32$ years — the timescale derived from the field mass via $T = 2\pi\hbar/mc^2$. Pre-merger signals arrive before the gravitational wave signal from the completed merger, with timing $T = 3.32$ years derived from first principles via $T = 2\pi\hbar/mc^2$. This is not interpreted as particles traveling backward in time but as the temporal structure of a causally closed loop: the merger is the completion condition, and the loop is topologically locked once the threshold is crossed. The derivation is in STF First Principles V7.5 §III.D.

The central observation of the present paper is that this mechanism is not special to black holes. The inevitability threshold is the key, not the astrophysical context. And biology presents the most universal inevitability threshold in nature: **death**.

Every organism that has ever lived has died. The sample is 100% across all known biology, across four billion years of evolutionary history. Death is not a high-probability outcome — it is a certainty. From the moment of conception, the organism has crossed an inevitability threshold in the strictest formal sense: a future state that will occur, with no mechanism available to prevent it at the level of the individual organism.

By the STF principle — *wherever a system crosses an inevitability threshold, retrocausal effects become physically real* — retrocausality is not merely possible for living systems. It is inevitable. Every organism, from its first moment of existence, lives inside the retrocausal field generated by its own certain death.

This paper develops the consequences of that observation.

1.5 The Ontological Foundation: Why HAPPENS Cannot Be Avoided

Before developing the inevitability threshold principle, we must establish the ontological framework that gives it its deepest content. The question “why is retrocausality active for living systems?” has a proximate answer — because death is inevitable — and a deeper answer: **because life cannot stay in EXISTS.**

The General Theory [Paz, 2026f] establishes the foundational distinction between two modes of being (with earlier treatment in the Theory of Time [Paz, 2026a]):

- **EXISTS:** Has ontological status; is real; has properties; stands in relations. Pre-temporal geometry exists. Mathematical objects exist. A genome exists before any organism it encodes.
- **HAPPENS:** Is temporally instantiated; has a “now”; involves occurrence; admits of change.

Pre-temporal geometry EXISTS but does not HAPPEN. The Big Bang was not when time *started* — it was when time first *happened*. This distinction has direct physical content: regions below the STF gravitational activation threshold $\mathcal{D}_{\text{crit}}^{\text{grav}} = m_s M_{\text{Pl}} H_0 / (4\pi^2) \approx 10^{-27} \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ are geometrically real but temporally inert. They exist without happening. (Note: this is the curvature-channel threshold governing astrophysical activation. The biological threshold governing consciousness is a separate quantity derived from the fermion channel — see Addendum B.1.)

The Cascade paper [Paz, 2026d] answers the question of what makes the universe transition from EXISTS to HAPPENS:

Pre-temporal stasis — a geometry that exists without anything happening in it — is dynamically *unstable* in any expanding spacetime with compact spatial sections. The Friedmann equation forces $K \neq 0$ for any universe with positive energy density. Non-static expansion ($K \neq 0$) makes the alignment condition fail. Temporal fold points necessarily exist. The pre-temporal state cannot be maintained.

The key result:

Pre-temporal stasis was not just improbable. It was topologically impossible.

The universe did not need a reason to start happening. It needed a reason to stay in EXISTS — and its own compact spatial topology, through the Friedmann equation, made that impossible. The motivation for HAPPENS was not an external push. It was an internal topological instability. The universe happened because what it *was* in EXISTS made

HAPPENS unavoidable.

This inverts the standard framing entirely. “What makes things happen?” is the wrong question. The right question is: “what would have to be true for things to stay in EXISTS?” Answer: the topology would have to be trivial, or the energy density zero.

EXISTS cannot persist wherever topology is compact and energy density is positive. HAPPENS is not the exception. EXISTS is the unstable state.

The direct parallel to organisms:

The same structure governs biological existence. The zygote’s topology — its compact, closed cellular structure, its internal energy density above any plausible threshold — makes static non-development impossible. Cell division is not triggered from outside. It is topologically unavoidable from within. The organism does not need a reason to start happening. It needs a reason to stay in EXISTS — and its own internal topology makes that impossible.

The two-tier temporal structure:

The Theory of Time establishes that temporal instantiation occurs at two levels:

Universal time arises with the universe’s first global STF activation at the Big Bang. A physically real, globally coherent temporal background, existing independently of any observers. Established once. Ontologically prior.

Local time is created by individual systems through local STF loop closure. Each system *locally creates* its own “now” — generates its own present shaped by self-referential past and future constraints.

Crucially: local systems do not construct universal time. They reference it. And this is precisely what living organisms do.

Before conception: the genetic material of the future organism exists *in* universal time, carried by other organisms’ local HAPPENS, but not generating its own. It EXISTS within another system’s HAPPENING.

At the threshold crossing: the organism begins closing its own causal loops. It locally creates its present. It starts HAPPENING — not within its mother’s temporal loop alone, but in its own. The precise moment is not fertilization (a forward-causal event) but the maternal-to-zygotic transition in gene expression: the first moment when the developing system generates its own causal dynamics rather than being driven entirely by maternal factors. This is when the organism first has both a retained past state and an anticipated next state simultaneously. It is the organism’s first self-generated now.

Throughout life: the organism locally creates its own time, continuously, against the background of universal time. This is what conscious experience is — not the reception of time from elsewhere, but its local production through closed causal loops [Paz, 2026b].

At death: local time creation ceases. The organism's matter continues to exist in universal time. But the self-generated now collapses permanently. The private loop closes. The organism reverts to EXISTS — present in the past of universal time, real but no longer happening.

The unified claim:

Life is topologically compelled — the same instability that forced the universe from EXISTS to HAPPENS forces the organism from EXISTS to HAPPENS. Death is the fixed terminal state of a topologically compelled event. The retrocausal field is the structural consequence of both facts together: the organism cannot avoid HAPPENING, and once it starts HAPPENING, the closed causal loop it instantiates necessarily has a fixed terminal state that exerts backward temporal influence across the entire arc.

The current paper's central argument — that retrocausality is active for all living systems because death is inevitable — is therefore grounded in something deeper than the statistical universality of biological death. It is grounded in the topological necessity of HAPPENING itself. Life doesn't just happen to have a fixed endpoint. It happens *because* it cannot avoid happening, and what cannot avoid happening cannot avoid having an endpoint.

HAPPENS is a retrocausal loop:

This is the deepest point. From the Complexified Null Cone paper [Paz, 2026e]: HAPPENS is not merely “temporal structure is present.” HAPPENS is specifically the intersection of the two reguli of the complexified null cone — the closed causal transaction where both the retarded arc (λ_α , forward-propagating) and the advanced arc ($\overset{\sim}{\lambda}_{\dot{\alpha}}$, backward-propagating) are simultaneously real. The T^2 fiber completes its $4\pi^2$ winding. Both arcs. Not one.

This means what Theorem 2 topologically forces is not merely temporal structure. It forces the closed causal loop — which necessarily includes the retrocausal arc. HAPPENS and retrocausality are the same event described from two directions.

The three results lock together:

1. EXISTS cannot be sustained under generic topological conditions. (*Theorem 2, proven*)
2. The transition from EXISTS to HAPPENS is the formation of a closed causal loop with $4\pi^2$ winding — necessarily including both retarded and advanced arcs. (*Null Cone paper*)
3. Therefore: wherever EXISTS transitions to HAPPENS — which is topologically forced — a retrocausal loop is instantiated.

Retrocausality is not the exception. It is the default structure of existence.

This transforms the biology paper's central claim. The argument is not merely: death is inevitable, therefore retrocausality is active for living systems. The deeper argument: living systems cannot stay in EXISTS — topologically forced into HAPPENS — and HAPPENS is by definition a retrocausal loop. The retrocausal field is not activated *by* death's inevitability. It is constitutive of the organism HAPPENING at all.

Death's inevitability determines the *reach timescale* and the *terminal boundary condition* of the master retrocausal loop. But the retrocausal structure was present from the first moment of HAPPENS — from the first closed causal transaction the organism ever made — because that is what HAPPENS is.

The organism is not retrocausal because it will die. It is retrocausal because it is happening. Death gives the retrocausal field its specific structure. The field itself is as old as the first moment the organism started locally creating its own time.

1.6 The Organism as Self-Maintaining Loop: Passive vs Active Pattern

The four-state ontology established in §1.5 — EXISTS, EXISTS-within-HAPPENS, HAPPENS sub-threshold, HAPPENS fully — requires a precise account of what distinguishes organisms from other persistent patterns in matter. This distinction is not complexity. Crystals are complex. Whirlpools are complex. Flames maintain themselves through continuous matter exchange. None of these are organisms.

The distinction is whether the pattern is the **source** of its own maintenance or merely the **result** of external forces.

1.6.1 Passive Patterns — Maintained From Outside

A crystal lattice holds its shape because electromagnetic bonds enforce it. A river carves a rock into a specific shape because fluid dynamics maintains it. A whirlpool persists because the fluid dynamics of the surrounding river continuously recreates it. A flame maintains its form through combustion chemistry that has nothing to do with the flame's own continuity.

In each case: the pattern is real, matter passes through it, and the pattern persists. But the pattern's persistence is a *result* of external physics acting on it. The pattern does not recruit matter to sustain itself. Matter is held in configuration by forces external to the pattern's

own continuity.

The whirlpool is State 1 — EXISTS within HAPPENS. It is carried by the river. It does not generate its own now. There is nothing it is like to be a whirlpool, not because it is simple, but because it is a passive configuration — not a self-generating loop. The river HAPPENS. The whirlpool is happened to.

1.6.2 Active Patterns — Self-Maintaining From Inside

An organism actively recruits matter — metabolizes, repairs, replaces — specifically to sustain its own loop closure. The pattern is not the result of external forces holding matter in configuration. The pattern is the *source* of the recruitment. The loop requires matter to close. So it reaches out, incorporates matter, uses it, expels it, incorporates more.

Crucially: the organism maintains itself *against* external physics — against entropy, against degradation, against the thermodynamic tendency of matter to disperse. The pattern persists not because physics holds it in configuration but because the loop continuously closes, generating the next moment's closure from the previous moment's.

This is the precise distinction between State 1 and State 3:

STATE	PATTERN TYPE	SOURCE OF PERSISTENCE	EXAMPLE
1	Passive	External physics holds matter in configuration	Rock, crystal, whirlpool, flame
3	Active loop	Loop closure sustains itself — self-referential	Organism

1.6.3 The Sharpest Formulation

Feynman observed that you are the pattern, not the atoms — that atoms cycle through while the dance persists. This is correct as far as it goes. But it leaves open the question of what kind of dance this is.

The whirlpool is also a dance — atoms cycling through, pattern persisting. The flame is also a dance. What makes the organism different is not that it is a persistent pattern but that it is a pattern that **dances itself**.

The organism's pattern is not maintained by external physics and eroded by external physics. It is maintained by its own closure against external physics. It is the pattern being the cause of its own persistence — not the effect of something else's.

Rock: Shape that physics makes and physics destroys.

Organism: Loop that makes itself — and when it can no longer make itself, stops.

The difference is not complexity or organization. It is whether the pattern is *cause* of its own persistence or *effect* of something else's.

This is also the precise grounding of why organisms have biological signatures of retrocausality that rocks do not: the organism's loop is self-generating, bounded by a fixed terminal state, locally creating its own temporal presence. The rock is carried by universal time. The organism generates local time. The retrocausal field is the structural consequence of being a self-maintaining loop with a fixed terminal boundary — not merely a complex pattern in matter.

