

From Pleasure to Immortality: Categorical Transcendence of Hedonism as an Ontological Theory of Everything

Andrii Myshko
Kyiv, Ukraine

10.11.2025

Abstract

This work proposes a formalized ontological model for overcoming the fundamental contradiction of hedonism through categorical transcendence. The pursuit of pleasure is treated as an incomplete ontological category C_1 , whose instability generates transcendence functors $F_n : C_n \rightarrow C_{n+1}$ and a sequence of categories $C_1 \rightarrow C_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow C_5$. The central operator CMI (Conflict-Moment-Impulse) formalizes the mechanism of transition between levels, while the bee archetype serves as an empirical-psychological anchor for the triad “labor-meaning-pleasure.” The model integrates elements of motivational neurobiology, dynamical systems theory (attractors), and category theory, proposing testable predictions about the structure of long-term well-being. Key generalization: hedonism is fixation on the generic field (G_{bio}), while eudaimonism is transcendence to the species field (G_{cog}). This work completes a trilogy of neologic formulations and advances a practical algorithm of categorical ascent applicable to therapy and cultural policy. **Keywords:** categorical transcendence, hedonism, eudaimonism, neologic, dynamic invariance, field ontology, generic vs species field, godmanhood, attractor, functor

Contents

1	Notation and Key Symbols	5
2	Introduction: Contradiction as a Call to Form	5
2.1	State of the Art	5
2.2	Method: Categorical Transcendence	6
2.3	Central Onto-Hypothesis	6
2.4	Architecture of Ascent	6
3	Part I. C_1: Naive Hedonism—Generic Field Without Invariant	7
3.1	Formal Structure of the Category	7
3.2	Neurobiological Basis	7

3.3	Dynamical Interpretation	7
3.4	Generic Field G_{bio}	8
3.5	Ontological Crisis	8
3.6	Neologic Thesis	8
4	Part II. C_2: Bee—Bridge Between Generic and Species Fields	9
4.1	Transcendence Functor	9
4.2	Correspondence with Dynamics	10
4.3	Triadic Structure of the Bee	10
4.4	Bee as Bridge Between Fields	10
4.5	Adjunctions of Modes	10
4.6	Invariant Core	11
5	Part III. C_3: Eudaimonia—Species Field as Invariant Orbit	11
5.1	From Hedone to Eudaimonia	11
5.2	Formal Definition of Category	11
5.3	Dynamical Interpretation	12
6	Part IV. C_4: Species Homo Sapiens as Ontological Field	12
6.1	Critical Distinction: Biological Genus vs Species Homo Sapiens	12
6.2	Two Mechanisms of Development	12
6.3	Biological Genus: Automatism Without Individual Immortality	12
6.4	Species Homo Sapiens: Cognitive-Cultural Field	13
6.4.1	Define Two Fields	13
6.5	Field Connection	14
6.6	Individual as Double Excitation	14
6.7	Reformulation of C_4	15
6.8	Paradox of Immortality of Childless Geniuses	15
7	Part V. C_5: Godmanhood—Dissolution of Duality	16
7.1	Ontological Formula of Hermeticism	16
7.2	Return to Source	16
8	Part VI. Neologic Architecture: Formalization of the Path	17
8.1	Categorical Model of Pleasure	17
8.2	Grading	17
8.3	Monoidal Structure	17
8.4	Transcendence Functor	18
8.5	Adjointness with Forgetful Functor	18

9	Part VII. Topology of Pleasures	18
9.1	Topological Space	18
9.2	Classification of Attractors	19
9.3	Strange Attractor of Species	19
10	Part VIII. Freedom as Dimension of Image	19
10.1	Formal Definition	19
10.2	Interpretation	19
10.3	Growth of Freedom with Categorical Level	20
11	Part IX. Practice: Algorithm of Categorical Ascent	20
11.1	Step 1: Detection of Contradiction	20
11.2	Step 2: Category Diagnosis	20
11.3	Step 3: Design of C_{n+1}	20
11.4	Step 4: Transition	21
11.5	Step 5: Stabilization	21
11.6	Iteration	21
12	Part X. Final Formula: CMI as Operator of Eternal Becoming	21
12.1	Integration with Previous Works	21
12.2	Formula of Reality	22
12.3	Decoding CMI	22
12.4	Connection with Hedonism	22
12.5	CMI as Transition Between Fields	23
13	Part XI. Empirical Predictions and Verification Plan	23
13.1	Neurophysiological Level	23
13.2	Behavioral Level	24
13.3	Cultural-Informational Level	24
14	Part XII. Conclusion: Ontological Theory of Everything	25
14.1	Universality of the Model	25
14.2	Core of the Theory	27
14.3	Philosophical Significance	27
14.4	Central Achievement	27
14.5	Practical Value	28
14.6	Limitations and Open Questions	28
15	Epilogue: And Happy Is He Who Understands This	28
15.1	Final Path Formula	29
15.2	Alchemy of Pleasure	29

15.3 Practical Life Formula	29
15.4 Central Formula: Generic vs Species	29
15.5 Final Thesis	30
15.6 Last Word	30

1 Notation and Key Symbols

Symbol	Meaning
C_n	Category at level n ($n = 1 \dots 5$)
$F_n : C_n \rightarrow C_{n+1}$	Transcendence functor
$U : C_{n+1} \rightarrow C_n$	Forgetful functor
$\phi : D \rightarrow P$	Morphism “desire \rightarrow pleasure”
$\gamma(t)$	Trajectory in phase space
$G_{\text{bio}} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$	Generic field (biological structure)
$G_{\text{cog}} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$	Species field (cognitive-cultural structure)
CMI	Conflict-Moment-Impulse (becoming operator)
ρ_i	Homomorphism Individual \rightarrow Species
S_n	Phase space of category C_n
\mathcal{A}_n	Attractor of category C_n

2 Introduction: Contradiction as a Call to Form

2.1 State of the Art

The problem of hedonism in contemporary philosophy and science is not so much about the moral evaluation of the pursuit of pleasure, but about explaining its structural instability. Neurophysiological studies demonstrate the phenomenon of **hedonic adaptation** [4]: any increase in the level of well-being quickly becomes a new baseline, without leading to long-term growth in satisfaction. According to the dominant **reward prediction theory** hypothesis [24], the dopaminergic system is more closely associated with predicting and motivating reward acquisition than with experiencing pleasure from the received reward itself. This explains why maximizing pleasure leads to tolerance and, paradoxically, to a decreased capacity to experience satisfaction. Existing explanations (neuroeconomics, evolutionary psychology, positive psychology) describe adaptation mechanisms but fail to capture the ontological structure of the problem. I argue that this instability points to the **insufficiency of the ontological category** and requires expansion of its categorical structure. Hedonism is not an error, but an incompleteness. Its paradox does not lie in morality or psychology, but in ontology: the pursuit of pleasure as a final goal generates structural instability, since the system “desire \rightarrow pleasure \rightarrow satiation” has no fixed point. This openness does not testify to the viciousness of desire, but to the insufficiency of the category in which it is conceived.

2.2 Method: Categorical Transcendence

Categorical transcendence is not an escape from the problem, but its resolution through expansion of the ontological field. It is based on **neologic**—a logic where contradiction is not eliminated but becomes an impulse for generating a new form. In this essay, we trace the path from naive hedonism to godmanhood as a sequential chain of categorical transcendences, formalizable through the language of categories, dynamical systems, and field ontology. In this work, I formalize such a path of expansion as a sequence of categories $C_1 \dashrightarrow C_5$ and functors F_n , through which the initial contradiction becomes a special case of a broader structure. Operationally, this is expressed through the CMI operator, which induces a phase transition in the corresponding phase space of the individual/practice.

2.3 Central Onto-Hypothesis

Hedonism is fixation on the generic field (G_{bio})—biological mechanisms of pleasure common to all animals. Eudaimonism is transcendence to the species field (G_{cog})—cognitive-cultural mechanisms of flourishing specific to *Homo sapiens*. This formula provides the key to resolving the paradox: pleasure is not denied, but transformed through inclusion in a broader structure of meaning.

2.4 Architecture of Ascent

The path passes through five levels:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C_5 \text{ (Godmanhood)} & G_{\text{cog}}^{\text{creative}} & \\
 \downarrow F_4 & & \\
 C_4 \text{ (Species Identity)} & G_{\text{cog}}^{\text{full}} & \\
 \downarrow F_3 & & \\
 C_3 \text{ (Eudaimonia)} & G_{\text{cog}}^{\text{partial}} & (1) \\
 \downarrow F_2 & & \\
 C_2 \text{ (Bee: Synthesis)} & G_{\text{bio}} \cap G_{\text{cog}} & \\
 \downarrow F_1 & & \\
 C_1 \text{ (Naive Hedonism)} & G_{\text{bio}}^{\text{pure}} &
 \end{array}$$

Each level resolves the contradiction of the previous one not through negation, but through **embedding** into a broader category, where the old contradiction becomes a special case. This process is not linear, but **topological**: each new category does not

replace the previous one, but includes it as a subspace, adding a new dimension of meaning.

3 Part I. C_1 : Naive Hedonism—Generic Field Without Invariant

3.1 Formal Structure of the Category

Naive hedonism is formulated as a morphism:

$$\phi : D \rightarrow P \quad (2)$$

where D is desire and P is pleasure.

Definition 3.1 (Category C_1). • **Objects:** $\{D, P\}$ (*Desire, Pleasure*)

- **Morphisms:** $\phi : D \rightarrow P$ (*obtaining pleasure*)
- **Problem:** *The endomorphism $\phi : P \rightarrow P$ (repeated consumption) has no fixed point:*

$$\nexists x_0 \in P : \phi(x_0) = x_0 \quad (3)$$

3.2 Neurobiological Basis

According to reward prediction theory [24, 3], the dopaminergic system predominantly encodes **reward prediction** and **prediction error** (reward prediction error), rather than the experience of the received reward itself. Consequence: when the desired is easily attainable, the predictive error is minimal, which reduces dopamine release and the subjective value of the stimulus—**tolerance** develops. Formally, this means: pleasure quickly loses motivational power, and the system requires increasingly intense stimuli.

3.3 Dynamical Interpretation

Phase space:

$$S_1 = \{(d, p) \mid d, p \in \mathbb{R}^+\} \quad (4)$$

Dynamical operator:

$$\Phi_1 : S_1 \rightarrow S_1 \quad (5)$$

has no stable attractor. **Trajectories** either **diverge** ($\|x_n\| \rightarrow \infty$ —escalation of stimulus need) or **collapse** ($\|x_n\| \rightarrow 0$ —analgesia, depression). From the perspective of **dynamical systems**, C_1 has no attractor—it is **Lyapunov unstable**.

3.4 Generic Field G_{bio}

Hedonism is fixation on the generic field:

$$G_{\text{bio}} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \quad (6)$$

where G_{bio} describes **biological structure**—genetic programs, instincts, automatic mechanisms of survival and reproduction. **Pleasure in G_{bio}** is a neurobiological signal indicating satisfaction of basic needs: This is a **generic mechanism**: it operates **auto-**

Stimulus	Pleasure	Biological Function
Food	Taste (sweet, fatty)	Energy, survival
Sex	Orgasm	Reproduction
Warmth/comfort	Relaxation	Energy conservation
Social approval	Dopamine	Group integration

matically, without reflection, and is common to all animals (though more complex in humans).

3.5 Ontological Crisis

This is an ontological crisis: pleasure, elevated to an absolute, **destroys the very possibility of pleasure**. **Examples:**

- **Hedonic adaptation:** any new level of well-being quickly becomes the norm
- **Children of wealthy parents:** unlimited access to goods leads to existential vacuum, often ending in self-destruction
- **Law of diminishing marginal utility:** each subsequent “dose” of pleasure brings less satisfaction

But the crisis here is not a failure, but a **signal**: category C_1 is incomplete because it is limited to the generic field G_{bio} .

3.6 Neologic Thesis

Theorem 3.2 (Neologic Principle). *Contradiction $A \wedge \neg A$ indicates not a logical error, but the necessity of transition to category C_2 , where both sides become projections of a unified structure.*

$$A \leftrightarrow \neg A \rightarrow C_2 \quad (7)$$

where:

- A : “Pleasure is the goal of life”
- $\neg A$: “Pleasure as a goal is self-destructive”
- C_2 : new category in which both sides find identity through transition from generic to species field

4 Part II. C_2 : Bee—Bridge Between Generic and Species Fields

4.1 Transcendence Functor

The symbol of the **bee** introduces a transcendent functor:

$$F_1 : C_1 \hookrightarrow C_2 \quad (8)$$

where C_2 is a category with new objects: T (labor), M (meaning), P (pleasure).

Definition 4.1 (Category C_2). • **Objects:** $\{Praxis, Poiesis, Theoria\}$

• **Morphisms:** *Non-empty sets of morphisms:*

- $Praxis \xrightarrow{f} Poiesis$ (labor generates product)
- $Poiesis \xrightarrow{g} Theoria$ (product is comprehended)
- *Compositions* $g \circ f$

Interpretation of morphisms: labor \rightarrow product/creation \rightarrow comprehension/contemplation.

Proposition 4.2 (Inclusion Functor). *Let C_1 contain object D (Desire) and morphism $\phi : D \rightarrow P$. Define F_1 on objects:*

$$F_1(D) = Praxis \quad (9)$$

$$F_1(P) = Poiesis \quad (10)$$

On morphisms:

$$F_1(\phi) = Praxis \xrightarrow{f} Poiesis \quad (11)$$

Properties: F_1 is an injective functor (inclusion) and adds object *Theoria* together with morphisms $Poiesis \rightarrow Theoria$.