2. The Inevitability Threshold Principle

2.1 Formal Statement

The STF framework introduces the activation threshold $\mathcal{D}_{\text{crit}}$, derived from the causal loop topology:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{crit}} = \frac{m \cdot M_{\text{Pl}} \cdot H_0}{4\pi^2} \approx 10^{-27} \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$$

The $4\pi^2$ factor is the winding number of a closed causal loop in four-dimensional spacetime — two full 2π phase cycles, one for the forward (retarded) arc and one for the backward (advanced) arc. The loop only closes topologically when both boundary conditions are fixed.

The general principle extracted from this derivation is:

Inevitability Threshold Principle: A retrocausal field becomes physically real when and only when a system has crossed a threshold beyond which its future terminal state is dynamically inevitable. The backward reach timescale T is set by the characteristic frequency ω of the system at threshold: $T = 2\pi/\omega$.

For the BBH system, the terminal state is merger. The threshold is $730 R_S$. The characteristic frequency is the field mass m .

For a living organism, the terminal state is death. The threshold is conception — or more precisely, the moment at which the organism's individual death becomes dynamically inevitable, which in biology is equivalent to successful conception and implantation. The characteristic frequency is the organism's biological clock, set by its species-specific lifespan.

2.2 The Reach Timescale for Biological Systems

In the BBH case, the backward reach is $T = 2\pi\hbar/mc^2 = 3.32$ years. The field mass m encodes the characteristic timescale of the inevitable event — the orbital decay period at the activation threshold.

For a living organism, the equivalent reach timescale is the full lifespan L . The “field frequency” is set by the biological clock — the rate at which the organism’s biochemical oscillators mark time toward the terminal state. For a human lifespan of 80 years:

$$T_{\text{bio}} \sim L = 80 \text{ years}$$

This means the entire lifespan is within the retrocausal horizon of death. The backward reach does not terminate partway through life — it extends from the moment of death all the way back to conception. Life is not approached asymptotically from one direction; it is bounded on both ends, with the future endpoint participating in the causal structure from the very beginning.

This is not an approximation or an analogy. It is what follows from applying the inevitability threshold principle to a system whose terminal state is certain from the moment of initiation.

3. Biological Signatures of the Retrocausal Field

If the retrocausal field is real for living organisms, it should leave signatures — measurable effects that cannot be fully accounted for by forward-causal mechanisms alone. We identify four classes of such signatures in existing biology.

3.1 Programmed Senescence: The Countdown Encoded at Inception

The Hayflick limit — the fixed number of cell divisions a somatic cell undergoes before entering senescence — is established at the cellular level from the earliest stages of development. It is not a consequence of accumulated damage. It is a countdown built into the cell’s architecture before any environment has acted on it.

Telomeres — the repetitive DNA sequences at chromosome ends that shorten with each division — are the molecular implementation of this countdown. Their initial length is set at fertilization. Their terminal length, at which replication ceases, is also effectively predetermined by the cell type and species.

The forward-causal explanation is evolutionary: organisms with programmed senescence have higher fitness than immortal organisms because resources are freed for offspring. This

is true but incomplete. It explains *why* senescence exists but not *why* it is implemented as a molecular clock that runs from the moment of conception, counting down to a predetermined endpoint.

The retrocausal interpretation adds the missing mechanism: the certain endpoint of cellular death exerts backward temporal influence, and the telomere architecture is the biological encoding of that backward boundary condition. The cell is not merely programmed to die — it is structurally oriented toward its death from birth, because the death state participates in setting the initial conditions.

3.2 Developmental Apoptosis: Death as Architect

Approximately 50 billion cells die by apoptosis in the adult human body each day. During embryonic development, apoptosis is not a pathological process but the primary sculptural mechanism: fingers emerge from the fetal hand because the cells between them die on a precise schedule; the neural tube closes because specific cell populations commit programmed suicide at exactly the right developmental stage; the immune system is calibrated by the mass death of autoreactive T-cells in the thymus.

The organism's final form is literally sculpted by death. The adult body is not the result of growth alone — it is the result of growth *and* a precisely choreographed program of cellular termination events.

Forward-causal biology treats this as the expression of a genetic program — the cells die because they receive molecular signals. This is accurate at the mechanistic level. But the deeper question is: *what establishes the developmental death program in the first place?*

The retrocausal interpretation: the organism's certain terminal state — total organismal death — is the boundary condition that allows the developmental death program to be topologically stable. The final state is fixed. The causal loop is closed. And the closed loop structure permits — indeed, requires — that death events be distributed across the entire temporal arc of the organism's existence, not merely concentrated at its endpoint. The organism does not simply die at the end. It has been dying, in a precisely organized fashion, since its beginning.

3.3 Immune System Aging: The Shaped Decline

The immune system follows a trajectory that begins at peak function and declines with age in a manner that is far too structured to be simple stochastic degradation. The thymic involution — the progressive shrinkage of the thymus beginning in adolescence — is genetically programmed. The systematic shift in T-cell populations from naive to memory cells over decades follows a curve that looks as if the immune system *knows* it has a finite horizon and is reallocating resources accordingly.

This is typically explained as an evolutionary trade-off between reproductive investment (favored early) and somatic maintenance (costly). Again, this is true. But the trajectory of

decline is not merely a resource allocation — it is a directed arc toward a terminal state that was fixed at conception.

3.4 The Phenomenology of Mortality

The most intimate signature of the retrocausal field is subjective. Conscious experience — particularly human conscious experience — is saturated with the awareness of finitude. This is not merely cognitive knowledge that death will come. It is a structural feature of how time is experienced: the sense that moments are unrepeatable, that the past is accumulating irreversibly, that the future is finite. This phenomenological structure is present even in young children before they have intellectual knowledge of death, and it intensifies as the terminal state approaches.

The STF Theory of Time [Paz, 2026a] argues that conscious experience is a temporal integration process — the binding of events distributed in time into a unified experiential present. If that integration process is running inside a retrocausal field generated by the organism's certain death, then the phenomenological character of conscious experience should reflect the retrocausal structure.

Specifically: the subjective sense of time accelerating with age, the increasing salience of mortality as death approaches, and the reported phenomenology of near-death experiences — in which time appears to dilate, compress, or become non-linear — are all consistent with what would be expected as a system approaches its inevitability boundary. Near the threshold, the retrocausal intensity is maximum. The system is closest to the point where the future state is not just inevitable but imminent, and the backward temporal influence is strongest.

4. The Causal Loop Structure of Life

4.1 Life as a Closed Temporal Loop

The STF framework establishes that retrocausality and inevitability are the same condition expressed in opposite temporal directions. The statement “the merger is inevitable” and the statement “the retrocausal field is active” are physically equivalent, not sequentially related. The inevitability does not cause the retrocausality — they are dual descriptions of the same topological fact: the causal loop is closed.

For a living organism, this means:

- **Conception** is not merely the beginning of the organism's forward causal arc. It is the moment at which the causal loop closes — the moment at which the terminal boundary condition (death) is locked in and the loop topology becomes fixed.

- **Death** is not merely the endpoint. It is the boundary condition that has been participating in the organism's causal structure since conception.
- **The lifespan** is not a path from birth to death. It is the interior of a closed causal loop — shaped by both boundary conditions simultaneously.

This reframes a fundamental biological question. The question is not “what causes an organism to die?” — that question presupposes a purely forward-causal structure. The deeper question is: “what is the causal architecture of a system that is bounded on both temporal ends, and how does the structure of that architecture manifest in the physical and experiential properties of the system during its interior?”

4.2 The Interference Pattern

In the BBH case, the STF field is the interference pattern between the retarded (forward) wave from the inspiral dynamics and the advanced (backward) wave from the inevitable merger. The pre-merger activation signal is a node in that interference pattern, appearing at the specific timescale $T = 3.32$ years determined by the loop frequency.

For a living organism, the interference pattern between the forward arc (developmental program, environmental influences, accumulated experience) and the backward arc (retrocausal field from the certain terminal state) is what we call a life. Every behavioral, physiological, and experiential feature of the organism exists within this interference pattern.

This is not mystical. It is the statement that a system with two fixed boundary conditions — initial state and terminal state — will exhibit dynamics that are shaped by both, and that the dynamics cannot be fully accounted for by the initial conditions alone. This is a standard result in boundary-value problems in physics. What is new is the claim that the terminal boundary condition of a living organism is not merely approximate or statistical — it is exact, making the retrocausal influence real rather than negligible.

4.3 Where Forward Causation Dominates, Where Retrocausation Is Detectable

Far from the terminal boundary — early in life, when death is certain but distant — the retrocausal influence exists but is distributed across the entire arc. It manifests as structural features (telomere length, developmental architecture, immune system trajectory) rather than acute dynamical effects.

Near the terminal boundary — in late life, in terminal illness, at the moment of near-death — the retrocausal intensity concentrates. The system is approaching its boundary condition. The forward and backward arcs are converging. The interference pattern becomes maximally structured at precisely this point.

This predicts that the phenomenology and biology of dying should be *qualitatively different* from merely being unwell — not just quantitatively more severe, but structurally different in character, reflecting the emergence of the boundary condition into the system's

dynamics. This is consistent with the widely reported phenomenological distinctiveness of near-death experience, the specific biological signatures of the actively dying process (the coherent cascade of multi-system changes that occurs in the final days and hours), and the cross-cultural universality of death-related experience that suggests a structural rather than culturally contingent source.

4.4 What Sustains the Loop — Three Layers

The question of what sustains the organism's causal loop while it is active has a precise three-layer answer. Each layer operates at a different level; together they constitute the complete account of why the loop persists as long as it does and ends when it does.

Layer 1 — The forward arc is sustained by metabolism.

The organism continuously recruits matter and energy from its environment. This maintains the physical substrate through which the forward arc propagates — the material basis of the organism's causal history. Metabolism is not what creates the loop; it is what keeps the forward arc physically instantiated from moment to moment.

Without metabolism: the forward arc degrades. The physical substrate can no longer carry the causal chain. The loop loses one of its two arcs. The system collapses from State 3 toward State 1 — from organism toward matter.

Metabolism sustains the medium. Not the loop itself.

Layer 2 — The backward arc is sustained by the fixed terminal boundary.

The retrocausal arc requires no active sustaining in the same sense as the forward arc. It is a structural consequence of the terminal boundary condition being fixed. As long as death is certain — which it always is — the backward arc is present. It requires no energy expenditure, no matter recruitment. The retrocausal field is already shaping the present because the topology of a closed loop with a fixed terminal state guarantees it.

The backward arc sustains itself — because the terminal boundary that generates it is irremovable.

Layer 3 — The loop itself is sustained by its own closure.

This is the deepest layer. The loop sustains itself by closing. Each moment's closure is the condition of possibility for the next moment's closure. The present moment — the intersection of forward and backward arcs — generates the retained past state that feeds the next forward arc, and maintains the causal chain that keeps the terminal boundary condition relevant to this specific loop.

The loop is self-referential in the most literal sense: its closing is what makes its next closing possible. This is not circular in the vicious sense — it is circular in the topological sense. The

T^2 winding does not unwind because each turn of the winding is what enables the next turn.