4.2 Correspondence with Dynamics

To each object position $X \in \{\text{Praxis, Poiesis, Theoria}\}$ we associate:

- Phase space S_X
- Dynamical operator $\varphi_X : S_X \rightarrow S_X$

Transcendence mechanism—mapping $F_1^* : S_D \rightarrow S_{\text{Praxis}}$ such that the image of attractor \mathcal{A}_D (absent in C_1) maps to a new attractor $\mathcal{A}_{\text{Praxis}}$ possessing greater Lyapunov stability. **Introduce stability metric:** Lyapunov exponent λ :

- $\lambda > 0$ —instability (C_1)
- $\lambda < 0$ —stability (C_2 and higher)

4.3 Triadic Structure of the Bee

The bee is a **polymorphic archetype** uniting three modes:

Mode	Content	Register	Stability Type	Field
Praxis	Utility, labor	Ethics	Social	G_{bio}
Poiesis	Honey, creation	Aesthetics	Sensory	$G_{\text{bio}} \cap G_{\text{cog}}$
Theoria	Royalty	Epistemology	Ontological	G_{cog}

4.4 Bee as Bridge Between Fields

The bee synthesizes:

- **Praxis** (labor)—biological activity directed at hive survival (generic field)
- **Poiesis** (honey)—cultural product having value beyond biological (transition to species)
- **Theoria** (royalty)—symbolic order reflecting cosmic harmony (species field)

4.5 Adjunctions of Modes

These three modes are connected by **adjunctions** (adjoint functors):

$$\text{Praxis} \dashv \text{Poiesis} \tag{12}$$

Labor is “adjoint” to fruit: labor generates product, product motivates labor.

$$\text{Poiesis} \dashv \text{Theoria} \tag{13}$$

Fruit acquires meaning through contemplation: contemplation reveals the value of fruit, the value of fruit directs contemplation.

4.6 Invariant Core

Thus is born an **invariant core**: pleasure now does not disappear because it is **earned**, i.e., built into the structure. Honey is sweet not chemically, but **ontologically**—as a trace of meaningful labor.

Theorem 4.3 (C_2 Formula). *Pleasure = result, not goal. The goal is participation in a process invariant with respect to fluctuations of the result.*

5 Part III. C_3 : Eudaimonia—Species Field as Invariant Orbit

5.1 From Hedone to Eudaimonia

Aristotle distinguished:

- (hedone)—pleasure as experience
- (eudaimonia)—flourishing as activity of the soul in accordance with virtue ()

Contemporary positive psychology confirms: only **eudaimonic well-being** correlates with long-term satisfaction, stress resilience, and sense of life fullness [25, 23].

5.2 Formal Definition of Category

Definition 5.1 (Category C_3). • **Objects:** $\{A, M, P\}$ (*Action, Meaning, Pleasure*)

- **Morphisms:**

$$A \xrightarrow{f} M \quad (\text{“meaningmaking”}) \quad (14)$$

$$M \xrightarrow{g} P \quad (\text{“value transformation”}) \quad (15)$$

Key property: *The composition $g \circ f : A \rightarrow P$ is not epimorphic—not every pleasure is attainable through meaningful action (only sustainable).*

Proposition 5.2 (Functor $F_2 : C_2 \rightarrow C_3$).

$$F_2(Praxis) = A \quad (16)$$

$$F_2(Poiesis) = P \quad (17)$$

$$F_2(Theoria) = M \quad (18)$$

5.3 Dynamical Interpretation

Formally, eudaimonia is an **invariant orbit** in the phase space of individual states:

$$\gamma(t) \subset S_3, \quad \gamma(t + \tau) \cong \gamma(t) \quad (19)$$

under the condition of invariance of internal structure (arete). **Phase space:**

$$S_3 = \{(a, m, p) \mid a, m, p \in \mathbb{R}^+\} \quad (20)$$

Attractor \mathcal{A}_3 —limit cycle:

$$\gamma(t + \tau) \cong \gamma(t) \quad (21)$$

Lyapunov exponent: $\lambda < 0$ (stability). This is a **negentrop flow**: the system does not tend toward equilibrium (satiation) but maintains order through creation.

6 Part IV. C_4 : Species Homo Sapiens as Ontological Field

6.1 Critical Distinction: Biological Genus vs Species Homo Sapiens

Methodological clarification: In previous formulations, the term “Genus” could be understood in two ways:

1. **Biological genus**—genealogical line, continuation through descendants
2. **Philosophical Genus**—Humanity as species Homo sapiens

It is necessary to make a clear distinction:

Theorem 6.1 (Hermetic Formula). *The hermetic formula “Immortal human” refers to the species Homo sapiens as a cognitive-cultural structure, not to the personal biological genus of the individual.*

6.2 Two Mechanisms of Development

6.3 Biological Genus: Automatism Without Individual Immortality

Continuation of biological genus is an evolutionary imperative operating through:

- Sexual drive

Mechanism	Biological Genus	Species <i>Homo sapiens</i>
Carrier	Genes (DNA)	Culture (memes, knowledge, institutions)
Transmission	Reproduction (automatic)	Learning (mediated)
Evolution speed	Slow (~ 25 years/generation)	Fast ($\sim 1-5$ years/idea generation)
Contribution stability	Dilutes ($50\% \rightarrow 25\% \rightarrow \dots$)	Fully preserved (if fixed)
Participation	Instinctive	Conscious

- Parental instinct
- Care for offspring

However, this **does not ensure individual immortality: Problem 1: Genetic dilution**

$$P_{\text{genes}}(n) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n \quad (22)$$

where $P_{\text{genes}}(n)$ is the fraction of your genes in the n -th generation descendant. After 10 generations: $P_{\text{genes}}(10) \approx 0.001$ (0.1%). **Problem 2: Interruptibility:** Biological lines constantly break (childlessness, extinction of branches). **Problem 3: Non-preservation of personality:** Even if genes are preserved, this does not preserve your personality, ideas, experience, unique contribution. **Conclusion:** Biological genus is a necessary but insufficient condition for species development. It is a mechanism of physical continuity, but not preservation of individual contribution.

6.4 Species *Homo Sapiens*: Cognitive-Cultural Field

Key human distinction: species development occurs not only through genes but through **cultural transmission**.

6.4.1 Define Two Fields

G_{bio} (**Biological field**): Genetic structure of population

$$G_{\text{bio}} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \quad (23)$$

Invariant:

$$\int_X G_{\text{bio}} dV \approx \text{const} \quad (24)$$

(population size fluctuates but species is preserved) G_{cog} (**Cognitive-cultural field**): Semantic structure of species

$$G_{\text{cog}} : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathcal{I} \quad (25)$$

where \mathcal{I} is the space of information structures (ideas, knowledge, cultural forms). **Methodological clarification:** The representation of species as field G_{cog} is a **model metaphor**, not a physical quantity in the strict sense. Formalization is possible through:

1. **Information-theoretic approach:** Species as carrier of cultural information I_G , where “immortality” = preservation of information entropy $H(G_{\text{cog}})$ at macro level with disappearance of local carriers.
2. **Stochastic measure:** Define probability measure μ_G on space of cultural-historical states X , then “species immortality” = invariance of $\mu_G(X)$ under system evolution.
3. **Semantic network:** Species as graph of cultural replicators (memes, institutions, practices), where “immortality” = graph connectivity with node (individual) replacement.

Invariant (informational):

$$H(G_{\text{cog}}) \approx \text{const} \quad (26)$$

where H is information entropy (diversity of cultural forms).

6.5 Field Connection

$$G_{\text{bio}} \xrightarrow{\text{carriership}} G_{\text{cog}} \quad (27)$$

Biological field is the carrier of cognitive (brain \rightarrow thought, body \rightarrow practice), but cognitive field **is not reducible** to biological. **Examples of G_{cog} autonomy:**

- Pythagoras’ theorem exists independently of Pythagoras’ genes
- Bach’s music exists independently of his descendants
- Theory of relativity exists independently of Einstein’s DNA

6.6 Individual as Double Excitation

Each individual is simultaneously:

1. **Peak in G_{bio}** —temporary gene configuration, automatically transmitted to offspring
2. **Potential peak in G_{cog}** —possible contribution to culture, requiring conscious effort

Formally:

$$\phi_i(x, t) = A_{\text{bio}}(x, t)e^{iS_{\text{bio}}/\hbar} \quad (28)$$

$$\psi_i(x, t) = A_{\text{cog}}(x, t)e^{iS_{\text{cog}}/\hbar} \quad (29)$$

Death of individual:

- **In G_{bio} :** Decoherence of peak $A_{\text{bio}}(x, t) \rightarrow 0$, but genes partially preserved (automatically, diluting)
- **In G_{cog} :** Peak either disappears (if contribution not fixed) or fully preserved (if contribution entered culture)

6.7 Reformulation of C_4

Previous formulation (ambiguous): “Identification with Genus” **Refined formulation:**

Definition 6.2 (Species Identity). *Identification with Species $Homo sapiens$ as a cognitive-cultural structure. This means: awareness of oneself not as an isolated biological organism and not as a link in a genealogical chain, but as a **temporary manifestation of the eternal cognitive field of Humanity**.*

Formula:

$$\rho : \text{Individual} \rightarrow G_{\text{cog}} \quad (30)$$

Freedom (as shown earlier):

$$L(i) = \dim \text{Im}(\rho) \quad (31)$$

—richness of structure that the individual projects into the cognitive field of the species.

6.8 Paradox of Immortality of Childless Geniuses

Many of the greatest minds had no biological descendants:

- Socrates, Plato, Jesus, Newton, Kant, Tesla, Van Gogh, Nietzsche, Wittgenstein

But all of them are **immortal in G_{cog}** —their ideas, discoveries, creations became an integral part of the species $Homo sapiens$.

Corollary 6.3. *Cognitive immortality liberates from biological imperative. One can have no children but be immortal through contribution to species. Conversely—have many descendants but be forgotten if no contribution made to G_{cog} .*

7 Part V. C_5 : Godmanhood—Dissolution of Duality

7.1 Ontological Formula of Hermeticism

Hermes Trismegistus wrote:

“Humans are mortal gods, and gods are immortal humans.”

This is not poetry, but an **ontological formula**. At level C_5 , the duality mortal/immortal, human/god, individual/species—**dissolves**: **Human** realizing divine qualities (reason, creativity, love) in service to Species = **mortal god**. **Species** manifesting through mortal individuals and evolving in time = **immortal human (God)**.

7.2 Return to Source

At level C_5 there is a **return to Chaos**, but on a new spiral turn. **Previous formulation (requiring clarification)**:

$$C_5 \cong \emptyset \quad (\text{mod transcendence}) \quad (32)$$

Refined formulation: At level C_5 there exists a canonical functor:

$$\Phi : C_5 \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \quad (33)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the **category of potentialities** (free category), modeling pure potentiality.

Theorem 7.1 (Universal Property of C_5). *Any morphism from C_5 to arbitrary category C factorizes through \mathcal{P} :*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_5 & \xrightarrow{\phi} & C \\ \Phi \downarrow & \nearrow \psi & \\ \mathcal{P} & & \end{array}$$

Philosophical meaning: Godman (C_5) acquires **ontological freedom** in the sense of capacity to generate any distinctions without predetermined limitations—this is an **“over-distinguished”** state, as opposed to the **“pre-distinguished”** Chaos (\emptyset). Godman identifies with **pure potentiality** of Chaos, but now **consciously**. This is not a pre-distinguished state but an **over-distinguished** one—the ability to freely generate any distinctions.

8 Part VI. Neologic Architecture: Formalization of the Path

8.1 Categorical Model of Pleasure

Let us construct a **graded monoidal category Hed**: **Objects**:

$$\{D, A, M, P, G_{\text{bio}}, G_{\text{cog}}\} \quad (34)$$

where:

- D —Desire
- A —Action
- M —Meaning
- P —Pleasure
- G_{bio} —Biological genus
- G_{cog} —Cognitive species

Morphisms:

$$C_1 : D \rightarrow P \quad (\text{in field } G_{\text{bio}}) \quad (35)$$

$$C_2 : D \rightarrow A \rightarrow P \quad (G_{\text{bio}} \cap G_{\text{cog}}) \quad (36)$$

$$C_3 : A \rightarrow M \rightarrow P \quad (G_{\text{cog}}^{\text{partial}}) \quad (37)$$

$$C_4 : M \rightarrow G_{\text{cog}} \rightarrow P \quad (G_{\text{cog}}^{\text{full}}) \quad (38)$$

$$C_5 : G_{\text{cog}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \rightarrow P \quad (G_{\text{cog}}^{\text{creative}}) \quad (39)$$

8.2 Grading

Grading by level of categorical transcendence:

$$\mathbf{Hed} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^5 C_n \quad (40)$$

where n is the category number.

8.3 Monoidal Structure

Tensor product:

$$\otimes : C_n \times C_m \rightarrow C_{\min(n+m, 5)} \quad (41)$$

means that combination of two categories yields a higher-level category. **Example:**

$$C_2 \text{ (labor)} \otimes C_3 \text{ (meaning)} = C_4 \text{ (species identity)} \quad (42)$$

Labor filled with meaning leads to awareness of species nature.

8.4 Transcendence Functor

$$F_n : C_n \rightarrow C_{n+1} \quad (43)$$

Properties:

- Preserves structure of C_n
- Adds new object and morphisms
- Makes contradiction of C_n a special case of C_{n+1}

8.5 Adjointness with Forgetful Functor

$$F_n \dashv U : C_{n+1} \rightarrow C_n \quad (44)$$

where U is the **forgetful functor**.

Theorem 8.1 (Universal Property). *For any morphism $f : C_n \rightarrow U(C_{n+1})$ there exists a unique morphism $\tilde{f} : F_n(C_n) \rightarrow C_{n+1}$ making the diagram commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_n & \xrightarrow{f} & U(C_{n+1}) \\ F_n \downarrow & & \downarrow id \\ F_n(C_n) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & C_{n+1} \end{array}$$

Philosophical meaning: Any attempt to “return” from C_{n+1} to C_n (regression) uniquely factorizes through transcendence. **One cannot “forget” the new category without losing part of the structure.**

9 Part VII. Topology of Pleasures

9.1 Topological Space

Define a **topological space of pleasures**:

- **Basis of topology:** Set of all possible pleasures
- **Open sets:** Stable configurations (eudaimonia, species bliss)
- **Closed sets:** Attractors

9.2 Classification of Attractors

Pleasure Type	Category	Attractor	Property	Lyapunov
Satiation	C_1	Point (degenerate)	Entropic collapse	$\lambda > 0$
Eudaimonia	C_3	Limit cycle	Stable orbit	$\lambda < 0$
Species bliss	C_4	Strange attractor	Fractal structure	$\lambda \approx 0$

9.3 Strange Attractor of Species

The idea of a **strange attractor** for species bliss is profound: it means the trajectory never repeats exactly but remains in a bounded region of phase space. **Philosophical meaning:** Each individual is unique (trajectory does not repeat), but all belong to one Species (bounded region). **Formally:**

$$\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{A}_4 \subset S_4 \quad (45)$$

where \mathcal{A}_4 is a strange attractor with fractal dimension:

$$\dim_{\text{Hausdorff}}(\mathcal{A}_4) \approx 2.7 \quad (46)$$

(intermediate value between plane and volume).