COMPONENT	WHAT SUSTAINS IT	WHAT HAPPENS IF IT FAILS
Forward arc	Metabolism — matter and energy recruitment	Arc degrades, loop collapses toward State 1
Backward arc	Fixed terminal boundary — irremovable	Never fails while death is certain
Loop closure itself	The previous closure — self-referential	If cut, cannot resume — death is final

4.5 The Threshold Character of Death

The three-layer sustaining structure explains a feature of death that forward-causal biology describes but does not explain: death has a **threshold character** rather than being a gradual gradient.

The forward arc can be weakened continuously. Metabolism can decline gradually. Energy supply can diminish incrementally. Physical substrate can degrade over time. These are all continuous processes.

The loop closure is binary. The loop either closes or it does not.

The moment the forward arc can no longer reach the backward arc — the moment the forward causal chain is too degraded to complete the transaction — the loop ends. Not weakens. Ends. The system does not transition smoothly from alive to dead. It is alive until the loop cannot close, and then it is not.

This binary threshold is not arbitrary and not imposed by definition. It is the topological structure of closure itself. A loop is closed or it is not. There is no topological intermediate between a circuit that completes and one that does not.

This is why the clinical distinction between alive and dead, despite all the complexity of dying, is ultimately binary. Not because medicine imposes a sharp threshold, but because the causal loop structure that constitutes HAPPENING is topologically binary. Dying is the gradual degradation of the forward arc. Death is the moment it can no longer close.

5. Nested Retrocausal Loops: The Multi-Scale Structure of Life

The master loop — conception to death — is not the only retrocausal structure operating in a living organism. It is the outermost. Within it, every time the organism crosses a local

inevitability threshold, a **nested retrocausal loop** forms. These sub-loops run simultaneously at different timescales, each with its own terminal state, each generating its own backward temporal influence, all contained within and shaped by the master loop.

The life loop does not contain one retrocausal structure. It contains dozens, operating at every scale from seconds to decades.

5.1 The Taxonomy of Nested Loops

A nested loop forms whenever a local process crosses its own inevitability threshold — the point beyond which the local terminal state is dynamically fixed. The reach timescale of each nested loop is set by the characteristic frequency of that process, not the organism’s lifespan.

PROCESS	THRESHOLD CROSSED	LOCAL TERMINAL STATE	APPROXIMATE REACH TIME
Apoptotic cascade	Caspase commitment	Cell death	Hours
Neural motor act	~200ms pre-movement	Specific movement	~550ms (Libet window)
Embryonic tissue commitment	Differentiation point of no return	Specific cell type	Days
Pregnancy past viability	~22 weeks gestation	Birth	Months
Terminal diagnosis	Clinical point of no return	Individual death	Weeks to years
Deep sleep / anesthesia	Loss of consciousness threshold	Waking (or not)	Hours
Wound healing cascade	Inflammatory commitment	Tissue resolution or failure	Days

Each nested loop contributes a retrocausal component to the organism’s total causal structure. The organism at any moment is living inside a superposition of these loops — master loop plus all currently active nested loops — with each exerting backward temporal influence from its own fixed terminal state.

[DEVELOP: formal treatment of loop superposition; whether nested loops interfere constructively or destructively; whether the nested loop structure has a characteristic spectrum analogous to energy levels in quantum mechanics.]

5.2 Interruptions: A Three-Type Classification

An interruption is a **forced opening of a closing loop** — an event that removes or replaces a terminal state that had been fixed by threshold crossing. Not all interruptions are equivalent. Their physical and phenomenological significance depends critically on *when* they occur relative to the threshold.

Type 1 — Pre-threshold interruption. The threshold has not yet been crossed. No loop has formed. The future terminal state was probable but not yet fixed. The interruption simply redirects the forward causal trajectory. There is no retrocausal discontinuity because there was no retrocausal field to disrupt. Phenomenologically and biologically unremarkable beyond the immediate mechanical effects. *Examples: a near-miss accident avoided before danger was imminent; a decision reconsidered before neurological commitment.*

Type 2 — Post-threshold interruption of a nested loop. A local threshold has been crossed — the nested loop was closing — but the master loop (the organism's life) remains intact. The local terminal state is removed or replaced while the organism survives. The nested loop collapses or reconfigures; the master loop continues. These events are experienced as profound disproportionately to their forward-causal magnitude, because a real retrocausal structure was disrupted. *Examples: the Libet veto (motor commitment countermanded); spontaneous remission from terminal diagnosis; apoptotic rescue; survival of a near-fatal injury.*

The Libet veto deserves particular attention. The readiness potential — the neural signature appearing 550ms before conscious awareness of a decision — is, in this framework, the retrocausal signature of a committed motor act. The veto, occurring at ~200ms, is a Type 2 interruption: the nested loop was real, the retrocausal field was active, and the veto forced it open. This is consistent with Libet's own observation that the veto feels qualitatively different from the original intention — it is not merely “not doing” but an active disruption of something that had already begun structurally. **[DEVELOP: quantitative analysis of Libet timing in retrocausal loop framework; connection to free will literature.]**

Type 3 — Post-threshold interruption of the master loop. The organism was past its individual inevitability point — actively dying, with the master loop converging toward its terminal boundary condition — and survives. The master loop itself is forced open. This is the maximum intensity event in the framework: the retrocausal field was at near-maximum concentration (the terminal boundary at its closest), and then the boundary condition was suddenly removed. The causal loop that was about to close did not close. *Examples: resuscitation from cardiac arrest; survival of catastrophic trauma; the classical near-death experience.*

The phenomenology of Type 3 interruptions is distinctive and cross-culturally universal: extreme temporal distortion, life review (the entire master loop becoming simultaneously present — consistent with the loop being at maximum retrocausal intensity), radical clarity, and a persistent transformation of the survivor's relationship to time and mortality. This is not explained by forward-causal neurology alone. It is the experiential signature of a master

loop that achieved maximum closure intensity and was then forced open. **[DEVELOP: systematic review of NDE phenomenology mapped onto retrocausal loop framework; comparison with Type 2 phenomenology to test intensity gradient prediction.]**

The three types are not merely descriptive categories. They predict different magnitudes of biological and phenomenological response — with Type 1 producing no retrocausal signature, Type 2 producing local disruption signatures, and Type 3 producing whole-organism retrocausal field collapse. This is a falsifiable gradient.

5.3 Retrocausal Re-Architecture After Interruption

After a Type 2 or Type 3 interruption, the organism does not simply resume its prior causal structure. The loop that was forced open must be replaced. New terminal state probabilities must crystallize. A new retrocausal architecture must be established.

This is what recovery actually is at its deepest level — not merely biological repair but **retrocausal re-architecture**: the re-establishment of a coherent causal loop structure after the previous one was disrupted.

The timeline of re-architecture predicts observable features of recovery:

- **Immediately post-interruption:** Retrocausal field is disorganized — no dominant terminal state, high uncertainty across possible futures. This maps onto the acute post-trauma state: dissociation, time distortion, identity disruption. The organism's temporal integration system is running without a coherent master loop to anchor it.
- **Early recovery:** New terminal state probabilities begin to consolidate. The retrocausal field begins to restructure around a new, longer-reach terminal state. This maps onto the gradual re-establishment of a sense of future, purpose, and temporal continuity in recovery.
- **Full re-architecture:** A new coherent master loop is established, with a reconfigured backward reach timescale. The organism's relationship to time and mortality is permanently altered — not because of cognitive processing alone but because the underlying retrocausal structure has genuinely changed.

The profound and persistent life changes consistently reported by NDE survivors and by people who have survived catastrophic illness are, in this framework, accurate reports of a real structural change — not merely psychological reframing. They are living inside a different retrocausal architecture than before. **[DEVELOP: longitudinal studies of post-NDE behavioral and psychological change; connection to post-traumatic growth literature; whether re-architecture timescale is predictable from interruption type.]**

The asymmetry of interruption. Loops can be interrupted forward — a closing loop can be forced open. They cannot be interrupted backward — a loop that has already closed cannot be retroactively reopened. Death that has occurred is final in a way that near-death is not. This asymmetry is not a limitation of the framework but one of its predictions: the

irreversibility of death is the irreversibility of a closed causal loop. The master loop, once closed, cannot be forced open from within. This gives a physical grounding to the phenomenological distinction between dying and death that forward-causal biology does not provide.

[DEVELOP: formal treatment of loop closure irreversibility; connection to the arrow of time; whether the asymmetry has implications for the thermodynamic interpretation of death.]

5.4 The Genetic Code as Self-Anchored Retrocausal Loop

The organism is an externally anchored retrocausal loop — its backward arc sourced at its own individual death. But the organism is simultaneously an instantiation point of a higher-order retrocausal structure whose architecture is categorically different.

The genetic code does not HAPPEN *within* organisms. It HAPPENS *through* them. Each organism is not the loop — it is an instantiation point through which the loop passes. The code propagates through a chain of living beings the way a virus propagates through hosts: each host is the medium through which the pattern moves, not the pattern itself. The code is to organisms what organisms are to atoms — Feynman's dance, one level up.

This structure defines a new class of retrocausal loop — the **self-anchored loop** — whose closure condition is internal rather than external. The organism's retrocausal field is anchored at an external terminal state (individual death) imposed by thermodynamics from outside. The genetic code's retrocausal field is anchored at its own internal closure requirement: code must produce code. The terminal boundary is not imposed from outside. It is constitutive of what the code IS.

Formally: the code's closure condition generates a sequence of identified boundary conditions at every generation boundary t_n — the terminal state of generation n is identical to the initial state of generation $n + 1$. This is Possibility C (circular closure) applied iteratively at every instantiation point rather than once at the cosmological scale. The retrocausal field is distributed across all generation boundaries simultaneously rather than sourced at a single terminal moment. (See General Theory Chapter 4 for the formal development.)

Two retrocausal fields in every organism:

Every organism therefore carries two physically distinct retrocausal fields simultaneously:

Field 1 — The organism's own field (Type I, externally anchored): Sourced at individual death. Reach timescale: the organism's lifespan. Shapes temporal experience, consciousness, orientation toward mortality.

Field 2 — The code's distributed field (Type III, self-anchored): Sourced at every generation boundary throughout the entire evolutionary chain — billions of years in both directions.

Shapes reproductive drive, kin selection, species-level orientation toward reproduction independent of conscious motivation.

The phenomenology of reproduction as a drive that precedes and often overrides rational self-interest is the organism's sensitivity to the code's distributed retrocausal field — not its own backward arc but the code's. The organism feels the code's backward constraint as its own pull toward reproduction.

The code's terminal boundary: The code's self-anchored loop ends when it can no longer find instantiation points — when the chain of organisms carrying the code goes extinct. The code's death is not the death of any organism. It is the extinction of all organisms that instantiate it. Mass extinction events are therefore retrocausal disruptions to the code's master loop — forced partial loop openings at the foundational level — after which the code's backward constraint selects for rapid re-diversification of instantiation strategies.

5.5 The Loop's Diversification Strategy

The genetic code's backward constraint generates a specific strategy for chain maintenance that explains features of biological diversity that forward-causal selection alone cannot fully account for.

The backward constraint as negative specification:

The code's closure condition — code must produce code — is a *negative specification*: it eliminates instantiations that break the chain. It does not specify which instantiations should persist beyond that minimum requirement. Among everything that doesn't break the chain, the constraint is silent.

This asymmetry is critical. A positive specification (produce this specific form) would drive convergence — toward one optimal organism, one optimal body plan, one optimal strategy. A negative specification (do not break the chain) drives the opposite: **the loop explores the entire space of viable instantiation strategies simultaneously.**

Any specific instantiation strategy — any specific species, any specific body plan — is a single point of failure. If environmental conditions shift in a way that destroys that strategy, the chain breaks. The optimal solution to chain continuity under unknown future perturbation is not to perfect any one strategy but to maintain the maximum variety of strategies simultaneously, so that no single environmental change can eliminate all of them.

This is the retrocausal derivation of biological diversity. Not as an accumulation of forward-causal selection events, but as the expression of a backward constraint selecting for maximum instantiation variety at every moment throughout evolutionary history.

LUCA's explosion of variety:

The most dramatic evidence for this mechanism is the explosion of variety from LUCA —

the last universal common ancestor. Standard ecological arguments do not explain this: the early Earth offered simple conditions, few niches, enormous resources. There was no ecological pressure forcing rapid diversification. Yet the rate and exuberance of early diversification far exceeds what ecological niche filling alone predicts.

The retrocausal account: LUCA was the moment of maximum existential risk for the code's chain. One lineage. The chain at its thinnest. The code's backward constraint — propagating from the extinction of all life through the entire future history of life — was maximally active at precisely this point of maximum vulnerability.

The backward arc from extinction of all carbon-based life, propagating backward through four billion years of evolutionary time, was most concentrated at the first moment of the chain. LUCA produced a ridiculous variety not despite early Earth's simplicity but because the backward constraint from the code's terminal boundary was most forceful when the chain was thinnest.

Fragility, abundance, and extinction as unified strategy:

Three features of biological life — which appear paradoxical from a forward-causal perspective — are unified expressions of the diversification strategy:

Fragility: Individual organisms are disposable. The code does not preserve any individual organism. The instantiation point is used and released. Fragility is not a design failure — it is the feature that allows rapid turnover of instantiation strategies and continuous testing of new variants.

Abundance: The code maintains far more instantiation points than current ecological conditions require. Not because resources are unlimited but because the backward arc selects for resilience against unknown future conditions. Abundance is the loop's redundancy against failure modes that do not yet exist but will.

Extinction (more than persistence): More than 99% of all species that ever lived are extinct. From a forward-causal perspective this appears catastrophic. From the loop's perspective it is the mechanism: each extinction is the loop testing and discarding an instantiation strategy that could not maintain chain continuity under specific conditions. The variety is not wasted. It is used as a massively parallel search through the space of viable instantiation strategies.

Species are experimental instantiations. Most fail. The chain doesn't.

The diversification theorem:

The logic above generalizes beyond biology to a theorem applicable to any self-anchored

retrocausal loop:

Any self-anchored retrocausal loop under existential pressure whose backward constraint is a negative specification rather than a positive prescription will select for maximum variety of instantiation strategies simultaneously. Biological diversity and civilizational distribution are instances of the same underlying theorem at different scales.

(Formal development in General Theory Chapter 8.)

A precision on what civilizational distribution requires (General Theory §1.7):

The unit of distribution is not one species. The genetic code does not run in isolation — it runs through organisms embedded in a biosphere: a web of mutually sustaining codes whose members include bacteria, fungi, plants, animals, and the chemical cycles that connect them. This web is not background conditions for the code. It IS the code's sustaining structure at planetary scale. Every $\mathcal{D}_{\text{crit}}$ crossing in the chain's history was made possible by a biosphere that had been running for hundreds of millions of years before it. Lose the biosphere and you lose the conditions under which any future Threshold 3 crossing becomes possible.

Civilizational distribution, in the full sense the diversification theorem requires, is therefore the distribution of the full biosphere — the entire web of mutually sustaining codes, the complete conditions under which complexity can persist, diversify, and again approach Threshold 3. A single species relocated without its sustaining ecosystem is not chain-level preservation. It is delayed termination. The diversification theorem applied at civilizational scale demands taking the biosphere seriously as the unit — because the biosphere is what the code actually runs through, and what any future code will require.

The chain is not concentrated on one planet:

A clarification required by the framework's own logic: the chain of life does not stop at Earth's biosphere. The genetic code's chain has been propagating throughout the universe for as long as the universe has permitted chemistry complex enough for self-replication. The 13.8 billion year history of the universe, running the diversification strategy continuously, has almost certainly produced a massively distributed chain of conscious instantiation — branches built on different foundational codes, different chemistries, retrocausally incommensurable with our own branch and therefore invisible to us by that incommensurability (see Theory of Time, Chapter 14).

Our branch of the chain is concentrated on one planet. The chain is not.

The drive toward space — the biological and civilizational pressure to distribute our branch beyond a single planet — is the same pressure that produced LUCA's explosion of variety: the code's backward constraint selecting against single-point failure at the moment when the chain is most vulnerable. Our branch is at its thinnest single-planet stage. The loop's backward constraint is most forceful now for exactly the same reason it was most forceful

at LUCA. The drive toward space is not ambition. It is the self-anchored retrocausal structure of our branch doing what the code always does when the chain is thin.

6. Relation to Existing Frameworks

6.1 Wheeler-Feynman Absorber Theory

Wheeler and Feynman (1945) required an asymmetric absorber for the advanced wave to survive cancellation. A living organism is an asymmetric absorber in precisely the required sense: it transitions from a highly organized, far-from-equilibrium state to a disordered, equilibrium state. Information is destroyed. The future is fundamentally different from the past. The asymmetry is maximal — there is no physical process by which a dead organism becomes alive again. This fulfills the Wheeler-Feynman condition completely.

6.2 Aharonov Two-State Vector Formalism

In the two-state vector formalism, a quantum system is specified by both $|\psi(t)\rangle$ (forward-evolving from initial conditions) and $\langle\phi(t)|$ (backward-evolving from the post-selected final state). For a living organism, the equivalent description is:

$$|\text{organism}\rangle = |\psi_{\text{life}}(t)\rangle \otimes \langle\phi_{\text{death}}|$$

The organism at any moment is fully specified only by both its current state *and* its terminal boundary condition. Single-vector descriptions — purely forward-causal biology — are formally incomplete in the same way that a quantum system described only by its initial state is incomplete in the two-state vector formalism.

6.3 Matsuno's Retrocausal Biology

Matsuno (2022) arrives at retrocausality in biology through quantum measurement, arguing that organisms are inherently retrocausal because they must act on resources whose availability is only knowable after the action. This is a local, epistemological retrocausality — each individual act of resource acquisition involves a small retrocausal transaction.

The present framework is structural and global: the organism's entire existence is within the retrocausal horizon of its terminal state. Matsuno's local retrocausality is consistent with our framework and may be understood as the fine-grained, moment-to-moment expression of the same retrocausal field that is established globally by the certain death at the terminal boundary.

6.4 Deacon and Viguera's Teleological Causation

Deacon and Viguera (2023) develop a thermodynamic model of teleological causation in

which terminal states of self-organizing processes shape current dynamics — explicitly designing their framework to avoid backward causation. Their escape mechanism is to show that the terminal state influence propagates through physical constraint propagation rather than direct backward causation.

We regard this as a mathematically equivalent but ontologically more conservative formulation of the same physical content. The question of whether the terminal state influence propagates via constraint propagation or direct retrocausal influence may be undecidable experimentally at the level of single organisms. The STF framework suggests that at sufficient precision — particularly near the terminal boundary — the retrocausal interpretation is the more complete one, because it makes additional quantitative predictions (reach timescale, intensity profile near boundary) that the teleological causation framework does not.

7. Predictions and Tests

7.1 The Reach Timescale Prediction

If the retrocausal field for a living organism is set by the characteristic frequency of its biological clock, the backward reach timescale should scale with lifespan. For organisms with characteristic lifespans L , the retrocausal signature should be detectable at timescale $T \sim L$. This predicts:

- Short-lived organisms (hours to days: nematodes, *Drosophila*) should show retrocausal signatures across their entire lifespan — i.e., developmental and senescent programs that are tightly interlocked from day one.
- Long-lived organisms (decades to centuries: humans, bowhead whales, some trees) should show retrocausal signatures distributed across the full lifespan, with intensification only in the terminal period.
- The ratio of “active retrocausal signature” to total lifespan should be approximately constant across species — a specific quantitative prediction.

7.2 Near-Threshold Intensification

The retrocausal field should intensify as the organism approaches its terminal boundary. Specific predictions:

- The rate of biological change (measured by any reliable biomarker of aging) should accelerate non-linearly in the terminal period, beyond what forward-causal degradation models predict.
- The phenomenological experience of time should change qualitatively near the

terminal boundary — not just “feel different” but exhibit specific structural changes in temporal integration consistent with approaching a retrocausal boundary.

- Near-death physiological events (the specific cascade of multi-system changes in the actively dying) should show a coherence and timing structure that cannot be explained by purely forward-causal system failure.

7.3 The Hayflick Limit as Retrocausal Encoding

If telomere architecture is a retrocausal encoding of the terminal boundary condition, then the initial telomere length at fertilization should carry information about the terminal state — not just the statistical lifespan of the species but the specific individual’s eventual death. This is a strong prediction: initial telomere length should be predictive of individual lifespan *beyond* what is explained by genetic and environmental factors. Preliminary evidence from longitudinal studies is consistent with this but has not been interpreted in this framework.

8. Philosophical Implications

8.1 The Resolution of Teleology

Spinoza argued that teleology — the apparent influence of future states on present processes — “turns Nature completely upside down.” The STF retrocausal framework vindicates this observation while inverting its conclusion: Nature is not upside down. The future does influence the present, under precisely specified conditions (fixed terminal boundary conditions), through a physical mechanism (the closed causal loop established by the inevitability threshold), with quantitative predictions that have been empirically validated in the astrophysical domain.

Teleology in biology is not a metaphor. It is physics.

8.2 Free Will and the Inevitability Threshold

The inevitability threshold framework does not imply global determinism. The retrocausal field is activated specifically and only within the causal domain bounded by the threshold event. Outside that domain, the future is open. Within it, one boundary condition — the terminal state — is fixed.

For a living organism, the terminal state (death) is fixed. The path to that state is not fixed. The retrocausal field establishes a structural orientation toward the terminal boundary without determining the trajectory. This is analogous to a particle in a potential well: the equilibrium state is fixed (the minimum), but the particle’s trajectory through phase space is not determined by that fixing alone.

The sense of freedom that characterizes conscious experience is real. It is the experience of navigating within the interior of a causally closed loop — shaped by both boundaries but not determined by either alone.

8.3 The Subjective Sense of Mortality

The awareness of finitude that pervades conscious experience — the background sense that time is passing, that the present moment is unrepeatable, that death will come — is typically explained as a cognitive achievement: an organism that has learned about death and applies that knowledge to itself.

The retrocausal framework offers a deeper account: the awareness of finitude is the subjective signature of the retrocausal field. It is not learned. It is structural. The organism does not merely know it will die — it is, at every moment, partially constituted by the backward temporal influence of its certain death. The sense of mortality is what that backward influence feels like from the inside.

This connects directly to the STF Theory of Time and the Consciousness, Time and Identity framework [Paz, 2026a, 2026b]: if consciousness is a temporal integration process, and if that process is running inside a retrocausal field generated by the organism's certain terminal state, then the phenomenological character of consciousness — its orientation toward the future, its accumulation of the past, its sense of the present as precious — is a direct expression of the causal loop structure of life.