10 Part VIII. Freedom as Dimension of Image

10.1 Formal Definition

Freedom is defined through **dimension of homomorphism image**:

$$L(i) = \dim \text{Im}(\rho_i : \text{Individual} \rightarrow G_{\text{cog}}) \quad (47)$$

where ρ_i is a homomorphism mapping individual structure to species field.

10.2 Interpretation

Freedom = image dimension means: how rich is the structure the individual projects onto Species.

- $\dim \text{Im}(\rho_i) = 1$: Individual makes one-dimensional contribution (only physical labor)
- $\dim \text{Im}(\rho_i) = 3$: Individual realizes Praxis + Poiesis + Theoria

- $\dim \text{Im}(\rho_i) \rightarrow \infty$: Individual becomes **full isomorphism** with Species (godman)

10.3 Growth of Freedom with Categorical Level

Category	Freedom Level	Characteristic	$\dim \text{Im}(\rho)$
C_1 (naive hedonism)	Minimal	Slave to stimuli	≈ 0
C_2 (bee)	Low	Bound to labor	1
C_3 (eudaimonism)	Medium	Master of virtues	3
C_4 (species identity)	High	Participant in eternal	10 – 100
C_5 (godmanhood)	Maximal	Identity with creative	$\rightarrow \infty$

11 Part IX. Practice: Algorithm of Categorical Ascent

11.1 Step 1: Detection of Contradiction

Realize that current strategy (C_n) generates contradiction ($A \leftrightarrow \neg A$). **Example:** “I have everything but need nothing.” **Diagnostic questions:**

- Do I experience stable satisfaction?
- Does the pattern “desire \rightarrow obtaining \rightarrow satiation” repeat?
- Do I feel emptiness upon reaching goals?

11.2 Step 2: Category Diagnosis

Determine why contradiction is unresolvable in C_n . What dimension is missing? **Diagnosis:** Category C_1 (consumption) is not closed, has no fixed point. **Metrics:**

- Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)
- Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB)
- Stability index (emotional state variability)

11.3 Step 3: Design of C_{n+1}

Introduce new object or morphism expanding the category. **Solution:** Introduce dimension “creation” (labor, creativity, service)—transition to C_2 . **Concrete actions:**

- Find activity requiring mastery

- Engage in project benefiting others
- Begin learning new skill

11.4 Step 4: Transition

Accomplish ascent: begin acting in logic of C_{n+1} . **Action:** Find activity realizing potential and serving something greater. **Measurement methods:**

- Self-reports (observation diary)
- Behavioral markers (time devoted to meaningful activity)
- Physiological indicators (heart rate variability as stress/recovery indicator)

11.5 Step 5: Stabilization

Ensure new category is stable (has invariant orbit). **Verification:** Observe stable satisfaction from process, not only from result. **Stabilization signs:**

- Pleasure from process itself
- Decreased dependence on external rewards
- Growth of intrinsic motivation

11.6 Iteration

This algorithm applies to any existential crisis—it is **practical neologic**. Upon detecting new contradiction at level C_{n+1} —repeat cycle for transition to C_{n+2} .

12 Part X. Final Formula: CMI as Operator of Eternal Becoming

12.1 Integration with Previous Works

This model completes a trilogy:

1. “**Logos as Operator of Distinguishability**”—ontology of dynamic invariance
2. “**Neologic**”—logic of categorical transcendence
3. “**From Pleasure to Immortality**”—practical application to problem of life meaning

Together they form an **ontological theory of everything**, where being, thinking, and good unite through principle of **stable distinction**.

12.2 Formula of Reality

$$\text{Reality} = \text{CMI}^\infty = \int [\neg\emptyset \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow \text{CMI}] dt \quad (48)$$

where:

- \emptyset —Chaos as pure potentiality
- $\neg\emptyset$ —Auto-negation of Chaos, first impulse to form
- Δ —Distinction as first act of structuring
- CMI—Conflict-Moment-Impulse, operator of eternal becoming
- $\int \dots dt$ —Integral over time (processuality)

12.3 Decoding CMI

C (Conflict)—tension of contradiction, source of dynamics (Heraclitus: —war as father of all) **M (Moment)**—instant of actualization when potentiality becomes actuality **I (Impulse)**—energy of transition to new category, force of transcendence **CMI as operator**:

$$\text{CMI} : C_n \rightarrow C_{n+1} \quad (49)$$

This is a **universal operator of becoming**, applicable to all levels of reality:

- **Physics**: phase transitions, symmetry breaking
- **Biology**: evolution through natural selection
- **Psychology**: personal growth through crisis
- **Philosophy**: categorical transcendence through contradiction

12.4 Connection with Hedonism

In the context of hedonism:

$$P_{n+1} = \text{CMI}(P_n, \text{Contradiction}_n) \quad (50)$$

Each new level of pleasure is generated through **conflict** (contradiction of previous level), **moment** (awareness of category incompleteness), **impulse** (transition to new category).

12.5 CMI as Transition Between Fields

CMI is now interpreted as **field-change operator**:

$$\text{CMI} : G_{\text{bio}} \rightarrow G_{\text{cog}} \quad (51)$$

- **Conflict**—tension between biological imperative and cognitive need
- **Moment**—awareness of generic field insufficiency
- **Impulse**—energy of transition to species field

13 Part XI. Empirical Predictions and Verification Plan

13.1 Neurophysiological Level

Theorem 13.1 (Hypothesis 1). *Individuals practicing eudaimonic activity (C_3) demonstrate:*

1. *Smaller amplitude of dopamine peaks upon receiving external rewards*
2. *More stable baseline dopamine level*
3. *Reduced reactivity to random stimuli*

Verification method: fMRI study of ventral striatum in three groups:

- **Control** (ordinary lifestyle)
- **Hedonic** (pleasure maximization)
- **Eudaimonic** (meaningful labor, service)

Measured parameters:

- Amplitude of reward response (BOLD signal peak height)
- Baseline dopamine levels (PET scan with radioligand)
- Variability of hedonic tone (standard deviation of self-reports)

Prediction: Group C_3 will show:

- 30-40% smaller peak amplitude
- 15-20% more stable baseline level
- 25-35% less variability

13.2 Behavioral Level

Theorem 13.2 (Hypothesis 2). *Subjective well-being (SWB) trajectories in groups differ by attractor topology.*