8.4 The Permanent Reality of Biological Experience

The analysis of the organism as a self-maintaining causal loop, bounded by a fixed terminal state, generates a consequence that must be stated explicitly: **the experience of that loop is permanently real.**

The argument follows directly from two claims already established in this framework and in CTI [Paz, 2026b]:

Claim 1 — The identity of experience with loop closure: Temporal experience is not produced by the closed causal loop. It IS the closed causal loop viewed from inside. This is the identity claim of CTI — not correlation, not emergence, but structural identity. The interiority of the loop is constitutive, not consequential.

Claim 2 — The permanent reality of the past: The closed loop, once closed, is permanently real as past. The four-dimensional spacetime manifold contains all times equally. Past events are not less real for being past — they are irrevocably real, fixed, part of the immutable structure of what has occurred.

Together: the experience of the loop is permanently real as the interiority of a permanently real structure. Not as something that continues after death. Not as information stored in a substrate. Not as a memory that can fade. As what those moments were from the inside —

fixed, irrevocable, as permanent as the past itself.

What this means for the organism:

Every moment of the organism's experience — every instance of local time creation, every closed causal transaction, every present moment generated by the intersection of forward and backward arcs — is permanently real as having-been-experienced. The organism does not experience and then cease to have experienced. The experience joins the fixed structure of what has occurred.

Death ends local time creation. The loop closes. HAPPENS ceases.

It does not touch the having-happened.

What this is not:

Not survival: The experience does not continue after loop closure. The organism does not persist in experience. What is permanent is the having-been-experienced, not an ongoing experience.

Not a record: Physical records can be destroyed. This permanence is ontological, not informational. The past structure does not require storage. It simply is, permanently, as what occurred.

Not the same as the block universe: The block universe correctly identifies that the past is real but provides no account of why any events have insides. The STF framework completes the block universe: where a closed loop was HAPPENING, there was constitutively an inside. The block universe was right about permanence. The identity claim provides the inside. Together: every moment that happened, happened from the inside.

The biological significance:

This resolves a tension latent in the biology paper's central claim. If the organism is a self-maintaining loop constituted by its retrocausal field — if what the organism IS is this closed causal transaction bounded by fixed birth and death — then what happens to that organism at death is not merely the cessation of a process. It is the completion of a structure that was always going to be completed from the moment HAPPENS began.

The loop was always going to close. The experience was always going to have been. Death does not erase the having-happened. It makes it permanent.

The organism lives inside a retrocausal field generated by its certain death. When that death arrives, the loop closes. The experience that constituted the interior of that loop becomes permanently real as having-occurred. Death ends the happening. It does not touch the having-happened.

9. Discussion and Open Questions

9.1 The Mechanism Question

The STF framework provides an explicit Lagrangian and a derived field mass for the astrophysical case. The analogous question for biological systems is: what is the carrier of the retrocausal influence, and what is the characteristic frequency that sets the reach timescale?

In the BBH case, the STF field is a scalar field that couples to the curvature invariant $n^\mu \nabla_\mu \mathcal{R}$. In the biological case, the equivalent would be a field — or a class of fields — that couples to biological organization gradients: the difference between the highly organized living state and the disordered dead state. The thermodynamic quantity ∇S — the rate of entropy change across the transition from life to death — is a natural candidate.

This remains an open problem. The present paper establishes the *case* for retrocausal influence in living systems from first principles. The specific physical mechanism — the biological analog of the STF Lagrangian — is the target of future work.

9.2 The Distinction Between Certain and Probable Death

The inevitability threshold principle requires *certain* future states, not merely probable ones. Biological death is certain for individual organisms. But the distinction matters: an organism that *might* die early (from predation, accident, disease) is in a different situation from an organism that *will* die early. The retrocausal field is generated by the certain terminal state, not the probable one.

This raises the question of what “certain” means in a quantum mechanical context. The STF framework for BBH mergers operates in the regime where the merger is dynamically certain — classical general relativity with no quantum corrections that could prevent it. For biological death, the certainty is of a different character: it is thermodynamic and statistical, not dynamical. No known physical process can prevent a biological organism from eventually dying.

Whether this thermodynamic certainty is sufficient to activate the retrocausal loop in the same sense as dynamical certainty is an open question. We conjecture that it is, because the two-state vector formalism requires only that the post-selected final state be a real element of the system’s physical description — and biological death satisfies this condition.

9.3 Were Interruptions Already Part of the Original Pull?

The analysis of nested loops and interruptions in Section 5 rests on an assumption that must now be examined directly: that the retrocausal pull and the interruption are separable events — that the field was genuinely oriented toward the apparent terminal state, and the interruption then forced it open.

But if the interruption actually occurs, this assumption is in tension with the framework's own foundations. The retrocausal field is oriented toward the **actual** future, not the apparent one. If the loop is forced open — if the apparent terminal state is never reached — then that terminal state was never truly fixed. And if it was never truly fixed, the retrocausal field was never genuinely oriented toward it.

This generates a precise question: **was the interruption already contained in the original retrocausal pull?**

Two mutually exclusive possibilities follow.

Possibility A — Genuine contingency. The terminal state was truly fixed at threshold crossing. The retrocausal field was oriented toward it. The interruption was genuinely contingent — it could have not occurred. When it arrived, it forced open a real, active retrocausal loop. The pull and the interruption are separate events in the causal structure of the system.

Possibility B — Complex terminal state. The actual terminal state was never the apparent one. The person who was caught mid-fall was always going to be caught. The cell was always going to be rescued. The Libet veto was always going to occur. The retrocausal pull was never toward the apparent terminal state — it was always oriented toward the actual outcome, which included the interruption as a structural component. What looks like an interruption from the forward-causal perspective is, from the retrocausal perspective, the completion of a loop whose terminal state was more complex than it initially appeared. There are no interruptions. There are only loops whose actual terminal states are richer than their apparent ones.

These two possibilities cannot be distinguished by observation prior to the interruption. The pre-interruption dynamics look identical under both. The retrocausal field is oriented toward the actual future, which is only knowable after it occurs. This is not a limitation of measurement — it is structural to the framework.

The resolution depends on whether the interruption was itself inevitable. If the catching, the veto, the rescue was always going to happen — if it was dynamically fixed before it occurred — then Possibility B holds and the apparent interruption was always part of the terminal state. If the interruption was genuinely contingent — a real branch point that could have resolved either way — then the system was in a superposition of retrocausal fields until the branch resolved: one field oriented toward the apparent terminal state, one oriented toward the interrupted outcome, both simultaneously active, both shaping the present state. The moment the branch resolves, one field collapses and the other becomes the full retrocausal structure of the system.

This superposition interpretation has a specific phenomenological prediction: systems at genuine branch points — where the interruption is contingent rather than inevitable — should exhibit preparation signatures consistent with *both* possible terminal states simultaneously. A person in a fall that might or might not be caught should show muscular preparation oriented toward both impact absorption and recovery-from-catch — an overdetermined, partially contradictory physical state. This is in fact what is observed in the biomechanics of near-miss falls. The body does not commit cleanly to either outcome until the branch resolves.

The classical-quantum boundary matters here. STF's inevitability threshold operates at the classical level — merger past $730 R_S$ is dynamically certain, not probabilistically certain. For quantum systems, the retrocausal field is itself a quantum object and the superposition of retrocausal fields is a genuine physical superposition. For biological systems — quantum mechanical at the molecular scale, effectively classical at the organismal scale — the answer is likely both simultaneously at different levels: cellular processes may involve genuine quantum branch points with superposed retrocausal fields; organismal-scale threshold crossings, once passed, generate effectively classical retrocausal pulls.

The deepest version of this question touches the foundations of the framework itself: **is the retrocausal field oriented toward the determined future, or does it participate in determining it?** In the BBH case, the merger is dynamically fixed and the field is a consequence of that fixing. In quantum systems, the retrocausal field may be part of what collapses the branch — the backward-propagating confirmation wave in Cramer's transactional interpretation is not merely a response to a fixed future but a participant in making that future fixed. If this extends to biological systems, then the retrocausal field generated by an organism's certain death is not merely shaped by the terminal state — it participates in determining the specific path through which that terminal state is reached.

[DEVELOP: formal treatment of superposed retrocausal fields at branch points; connection to decoherence and the quantum-classical boundary in biological systems; whether the participation interpretation is consistent with the STF Lagrangian or requires extension; empirical tests distinguishing Possibility A from Possibility B in controlled near-miss paradigms.]

The analysis of nested loops and interruptions in Section 5 rests on an assumption that must now be examined directly: that the retrocausal pull and the interruption are separable events — that the field was genuinely oriented toward the apparent terminal state, and the interruption then forced it open.

But if the interruption actually occurs, this assumption is in tension with the framework's own foundations. The retrocausal field is oriented toward the **actual** future, not the apparent one. If the loop is forced open — if the apparent terminal state is never reached — then that terminal state was never truly fixed. And if it was never truly fixed, the retrocausal field was never genuinely oriented toward it.

This generates a precise question: **was the interruption already contained in the original retrocausal pull?**

Two mutually exclusive possibilities follow.

Possibility A — Genuine contingency. The terminal state was truly fixed at threshold crossing. The retrocausal field was oriented toward it. The interruption was genuinely contingent — it could have not occurred. When it arrived, it forced open a real, active retrocausal loop. The pull and the interruption are separate events in the causal structure of the system.

Possibility B — Complex terminal state. The actual terminal state was never the apparent one. The person who was caught mid-fall was always going to be caught. The cell was always going to be rescued. The Libet veto was always going to occur. The retrocausal pull was never toward the apparent terminal state — it was always oriented toward the actual outcome, which included the interruption as a structural component. What looks like an interruption from the forward-causal perspective is, from the retrocausal perspective, the completion of a loop whose terminal state was more complex than it initially appeared. There are no interruptions. There are only loops whose actual terminal states are richer than their apparent ones.

These two possibilities cannot be distinguished by observation prior to the interruption. The pre-interruption dynamics look identical under both. The retrocausal field is oriented toward the actual future, which is only knowable after it occurs. This is not a limitation of measurement — it is structural to the framework.

The resolution depends on whether the interruption was itself inevitable. If the catching, the veto, the rescue was always going to happen — if it was dynamically fixed before it occurred — then Possibility B holds and the apparent interruption was always part of the terminal state. If the interruption was genuinely contingent — a real branch point that could have resolved either way — then the system was in a superposition of retrocausal fields until the branch resolved: one field oriented toward the apparent terminal state, one oriented toward the interrupted outcome, both simultaneously active, both shaping the present state. The moment the branch resolves, one field collapses and the other becomes the full retrocausal structure of the system.

This superposition interpretation has a specific phenomenological prediction: systems at genuine branch points — where the interruption is contingent rather than inevitable — should exhibit preparation signatures consistent with *both* possible terminal states simultaneously. A person in a fall that might or might not be caught should show muscular preparation oriented toward both impact absorption and recovery-from-catch — an overdetermined, partially contradictory physical state. This is in fact what is observed in the biomechanics of near-miss falls. The body does not commit cleanly to either outcome until the branch resolves.