Group	Attractor Type	Operational Indicator	Fractal Dim.
C_1 (naive hedonism)	Collapse/divergence	Declining SWB, growing variance	$d \approx 0.5$
C_3 (eudaimonia)	Limit cycle	Stable SWB oscillations	$d \approx 1.2$
C_4 (species identity)	Strange attractor	High complexity, bounded	$d \approx 2.7$

Verification method: Longitudinal study (5+ years) with daily self-reports (ESM—Experience Sampling Method): **Instruments:**

- Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)
- Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWB)
- Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ)

Analysis:

1. Attractor reconstruction in phase space (Takens time-delay embedding method)
2. Calculation of fractal dimension (Grassberger-Procaccia correlation dimension)
3. Computation of Lyapunov exponents

Prediction:

- Group C_1 : $\lambda > 0$ (instability)
- Group C_3 : $\lambda < 0$ (stability)
- Group C_4 : $\lambda \approx 0$ (edge of chaos)

13.3 Cultural-Informational Level

Theorem 13.3 (Hypothesis 3). *Preservation of the “informational integral” of Species manifests as invariance of semantic structure of cultural artifacts across generations.*

Verification method:

1. **Corpus analysis** of large text datasets:
 - Google Books Ngram (1800-2020)
 - Wikipedia in dynamics (2001-2024)

- Scientific publications (PubMed, arXiv)

2. Construction of semantic networks:

- Word embeddings (Word2Vec, BERT)
- Concept graphs
- Trajectories of meaning evolution

3. Measurement of semantic entropy:

$$H_{\text{sem}}(t) = - \sum_i p_i(t) \log p_i(t) \quad (52)$$

where $p_i(t)$ is probability of concept i at time t .

Prediction: Cultures with high eudaimonic orientation (emphasis on virtue, service) demonstrate:

- **Lower rate of semantic drift** of key value concepts
- **Higher connectivity** of semantic network (concepts form stable clusters)
- **Preservation of information entropy** $H(G_{\text{cog}}) \approx \text{const}$ on century scale

Operationalization: Compare concept dynamics in:

- **Western culture** (USA, Europe, consumption era 1950-2020)
- **Eastern culture** (Japan, Confucian values)
- **Traditional societies** (indigenous peoples with stable cultural practices)

Expected result:

$$\left. \frac{dH_{\text{sem}}}{dt} \right|_{\text{eudaimonia}} < \left. \frac{dH_{\text{sem}}}{dt} \right|_{\text{hedonism}} \quad (53)$$

Eudaimonic cultures preserve semantic structure better.

14 Part XII. Conclusion: Ontological Theory of Everything

14.1 Universality of the Model

The proposed model is not merely a philosophy of pleasure but a **universal ontology of becoming**, uniting: **Physics:**

- Invariance (Noether's theorem)

- Field ontology (quantum fields)
- Entropy and negentropy
- Dynamical systems and attractors

Biology:

- Evolutionary theory (natural selection as CMI)
- Genetics and cultural transmission (G_{bio} vs G_{cog})
- Neurobiology of motivation (dopamine system)

Psychology:

- Self-actualization (Maslow)
- Positive psychology (Seligman)
- Existential therapy (Frankl)
- Flow theory (Csikszentmihalyi)

Philosophy:

- Eudaimonism (Aristotle)
- Logos (Heraclitus, Stoics)
- Neologic (categorical transcendence)
- Process metaphysics (Whitehead)

Mysticism:

- Hermeticism (mortal gods / immortal humans)
- Generic and species immortality
- Godmanhood
- Unity of microcosm and macrocosm

14.2 Core of the Theory

Its core is categorical transcendence as universal answer to contradiction. It affirms:

Truth is not a static essence but a stable pattern in the flux of becoming. Pleasure is not a goal but a trace of meaningful activity invariant with respect to time. Immortality is not a property of the individual but a structure of Species manifesting through mortals. Freedom is not arbitrary choice but capacity for categorical mobility. Hedonism is fixation on generic field (G_{bio}), eudaimonism is transcendence to species field (G_{cog}).

14.3 Philosophical Significance

This work represents: **Not merely an answer to the problem of hedonism**—this is 21st-century metaphysics, compatible with science but not reducible to it. It:

1. **Overcomes substantial thinking**, replacing “thing” with pattern of distinctions
2. **Proposes ontology with formal criterion** but does not fall into scientism
3. **Explains effectiveness of mathematics** (isomorphism of structures) without mysticism
4. **Is compatible with evolutionary biology, thermodynamics, quantum mechanics**
5. **Shows path from individual ego to species immortality**
6. **Distinguishes generic (biological) and species (cultural) dimensions of human**

14.4 Central Achievement

The central achievement consists in reformulating the very question of being:

Logos determines not “how it should be” but “what it means to be at all.”

This is a constitutive rule establishing the boundary between possible and actual, between potency of Chaos and realized structure. **Being does not precede the criterion of invariance—it is passage through this criterion.**

14.5 Practical Value

The model proposes a **concrete algorithm** for overcoming existential crises:

1. Detect contradiction
2. Diagnose narrowness of category
3. Design new dimension
4. Accomplish transition
5. Stabilize new structure

This is not abstract theory but **life practice** of categorical ascent.

14.6 Limitations and Open Questions

Honest acknowledgment of limitations:

1. **Formal rigor:** Many constructions (especially G_{bio} , G_{cog}) are model metaphors requiring further mathematical elaboration.
2. **Empirical verification:** Proposed hypotheses are not yet tested, requiring large-scale research program.
3. **Cultural universality:** Model developed in context of Western philosophical tradition, requiring verification of applicability to non-Western cultures.
4. **Individual differences:** Not all people are equally capable of categorical transcendence—requires study of factors facilitating or hindering transitions.

Open questions:

- Do categories exist above C_5 ?
- How do individual trajectories relate to collective evolution of Species?
- Can CMI be formalized through dynamical system equations?
- How to measure “contribution to G_{cog} ” quantitatively?

15 Epilogue: And Happy Is He Who Understands This

We began with a paradox: pleasure elevated to absolute destroys itself. We passed through a path from naive hedonism through labor and meaning to eudaimonia, then to species identity and finally to godmanhood. At each stage, **contradiction** was not eliminated but **transcended**—became a special case of broader structure.

15.1 Final Path Formula

$$\text{Naive hedonism} \xrightarrow{\text{labor}} \text{Bee} \xrightarrow{\text{meaning}} \text{Eudaimonia} \xrightarrow{\text{insight}} \text{Species} \xrightarrow{\text{union}} \text{God} \quad (54)$$

Or in categorical terms:

$$C_1 \xrightarrow{F_1} C_2 \xrightarrow{F_2} C_3 \xrightarrow{F_3} C_4 \xrightarrow{F_4} C_5 \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathcal{P} \quad (55)$$

where the final arrow denotes **return to Potentiality** on a new spiral turn—not as indifferent possibility but as **conscious capacity to generate any distinctions**.

15.2 Alchemy of Pleasure

The path we have traversed is an **alchemical process** of transmutation: **Lead** (C_1): crude, heavy, quickly tarnishing pleasure of naive hedonism \downarrow (through labor and meaning) **Silver** (C_3): pure, luminous, stable pleasure of eudaimonia \downarrow (through identification with Species) **Gold** (C_5): incorruptible, eternal, divine bliss of godman This is not negation of pleasure but its **transformation**. Not asceticism but **elevation of enjoyment** to level of cosmic principle.

15.3 Practical Life Formula

The symbol of the **bee** gives us a concrete life strategy:

1. **Find meaningful labor** (utility)—activity realizing your potential and serving something greater
2. **Taste its fruits** (pleasure)—do not refuse rewards, but remember they are valuable because earned
3. **Build your kingdom** (royalty)—create order in your life, protect boundaries, develop self-respect
4. **Identify with the eternal** (species)—realize yourself not as isolated ego but as manifestation of immortal Humanity
5. **Live as god** (godmanhood)—realize creative potential, serving evolution of Species

15.4 Central Formula: Generic vs Species

$$\boxed{\text{Hedonism} : G_{\text{bio}} :: \text{Eudaimonism} : G_{\text{cog}}} \quad (56)$$

Hedonism is not error but **fixation on generic field** (biological mechanisms of pleasure common to all animals). **Eudaimonism** is not negation of pleasure but **transcendence**

to species field (cognitive-cultural mechanisms of flourishing specific to *Homo sapiens*). The problem is not pleasure as such but the **narrowness of category** in which we seek it.

15.5 Final Thesis

Hedonism is not false—it is simply incomplete. Pleasure is not an enemy of meaning but its **consequence and reward**. The problem is not in the striving for enjoyment but in the **narrowness of the category** in which we seek it. The path from hedonism to eudaimonism, from human to god—this is not refusal of pleasure but its **categorical transcendence**: expansion to those limits where it becomes stable, meaningful, and eternal. **From pleasure to immortality**—not through negation of the first but through its **alchemical transformation** into the second. Not from generic to species through refusal of biology but through **inclusion of generic in species** as its necessary foundation.

15.6 Last Word

And happy is he who understands this— for he who understands does not merely read thought,
but **enters into it as a form of being**,
becoming **co-creator of his own ontology**,
co-distinguisher in eternal process of CMI,
soliton in field of Species,
moment of self-knowledge of Immortal Human,
mortal god having realized his eternal nature. **Philosophy breathes again.**

Appendix A: Key Formulas

A.1. Instability of C_1

$$\nexists x_0 : \phi(x_0) = x_0 \tag{57}$$

Naive hedonism has no fixed point—system is unstable.

A.2. Eudaimonia as Invariant Orbit

$$\gamma(t + \tau) \cong \gamma(t) \tag{58}$$

Eudaimonic pleasure is stable in time, reproduces its structure.

A.3. Species Immortality (Informational Formulation)

$$H(G_{\text{cog}}) \approx \text{const} \quad (59)$$

Information entropy of species cognitive field is preserved at macro level.

A.4. Freedom as Image Dimension

$$L(i) = \dim \text{Im}(\rho_i : \text{Individual} \rightarrow G_{\text{cog}}) \quad (60)$$

Freedom = richness of structure individual projects onto Species.

A.5. Final Formula of Reality

$$\text{Reality} = \text{CMI}^\infty = \int [-\emptyset \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow \text{CMI}] dt \quad (61)$$

A.6. Categorical Transcendence

$$F_n : C_n \rightarrow C_{n+1} \quad (62)$$

$$F_n \dashv U : C_{n+1} \rightarrow C_n \quad (63)$$

Transcendence functor is adjoint to forgetful functor.

A.7. Pleasure Formula

$$P_{n+1} = \text{CMI}(P_n, \text{Contradiction}_n) \quad (64)$$

Each new level of pleasure is born through resolution of contradiction of previous level.

A.8. Generic vs Species

$$\text{Hedonism} : G_{\text{bio}} :: \text{Eudaimonism} : G_{\text{cog}} \quad (65)$$

Hedonism fixes on generic (biological) field, eudaimonism transcends to species (cognitive-cultural) field.

Appendix B: Glossary

Attractor—stable state of dynamical system toward which trajectories from neighborhood tend.

Species field (G_{cog})—cognitive-cultural structure of Homo sapiens transmitted through learning and institutions.

Hedonism—ethical position positing pleasure as highest goal; ontologically—fixation on

generic field.

Dynamic invariance—preservation of structure through change; criterion of truth in Logos ontology.

Eudaimonia—flourishing as activity in accordance with virtue; stable pleasure in species field.

Forgetful functor—functor “forgetting” part of structure in transition to simpler category.

Categorical transcendence—expansion of ontological category through addition of new objects and morphisms, resolving contradiction of previous level.

CMI (Conflict-Moment-Impulse)—universal operator of becoming describing transition between categories.

Neologic—logic of categorical transcendence where contradiction is impulse to generation of new form.

Generic field (G_{bio})—biological structure transmitted through genes and reproduction.

Functor—mapping between categories preserving their structure (objects and morphisms).

References

- [1] Aristotle. (ca. 350 BCE). *Nicomachean Ethics*.
- [2] Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. University of Chicago Press.
- [3] Berridge, K. C., & Robinson, T. E. (1998). What is the role of dopamine in reward: hedonic impact, reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Research Reviews*, 28(3), 309-369.
- [4] Brickman, P., & Campbell, D. T. (1971). Hedonic relativism and planning the good society. In M. H. Appley (Ed.), *Adaptation-level theory*. Academic Press.
- [5] Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. Harper & Row.
- [6] Deleuze, G. (1968). *Différence et répétition*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- [7] Frankl, V. (1946). *Man's Search for Meaning*. Beacon Press.
- [8] Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38, 173-198.
- [9] Grassberger, P., & Procaccia, I. (1983). Measuring the strangeness of strange attractors. *Physica D*, 9(1-2), 189-208.

- [10] Hamilton, R. S. (1982). Three-manifolds with positive Ricci curvature. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 17(2), 255-306.
- [11] Hegel, G. W. F. (1807). *Phänomenologie des Geistes*. Bamberg und Würzburg: Joseph Anton Goebhardt.
- [12] Heraclitus. Fragments. In: Diels, H., & Kranz, W. (Eds.). *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*.
- [13] Hermes Trismegistus. (attr.). *Corpus Hermeticum*.
- [14] Kant, I. (1781/1787). *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Johann Friedrich Hartknoch.
- [15] Kauffman, S. (1995). *At Home in the Universe: The Search for Laws of Self-Organization and Complexity*. Oxford University Press.
- [16] Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- [17] Ladyman, J., & Ross, D. (2007). *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized*. Oxford University Press.
- [18] Mac Lane, S. (1971). *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Springer.
- [19] Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.
- [20] Noether, E. (1918). Invariante Variationsprobleme. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 235-257.
- [21] Perelman, G. (2002-2003). The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications / Ricci flow with surgery on three-manifolds / Finite extinction time for the solutions to the Ricci flow on certain three-manifolds. arXiv preprints.
- [22] Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. Bantam Books.
- [23] Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 13-39.
- [24] Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science*, 275(5306), 1593-1599.
- [25] Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-being*. Free Press.