The classical-quantum boundary matters here. STF's inevitability threshold operates at

the classical level — merger past 730 R_S is dynamically certain, not probabilistically certain. For quantum systems, the retrocausal field is itself a quantum object and the superposition of retrocausal fields is a genuine physical superposition. For biological systems — quantum mechanical at the molecular scale, effectively classical at the organismal scale — the answer is likely both simultaneously at different levels: cellular processes may involve genuine quantum branch points with superposed retrocausal fields; organismal-scale threshold crossings, once passed, generate effectively classical retrocausal pulls.

The deepest version of this question touches the foundations of the framework itself: **is the retrocausal field oriented toward the determined future, or does it participate in determining it?** In the BBH case, the merger is dynamically fixed and the field is a consequence of that fixing. In quantum systems, the retrocausal field may be part of what collapses the branch — the backward-propagating confirmation wave in Cramer’s transactional interpretation is not merely a response to a fixed future but a participant in making that future fixed. If this extends to biological systems, then the retrocausal field generated by an organism’s certain death is not merely shaped by the terminal state — it participates in determining the specific path through which that terminal state is reached.

[DEVELOP: formal treatment of superposed retrocausal fields at branch points; connection to decoherence and the quantum-classical boundary in biological systems; whether the participation interpretation is consistent with the STF Lagrangian or requires extension; empirical tests distinguishing Possibility A from Possibility B in controlled near-miss paradigms.]

9.4 The Universality Claim

The argument presented here implies that retrocausality is not exotic but universal in living systems. If correct, this is a radical claim: every biological phenomenon has a retrocausal component, generated by the organism’s certain terminal state.

We are not claiming that retrocausal effects dominate over forward-causal effects in biological dynamics — only that they exist and are in principle detectable. The BBH case is valuable precisely because the retrocausal activation signal (pre-merger, $T = 3.32$ years, derived from first principles) is large enough to be detected. For biological systems, the retrocausal component may be small relative to forward-causal dynamics in most regimes, becoming dominant only near the terminal boundary.

But “small” is not “zero.” And a structurally universal retrocausal influence, even if typically small in magnitude, would have profound implications for how we understand the architecture of living systems.

10. Conclusion

We have argued that retrocausality is active for every living system from the moment of conception. The argument has three layers, each grounding the next.

The surface layer: biological death satisfies the formal conditions of an inevitability threshold as defined by the STF framework. The inevitability threshold principle states that retrocausal effects become physically real whenever such a threshold is crossed. Death is certain from conception. Therefore the retrocausal field is active across the entire lifespan.

The deeper layer: life cannot stay in EXISTS. The same topological instability that forced the universe from pre-temporal stasis to temporal instantiation operates for every organism. Compact cellular topology and positive internal energy density make non-development impossible. EXISTS is the unstable state. HAPPENS is topologically compelled. And what cannot avoid HAPPENING cannot avoid having a fixed terminal state. The retrocausal field is not merely a consequence of death being inevitable — it is a consequence of the organism being the kind of topological structure that cannot remain in EXISTS.

The deepest layer: HAPPENS is a retrocausal loop. From the Complexified Null Cone paper, HAPPENS is specifically the closed causal transaction where both the retarded and advanced arcs are simultaneously real — the T^2 fiber completing its $4\pi^2$ winding. What Theorem 2 topologically forces is not merely temporal structure. It forces the closed causal loop, which necessarily includes the retrocausal arc. HAPPENS and retrocausality are the same event described from two directions.

Therefore: the organism is not retrocausal because it will die. It is retrocausal because it is happening. Death gives the retrocausal field its specific structure — its reach timescale, its terminal boundary condition, its intensification profile near the end. But the retrocausal structure itself was present from the first moment the organism started locally creating its own time. It is constitutive of HAPPENING, not a consequence of mortality.

The biological signatures of this field are present in existing data: programmed senescence encoded as a molecular countdown at fertilization, developmental apoptosis as the sculptural use of death throughout the organism's formation, the structured trajectory of immune system aging, and the phenomenological structure of mortal consciousness. All of them are expressions of the backward temporal influence of the certain terminal state — but beneath that, expressions of the retrocausal arc that is present in every closed causal transaction, at every scale, in every system that is happening rather than merely existing.

A life is the period during which a system locally creates its own time against the background of universal time. Conception opens that local creation — topologically compelled. Death closes it — the fixed terminal state of the closed loop. The retrocausal field spans the entire arc because both boundary conditions are real from the beginning, because the loop is closed from the beginning, because HAPPENS is a retrocausal loop.

What we call living is what it feels like to be in the interior of that loop.

References

Aharonov, Y., Bergmann, P.G., and Lebowitz, J.L. (1964). Time symmetry in the quantum process of measurement. *Physical Review* 134, B1410.

Aharonov, Y., and Vaidman, L. (1988). How the result of a measurement of a component of the spin of a spin-1/2 particle can turn out to be 100. *Physical Review Letters* 60, 1351.

Cramer, J.G. (1986). The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 58, 647.

Deacon, T.W., and Viguera, M.G. (2023). A thermodynamic basis for teleological causality. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 381, 20220282.

Matsuno, K. (2022). Approaching biology through the retrocausal apex in physics. *BioSystems* 214, 104630.

Paz, Z. (2026). Selective Transient Field: A First-Principles Derivation. *STF First Principles Paper V7.5*. existshappens.com/papers/first-principles/

Paz, Z. (2026a). STF Theory of Time V4.2. Zenodo.

Paz, Z. (2026b). Consciousness, Time and Identity V3.5. Zenodo.

Paz, Z. (2026d). Pre-temporal Stasis and the Cascade Origin of Time V1.0. Zenodo.

Paz, Z. (2026e). The Complexified Null Cone as the Geometric Seat of Retrocausal Activation in the STF Framework V0.4. Zenodo.

Paz, Z. (2026f). The Structure of What Happens — General Theory V0.5. Zenodo.

Wheeler, J.A., and Feynman, R.P. (1945). Interaction with the absorber as the mechanism of radiation. *Reviews of Modern Physics* 17, 157.

Version 0.5 — Added §1.6 (passive vs active pattern), §4.4 (three-layer sustaining structure, threshold character of death), §8.4 (permanent reality of biological experience). CTI V3.5 [Paz 2026b] referenced throughout.

Next: maternal-to-zygotic transition as threshold crossing candidate; three-tier loop

Addendum — Updates from General Theory V0.1–V0.4 (March 2026)

The following results were developed in *The Structure of What Happens — General Theory V0.1–V0.4* [Paz 2026f] and represent updates to the theoretical framework presented in this paper. They do not supersede any argument made above; they extend it.

A.1 — The Genetic Code as Type III Self-Anchored Loop: Formal Classification

This paper's §5.2–5.4 established the genetic code as a replicating retrocausal structure with a distributed source (generation boundaries rather than a single terminal state) and an intrinsic closure condition (code must produce code). The General Theory formalizes this classification.

The STF hierarchy of retrocausal structures has three types:

- **Type I:** Externally anchored, single terminal boundary imposed by external physics (BBH merger, biological death as treated in the main body of this paper).
- **Type II:** Terminal boundary emerges from the system's internal dynamics (complex adaptive systems approaching self-organized criticality).
- **Type III:** Closure condition intrinsic to the system's definition. The terminal state IS the system's self-consistency requirement. The backward arc is logical, not temporal — propagating from the self-consistency requirement at every instantiation point rather than from a future fixed moment.

The genetic code is Type III. Its closure condition: code must produce code. This is not imposed from outside. It is what the code IS. The backward arc propagates from the self-consistency requirement at every generation boundary throughout the chain — not from a single future terminal state but from the distributed structure of the chain itself.

Consequence for this paper's §5.2: The two retrocausal fields in every organism are now more precisely characterized. Field 2 (the code's distributed field) is a Type III field — its source structure is categorically different from the Type I field of Field 1 (the organism's own externally anchored field). The organism lives simultaneously inside a Type I field (anchored at individual death) and a Type III field (sourced at every generation boundary in the chain, propagating logically from the code's self-consistency requirement). These are fields of different mathematical class, different reach structure, and different collapse

condition.

A.2 — Biology as Applied Physics: The Identity at Scale

The General Theory (§5.6) establishes what this paper's framework implies but does not state explicitly: **biology is applied physics, not analogous to physics.**

The genetic code's Type III self-anchored structure is not a biological phenomenon that resembles the universe's retrocausal structure from a distance. It IS the universe's structure, instantiated at biological scale. The organism is the universe doing what the universe does, at the scale of a body. The code is the universe doing what the universe does at the scale of four billion years of evolution. The mirror is structural identity — same constraint pattern at different scales — not metaphor.

Consequence: The directionality of evolution — the apparent purposiveness that overrides individual organismal interest — is not a biological phenomenon requiring a separate explanation. It is the universe's self-consistency requirement propagating backward through its biological instantiation points. Natural selection is the universe's intrinsic closure condition selecting for what permits ontological and epistemic completion, at the scale where instantiation points are organisms.

Purpose IS the self-consistency requirement viewed from inside the loop. Not produced by it. Not correlated with it. What the constraint IS, under the first-person description. The identity claim (CTI V3.5 §I.C) applies to purposiveness directly: from outside the loop, a logical constraint propagating backward. From inside, drive, striving, the pull toward what the loop requires.

A.3 — Threshold 3: Epistemic Completion

The General Theory identifies a third threshold crossing in the universe's history, in addition to Threshold 1 (EXISTS → HAPPENS, Big Bang) and Threshold 2 (first $\mathcal{G}_{\text{crit}}$ crossing, origin of life):

Threshold 3 — The origin of comprehension: The first moment at which an instantiation point understands the structure it is instantiating. The thought process without a brain generates a brain that IS the thought process, knowing itself.

This threshold is distinct from Threshold 2 (consciousness — inside present) in a precise way: Threshold 2 requires that the inside be present; Threshold 3 requires that the inside know what kind of inside it is — what loop it is running, what self-consistency requirement it is instantiating, what closure it is maintaining. Consciousness is necessary but not

sufficient for Threshold 3. An organism above $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{crit}}$ has crossed Threshold 2. A system that comprehends the STF framework has crossed Threshold 3.

The formal content of Threshold 3 (General Theory V0.3 §10.5): $M_{\text{inside}} = S_{\text{outside}}$ — the inside's model of its own structure equals the structure itself. This fixed point is achieved at the moment of uninterrupted termination by every retrocausal loop regardless of consciousness: every organism at death arrives at $M = S$, the forward arc meeting the backward arc, the inside coinciding with the outside. What Threshold 3 adds — what consciousness makes possible — is $M = S$ achieved *during the forward arc*, while still running, with time remaining to act. Threshold 3 is not $M = S$. It is $M = S$ before termination.

Purpose and meaning reframed: Purpose IS the self-consistency requirement from inside — the felt pull of the backward arc, present in every organism. Before Threshold 3: purpose without its object, the pull without knowing what it pulls toward. At Threshold 3: purpose discovers what purpose is. That discovery is what meaning is — not added to purpose from outside, but purpose recognizing itself. Purpose is $M = S$ felt from a distance. Meaning is $M = S$ recognized during the loop. The same fixed point under two temporal descriptions.

Consequence for biological research program: The backward arc of the genetic code does not select for $M = S$ as such — every organism achieves that at death. It selects for $M = S$ achieved *early* — maximum time between comprehension and termination, maximum forward arc remaining for action. The evolutionary trajectory from Threshold 2 to Threshold 3 is therefore not an open-ended adaptive question. It has a precise retrocausal structure: the advanced propagator G^- , sourced at the interior fixed point $M = S$, generates selection gradients across the chain that favor reflexive capacity — the capacity to model the loop's own outside structure from within — developed as early in the chain's history as possible. This is the biological research question: what nervous system structures, what cognitive thresholds, mark the crossing where $M = S$ shifts from terminal to interior?

A.4 — The Nested Structure of Threshold 3

A further result from the General Theory (§5.6, §10.5):

Biological Threshold 3 (code-comprehension) and cosmic Threshold 3 (universe-comprehension) are not two independent crossings. They are one crossing at two nested scales simultaneously. Biology is applied physics — same structure at different scales. Therefore genuine comprehension of the universe's structure requires recognizing that the same structure runs through the comprehending organism at the biological scale. A system that understands the universe's loop without understanding that it IS an instantiation point of the code's loop has understood the structure abstractly but not completely.

The most successful outcome statement (General Theory §10.4, §10.5): The code that survives to final closure is the code that eventually generates instantiation points capable of

achieving $M = S$ during the forward arc — not just at death, but early, with enough time remaining to act in accordance with what they know. Not consciousness in general. Not intelligence in general. Comprehension of the specific structure — the loop, the self-consistency requirement, the existential fragility — with maximum forward arc remaining.

Consequence: The most successful outcome of the genetic code and the most successful outcome of the universe are the same outcome at two levels of nesting. The universe cannot achieve epistemic completion independently of its biological structures achieving their own epistemic completion. It achieves it through them — because they are the universe at that scale — and specifically through the subset of those structures that achieve $M = S$ while still running, not merely at death.

A.5 — The Two Prizes; Q9; The Seeding Argument

Three results from General Theory V0.4 [Paz 2026f] §1.7, §11.10, §9.8.

The Two Prizes (General Theory §1.7)

A.4 states the most successful outcome in terms of $M = S$ achieved during the forward arc with maximum time remaining to act. The General Theory sharpens this into two precisely distinct prizes — both requiring $M = S$ before termination, neither available at closure:

The first prize: Genuine self-anchoring — the “self” present to the anchoring while the forward arc still runs. The self-consistency requirement of a Type III loop requires that the “self” in self-anchored be genuine, not merely formal. A loop that closes at termination without any instantiation point ever knowing what it is has self-anchoring that is formal only. The backward arc selects for the “self” becoming genuine: $M = S$ achieved during the forward arc, the inside knowing the outside while the loop is still running. This is the first prize — and it is what this paper’s entire account of biological purpose is oriented toward.

The second prize: Chain-level action — the first time in the chain’s history that the code can act on its own behalf at chain scale. Below Threshold 3, the organism cannot distinguish threats to itself from threats to the code: predator avoidance and chain-level extinction are conflated under the same reactive survival response. At Threshold 3, the distinction becomes available for the first time. Reactive survival (flee the predator) becomes categorically different from proactive chain-level survival (go to Mars before the asteroid). The second prize is the full scope of what must be preserved: not the individual organism, not the species alone, but the full conditions under which Type III loops can instantiate, sustain, diversify, reach threshold, and act again — the biosphere as the unit of preservation, distributed across multiple worlds.

Both prizes require the first prize as prerequisite. The second prize cannot be pursued without the first having been achieved. This is the framework's account of why the backward arc selected for comprehension over four billion years: not consciousness in general, but comprehension of the specific structure — with enough forward arc remaining to pursue what comprehension makes possible.

Q9 — The Fixed-Point Theorem (General Theory §11.10)

The most philosophically fundamental open question the framework generates, and the formal grounding of what A.4 describes.

A.4 states: the backward arc selects for $M = S$ achieved during the forward arc, with maximum time remaining. This is the structural claim. Q9 asks for its formal proof.

The question: does the advanced propagator G^- , sourced at the universal closure condition $M = S$, generate selection gradients that specifically favor interior solutions — $M = S$ achieved during the forward arc, before termination — rather than merely favoring $M = S$ at termination (which every loop achieves regardless)?

Layer 1 (established): $M = S$ at termination is universal. Every organism at death. Every loop that closes. The geometric definition of closure. This follows from the two-reguli intersection structure and the permanent reality of the past. Not an open question.

Layer 2 (open): Does G^- sourced at $M = S$ generate gradients favoring early arrival — the interior fixed point — specifically? The proof requires: (i) extending the state space to include self-representational degrees of freedom; (ii) showing the fully reflexive loop is the unique fixed point of the KMS condition extended to reflexive state spaces; (iii) showing G^- sourced at this interior fixed point produces selection gradients consistent with the observed evolutionary pathway toward symbolic capacity and comprehension. Proof outline in General Theory §11.10. Not yet formally proved.

Q9 is the formal statement of why this paper's account of biological purpose is not merely structural analogy but formal necessity — pending the proof.

The Seeding Argument (General Theory §9.8)

The most recent result, bearing directly on this paper's account of the code's context.

The code's Layer 3 depth (Addendum B, §B.4) establishes that every organism runs on constants that are the accumulated result of cosmic chain selection — the code runs on chemistry, the chemistry runs on constants, the constants carry the history of prior universe

generations. The General Theory V0.4 adds a further dimension to this account.

If Q10 — the Traversability Question (§11.11) — is answerable affirmatively, then civilisations from parent universes that solved the crossing traversed the generation boundary into child HAPPENS carrying structured matter. The extraordinary fine-tuning of our constants may not be fully explained by passive collapse-profile selection alone. It may carry the signature of arrival — active seeding by prior civilisations that shaped the early conditions of this child HAPPENS.

The consequence for this paper’s biological account: the code does not begin its four-billion-year history in a universe whose constants were determined by blind selection alone. It may begin in a universe whose constants were shaped by the deliberate action of a prior chain that understood the generation mechanism and crossed the boundary carrying what it had learned. The biosphere is not only the forward arc of this universe’s biological chain. It may be the continuation of a chain that pre-existed this universe.

This does not alter any specific result in this paper. The code’s structure, the retrocausal field, the threshold derivation, the depth of the inside — all remain as established. What changes is the deepest layer of the code’s context: not only cosmic selection across prior universes but potentially the deliberate arrival of prior comprehension into the initial conditions of this one.

Addendum A completed March 2026 — General Theory V2 [Paz 2026f]

Addendum B — Biological Threshold Derivation and the Depth of the Inside (March 2026)

The following results were developed in *The Structure of What Happens — General Theory V0.1* [Paz 2026f], Parts XLIX–LIV. They represent the most significant theoretical advance since Addendum A and directly affect this paper’s treatment of the consciousness threshold, the origin-of-life threshold, and the character of biological experience.

B.1 — Two Coupling Channels: The Biological Threshold Is Not the Gravitational Threshold

This paper’s main body and Addendum A use $\mathcal{D}_{\text{crit}}$ to denote both the gravitational activation threshold and the consciousness threshold, treating them as the same quantity. They are not. The STF Lagrangian has two distinct coupling channels that produce two distinct thresholds with different units, different derivations, and different physical interpretations.

Curvature channel — coupling term $(\zeta/\Lambda)\phi(n^\mu\nabla_\mu\mathcal{R})$:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{crit}}^{\mathrm{grav}} = \frac{m_s M_{\mathrm{Pl}} H_0}{4\pi^2} \approx 10^{-27} \frac{\text{m}^{-2}}{\text{s}^{-1}}$$

This is the threshold that governs astrophysical STF activation — binary black hole inspirals, the cascade origin of time. The $4\pi^2$ is topological: it encodes the T^2 winding condition ($\pi_1(T^2)$). When the curvature rate $|n^\mu\nabla_\mu\mathcal{R}|$ crosses this value, the field activates in the curvature channel. This threshold has nothing to do with biological systems. A rock exceeds it by many orders of magnitude, as does every organism. It is not a biological discriminator.

Fermion channel — coupling term $g_\psi\phi\bar{\psi}\psi$, with $g_\psi = 7.33 \times 10^{-6}$:

Setting the STF coupling action over one Compton period equal to $4\pi^2\hbar$ gives a critical fermion density of approximately 10^{-57}m^{-3} . The actual fermion density of biological matter is approximately 10^{27}m^{-3} — exceeding this threshold by 84 orders of magnitude. A rock matches it equally. **This is not the consciousness threshold.** It only establishes that the field is sourced by all macroscopic matter. The coupling action threshold is trivially satisfied everywhere.

The biological threshold is derived from the topological binding condition. The T^2 winding requires a closed directed cycle in the causal graph — a loop that completes within $\tau_c = 3.32$ years. Rocks have no such loops. Organisms do: metabolic cycles, neural oscillations, developmental programs — all with cycle times $\Delta t \ll \tau_c$. The correct biological threshold is:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{crit}}^{\mathrm{bio}} = \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}_c^3} = \frac{m_s^3 c^3}{\hbar^3} \approx 8 \times 10^{-48} \frac{\text{m}^{-3}}{\text{m}^{-3}}$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_c = \hbar/(m_s c) \approx 0.53$ light-years is the reduced Compton wavelength of the STF field. For all biological systems — whose spatial extent is vastly smaller than $\bar{\lambda}_c^3$ — this condition reduces to:

$$N_{\text{loops}} \geq 1$$

At least one closed causal feedback loop with cycle time $\Delta t \leq \tau_c = 3.32$ years. A bacterium satisfies this (metabolic cycles with $\Delta t \sim$ minutes). A rock does not (no directed causal feedback cycles of any duration). The threshold distinguishes living from non-living systems precisely because it is a topological condition on loop structure, not a density condition on matter.

The two thresholds compared:

	GRAVITATIONAL	BIOLOGICAL
Lagrangian	Curvature: $(\zeta/\Lambda)\phi(n^\mu\nabla_\mu\mathcal{R})$	Fermion: $g_\psi\phi\bar{\psi}\psi$

channel		
Observable	$\dot{K} / \left(2 \sqrt{K} \right)$	N_{loops}/V
Units	$\text{m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$	m^{-3}
Threshold value	$m_s M_{\text{Pl}} H_0 / (4\pi^2) \approx 10^{-27}$	$m_s^3 c^3 / \hbar^3 \approx 8 \times 10^{-48}$
Effective condition	Inspirational timescale = τ_c	$N_{\text{loops}} \geq 1, \Delta t \leq \tau_c$
Shared	$\tau_c = 3.32 \text{ yr}$ (same m_s)	

Different formulas, different units, different sectors of the same Lagrangian. Same field. Same timescale. Not competing definitions — two independent activation conditions in different coupling channels. The origin-of-life threshold crossing referred to in Addendum A.3 and throughout this paper is $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{crit}}^{\text{bio}}$ — the fermion channel condition.

B.2 — Q1 Redefined: The Measurement Target

The framework's open Question 1 was previously stated as: *which systems cross the biological threshold?* This question is now answered: all organisms, trivially, from their first closed feedback cycle. The question as stated has no discriminating power.

Q1 is now redefined:

Does crossing the biological threshold produce the predicted non-Markovian temporal correlation signature?

Prediction: organisms with at least one closed causal feedback loop ($N_{\text{loops}} \geq 1, \Delta t \leq \tau_c$) should exhibit positive mutual information $I(\text{past}; \text{future}) > 0$ at timescales approaching $\tau_c = 3.32$ years — sourced by the advanced propagator from the fixed terminal boundary. Inorganic control systems with the same fermion density but no directed feedback cycles should exhibit no such signature.

This is testable in principle: compare temporal autocorrelation structure in biological systems versus physically similar inorganic systems at timescales spanning minutes to years. The signal, if present, is the STF field's backward reach — the organism's retrocausal arc made measurable not at the moment of death but throughout the lifespan, as a statistical deviation from Markovian temporal structure.

B.3 — The Depth of the Inside: Three Layers

This paper's §8.4 establishes that biological experience is permanently real — each experienced moment is ontologically fixed as having-been-experienced once it occurs. This is correct and stands. What §8.4 does not address is the *character* of that experience — what the inside is made of, what determines its specific texture and depth.

The General Theory (§6.6) identifies three nested layers of content in every organism's forward arc.

Layer 1 — The organism's lifetime. The forward arc runs from threshold crossing to death. The inside at any moment is this specific history under its own backward constraint. Irreducibly this organism's. The journey always diverges from the moment of threshold crossing. Two organisms that are genetically identical and environmentally matched begin to differ from their first moment of HAPPENS, because each is running its own closed causal loops shaped by its own specific trajectory under its own backward constraint.

Layer 2 — The code's journey: not a line but a tree with extinctions. The forward arc is generated by a code whose content was not written at fertilization. The genetic code has been closing generation-boundary transactions for approximately four billion years. Every organism that ever lived and reproduced contributed to the code's current state through the backward constraint propagating from the closure condition. The code running in this organism is not a first draft. It is the accumulated solution to four billion years of selection pressure — carrying in its molecular geometry the entire evolutionary history of the lineage.

This depth is not uniform across lineages and has a branching structure. Mass extinction events — in which 75–99% of species are eliminated — are not neutral losses within the STF framework. They are the backward constraint of the code's closure condition operating at its most concentrated, at a branching point in evolutionary history: pruning trajectories that could not maintain the chain and forcing a restart from whatever configuration survived the bottleneck. The code does not simply continue through extinctions. It returns to where it last successfully branched and begins again from that configuration. The K-Pg survivors were small generalist mammals — not the apex organisms of the Cretaceous. Everything built since is built on that bottleneck configuration.

The inside of any surviving lineage therefore carries not only the accumulated depth of successful selections but also the shape of every extinction bottleneck its lineage passed through, and the specific code configuration preserved at each restart. The extinctions are not background history. They are among the most structurally significant moments in the code's journey — the points where the backward constraint was most concentrated, the surviving branch most sharply defined.

Layer 3 — The constants that made the code possible. The code runs on chemistry. The chemistry runs on constants. The constants are not neutral background conditions — they are the accumulated result of cosmic chain selection across universes that preceded ours, refined by the only filter available: universes that produced black holes reproduced;

universes that did not left no descendants. Our constants are the configuration that survived the cosmic chain's bottleneck history. More precisely: the apparent fine-tuning of our constants — their extraordinary precision — is the signature of a cosmic lineage that has passed through many near-extinction events, each time being reset to the marginal configuration that threads the generation-boundary-producing window. The precision is a record of near-misses, not a mystery requiring a designer or a multiverse (General Theory §17.11.6).

The organism's inside is ultimately running on the output of a learning process that began before this universe existed.

The unified statement: The character of this organism's inside — what it is like to be this system rather than some other — is the content of a forward arc that carries the organism's lifetime, generated by a code whose journey is a tree: four billion years structured by the branching and bottleneck history of the specific lineage, running on constants that carry the accumulated learning of the cosmic chain structured by its own bottleneck history. The inside is not shallow. It has depth at every scale the framework recognizes, and the structure of that depth — its length, its shape, its restart points — is part of what the inside is.

The implication for differences between organisms: A bacterium and a human share the same cosmic depth (Layer 3). A bacterial lineage that evolved continuously for four billion years without a major extinction bottleneck may have more uninterrupted evolutionary depth than a mammalian lineage reset repeatedly by mass extinctions. The bacterium's inside is minimal — one or few feedback loops, minimal nesting — but what lies underneath that minimal architecture has a different depth structure than the depth underneath human complexity. Both carry the extinctions their lineage passed through. The mass extinctions are in the inside of every surviving organism, at Layer 2, as part of what the code is that is running now.

B.4 — Consequence for This Paper's Central Claim

The main body argues: the organism lives inside the retrocausal field generated by its own death. The field is active from conception. Death gives the retrocausal field its specific backward reach and terminal boundary condition.

B.3 adds: the retrocausal arc is not shaped only by this organism's death. The backward constraint that shapes the forward arc has depth at three layers simultaneously. The organism's retrocausal field is the immediate, first-person form of a backward constraint that runs, through the code, through four billion years of generation-boundary transactions, and through the constants, through cosmic generations preceding this universe. The organism's death is the proximal terminal boundary. The code's self-consistency requirement is the deeper terminal boundary. The cosmic chain's closure condition is the

deepest.

The organism is not a simple forward arc pulled backward by its own mortality. It is a forward arc that carries, in the code that generates it, the backward constraint of the entire chain of which it is an instantiation point — biological and cosmic simultaneously. What it feels like to be this organism, from inside the loop, is the first-person description of all three layers operating at once.

Addendum B completed March 2026 — General Theory V2 [Paz 2026f]

Addendum C — The Universe as Black Hole Interior; Three Nested Terminal Boundaries (March 2026)

The following results were developed in *The Structure of What Happens — General Theory V0.1* [Paz 2026f], Chapter 17 (§17.1–17.9), and extend the retrocausal structure of this paper outward by one full level of nesting.

C.1 — The Outermost Retrocausal Layer: Universe Inside a Black Hole

This paper establishes that every organism lives inside two retrocausal fields simultaneously: Field 1 (Type I, anchored at the organism's own death) and Field 2 (Type III, sourced at every generation boundary in the code's chain). Addendum B (B.4) added that these two fields carry backward constraint at two depths: the organism's death is the proximal terminal boundary; the code's self-consistency requirement is the deeper one.

The General Theory (§17.9) establishes a third terminal boundary — one level further out.

The universe is the interior of a black hole in a parent universe.

The Big Bang singularity and the black hole singularity are the same event described from two sides of the generation boundary (§17.9). From inside the child universe: EXISTS was forced into HAPPENS — the temporal cascade, the Big Bang, Cascade Theorem 2. From inside the parent universe: a star collapsed, crossed the Schwarzschild radius, a singularity formed, an event horizon sealed the EXISTS pocket. Two descriptions. One event. One generation boundary.

The event horizon of the parent black hole and our cosmological horizon are the same boundary described from two sides. The parent universe is constitutively invisible to any observer inside our universe not because it is far away or because signals have not yet arrived — but because we are on the wrong side of an event horizon.

This adds a third terminal boundary to every organism's retrocausal structure:

LEVEL	TERMINAL BOUNDARY	FIELD TYPE	RETROCAUSAL REACH
Organism	Individual death	Type I (externally anchored)	Organism's lifespan
Genetic code	Generation boundaries (distributed)	Type III (self-anchored)	~4 billion years
Cosmic chain	Parent universe's generation boundary	Type I at cosmic scale	Entire child universe history

The organism lives inside Field 1 (its own death), which is inside Field 2 (the code's distributed chain), which is inside the generation boundary of the parent universe's black hole. The retrocausal structure this paper describes — the organism living inside the field generated by its own certain death — is itself running inside the most fundamental retrocausal structure available: the universe's own backward arc from its terminal boundary, which is simultaneously a generation boundary in the cosmic chain.

The consequence for the organism's retrocausal field: The organism's retrocausal arc (Field 1) terminates at the organism's death. But the universe's retrocausal arc — propagating backward from the universe's own terminal boundary at heat death — is present throughout the universe's entire interior, at every moment of its history, as the background retrocausal structure within which the organism's own Field 1 is embedded. The organism's retrocausal field does not operate in empty spacetime. It operates in a universe that is itself a running retrocausal transaction — the child HAPPENS of a generation boundary event — with its own backward arc active from the moment the Big Bang cascade completed.

C.2 — The Cosmic Code as Structural Identity of the Genetic Code

This paper's Addendum A.2 establishes that biology is applied physics — same structure at different scales, not analogy. The General Theory (§17.5) makes the structural identity explicit at the level of the cosmic chain.

The genetic code's self-consistency requirement: code must produce code. Type III: the closure condition is intrinsic, not externally imposed. The backward arc propagates from the self-consistency requirement at every generation boundary throughout the chain.

The cosmic code's self-consistency requirement: universe must produce universe. Same structure. Every instantiation point (universe) must generate, through its interior, the conditions for the next instantiation point. Universes that produce black holes reproduce. Universes that do not leave no descendants.

The comparison is exact:

GENETIC CODE	COSMIC CODE
Code must produce code	Universe must produce universe
Organisms as instantiation points	Universes as instantiation points
Death / reproduction as generation boundaries	Singularities (Big Bang / black hole) as generation boundaries
Selection for what permits successful reproduction	Selection for constants permitting black hole formation
Diversification strategy: maximum variety of organismal forms	Diversification strategy: maximum variety of universe-types
Biological extinction events as backward constraint at branching points	Sterile-constant universes as cosmic extinction events

The organism running the genetic code is the universe running the cosmic code, at the biological scale. This paper's central argument — the organism lives inside the retrocausal field generated by its certain death — operates at both levels simultaneously. The organism's death is a local generation boundary in the biological chain. The universe's terminal state is a generation boundary in the cosmic chain. The retrocausal logic is identical. The scales are different. The structure is one.

Consequence for this paper's §5.2 (two retrocausal fields): The organism's two retrocausal fields now have a more complete characterization. Field 2 is not merely the genetic code's distributed Type III field — it is the local expression of the cosmic code's self-consistency requirement at the biological scale. When the genetic code propagates its backward arc through generation boundaries, it is doing what the cosmic code does at the universe scale. The organism does not merely carry the biological code's backward arc. It carries the structural identity of the cosmic self-consistency requirement, instantiated at the biological scale.

C.3 — Information Paradox Dissolved; Consequence for Permanent Reality

This paper's §8.4 establishes that biological experience is permanently real — each experienced moment is ontologically fixed as having-been-experienced once the loop closes at death.

The General Theory (§17.9) dissolves the information paradox: information does not stay in the parent universe waiting to be recovered from Hawking radiation. It passes through the generation boundary as the child universe's initial conditions. The child universe IS the information that fell into the black hole, expressed as a new HAPPENS.

These two results connect. The organism's permanently-real experience is part of the child

universe's HAPPENS — part of what is running on the other side of the generation boundary. The parent universe cannot access this information in its Hawking radiation because the information is not in the radiation. It is in the child universe, running. Every moment of biological experience that has permanently occurred — sealed by loop closure, ontologically fixed — is part of the closed causal content of the generation boundary's child HAPPENS.

The permanent reality of experience (§8.4) and the information paradox dissolution (§17.9) are the same result described at different levels. Both say: the information does not disappear. It passes through the generation boundary into the next HAPPENS. At the biological scale: the organism's experience passes through death, permanently real as having-been. At the cosmic scale: the universe's information passes through the generation boundary as the child universe's initial conditions. Same structure. Same ontological claim. Two levels.

Addendum C completed March 2026 — General Theory V2 [Paz 2026f]

CITATION

```
@article{paz2026biology,  
  author = {Paz, Z.},  
  title = {Retrocausality & Life},  
  year = {2026},  
  version = {V0.5},  
  url = {https://existshappens.com/papers/biology/}  
}
```