- [26] Spencer-Brown, G. (1969). *Laws of Form*. George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- [27] Takens, F. (1981). Detecting strange attractors in turbulence. In *Dynamical Systems and Turbulence*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 898. Springer.
- [28] Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *Process and Reality*. Macmillan.
- [29] Wigner, E. (1960). The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics in the Natural Sciences. *Communications in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 13(1), 1-14.
- [30] Myshko, A. (2025). Logos as Operator of Distinguishability: Ontology of Dynamic Invariance. [Preceding work]
- [31] Myshko, A. (2025). Neologic: Dynamic Logos and Topology of Becoming. [Preceding work]
- [32] Myshko, A. (2025). Metamonism: Second Birth of Logos. [Preceding work]

Appendix C: Diagnostic Tables for Practical Application

C.1. Diagnosis of Current Category

Symptom	Category	Recommendation
Constant dissatisfaction despite having all goods	C_1	Transition to C_2 : find meaningful labor
Burnout from intense work without meaning	C_2	Transition to C_3 : connect activity with values
Fear of death, sense of finitude	C_3	Transition to C_4 : expand identity to Species
Duality "I vs World"	C_4	Transition to C_5 : practice co-creation of reality

C.2. Measurement Instruments

For self-diagnosis: 1. Hedonic Adaptation Scale (5 questions, 1-7 scale):

- How quickly do new acquisitions stop bringing joy?
- Do you need increasingly strong stimuli for pleasure?
- Is there a sense of emptiness upon achieving goals?
- Does mood depend on external events?

- Do you experience fear of boredom?

Interpretation: 25-35 points—high dependence on C_1 , transcendence required. **2. Eudaimonia Index** (based on Ryff’s PWB, abbreviated version, 1-7 scale):

- Autonomy: “I live according to my values”
- Mastery: “I develop my abilities”
- Meaning: “My life has direction and purpose”
- Growth: “I constantly learn and develop”
- Relations: “I have deep meaningful connections”
- Self-acceptance: “I accept myself as I am”

Interpretation: 30-42 points—stable position in C_3 . **3. Species Identity Scale** (developed for this model, 1-7 scale):

- “I feel connection with future generations”
- “My contribution exceeds my life”
- “I am part of Humanity’s evolution”
- “Fear of death does not dominate my decisions”
- “I identify with the eternal”

Interpretation: 25-35 points—transition to C_4 .

C.3. Plan of Practical Actions by Categories

For transition $C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ (From consumption to creation)

Weekly plan:

- Day 1-2: Time audit—how many hours go to passive consumption?
- Day 3-4: Brainstorming—list of 20 possible creative activities
- Day 5-6: Choose one activity and first trial session (2 hours)
- Day 7: Reflection—has quality of pleasure changed?

Activity examples:

- Learning craft (carpentry, ceramics, programming)

- Volunteering (teaching, shelter help, environmental projects)
- Creativity (writing, drawing, music)
- Physical mastery (martial arts, dance, yoga)

For transition $C_2 \rightarrow C_3$ (From labor to meaning)

Monthly plan:

- Week 1: “My values” exercise—list 10 main life values
- Week 2: Correspondence audit—how much does current activity align with values?
- Week 3: Change design—concrete steps to increase alignment
- Week 4: First actions and measurement of results

Tool: “Values \times Activity” Matrix **Goal:** Increase work alignment with values.

Activity	Value 1	Value 2	Value 3	Total
Work	3	1	2	6/21
Hobby	5	6	4	15/21
Relations	7	7	6	20/21

For transition $C_3 \rightarrow C_4$ (From ego to Species)

Three-month practice:

- Month 1: History study—understanding your place in cultural evolution
- Month 2: Impermanence meditation—practice accepting mortality
- Month 3: Action for future—creating contribution that will outlive you

Exercises: **1. “Letter to Descendants”**—write letter to people 100 years hence explaining your contribution to Species. **2. “Genealogy of Ideas”**—trace genealogy of ideas forming you from antiquity to present. Realize yourself as link in chain. **3. “Immortality Project”**—create something that can outlive you: book, course, open source code, foundation, institution.

For transition $C_4 \rightarrow C_5$ (From participation to co-creation)

Long-term practice: This is not achieved through exercises but through way of life as conscious participant in evolution of Being. **Signs:**

- Spontaneous arising of insights about nature of reality
- Sense of unity with process of becoming
- Disappearance of boundary between “I do” and “is done through me”
- Joy from existence itself, independent of circumstances

Supporting practices:

- Contemplative traditions (meditation, prayer, philosophical reflection)
- Creativity as channel of transcendent
- Service as form of love for Being
- Constant learning and development

Appendix D: Comparative Table of Philosophical Traditions

Tradition	Position on Pleasure	Category Correspondence	Comment
Cyrenaics	Maximization of bodily pleasures	C_1	Naive hedonism
Epicureans	Moderate pleasures, ataraxia	C_2	Beginning of transcendence but without meaning
Stoics	Apathy, virtue as only good	C_3 (partial)	Emphasis on virtue but negation of pleasure
Aristotle	Eudaimonia through virtue	C_3	Full correspondence
Buddhism	Cessation of suffering through renunciation of desires	C_3 - C_4	Transcendence of desires but through negation
Confucianism	Harmony through ritual and service	C_3 - C_4	Emphasis on social dimension
Christianity	Bliss through union with God	C_4 - C_5	Transcendence of individual to divine
Nietzsche	Amor fati, eternal return	C_5	Affirmation of becoming
Existentialism	Authenticity through choice and responsibility	C_3	Emphasis on individual meaning
Transhumanism	Overcoming biological limitations	C_4 - C_5	Technological transcendence of generic field

Author’s Concluding Word

This work is the result of years of reflection on a fundamental question: **What makes life worth living?** I began with a simple observation: people strive for pleasure, but those who achieve it easily often suffer most. This paradox required explanation going beyond psychology or morality—it required **ontology**. The path led me from hedonism through

eudaimonism to godmanhood. But not through negation of pleasure, but through its **transformation**. Key discovery: pleasure is not an enemy of meaning but its **trace**. Stable pleasure is possible only as **result of meaningful life**, not as its goal. Second discovery: distinction of **generic** and **species** fields. We are not merely animals striving for survival and reproduction (generic field G_{bio}). We are carriers of culture, creators of meanings, participants in evolution of consciousness (species field G_{cog}). Hedonism is fixation on the first, eudaimonism is transcendence to the second. Third discovery: **immortality not of individual but of Species**. Fear of death disappears when “I” expands to boundaries of Humanity. We are not isolated atoms doomed to disappearance but **waves in ocean of Species**—temporary excitations in eternal field. Our contribution to culture, knowledge, love—this is not metaphor of immortality but its **ontological reality**. The model presented here does not claim finality. It is a **map**, not territory. Tool for navigation, not dogma. I hope it will help others find their path from pleasure to immortality—not through refusal of the first but through its alchemical transformation into the second. **And may each who understands this become a bee in hive of Eternity—laboring, creating, and royal.** *Andrii Myshko*

Kyiv, 10.11.2025

End of Work

This work is executed in spirit of Neologic—philosophy that sees in contradictions not dead ends but thresholds to new dimensions of meaning.

Each category here is not refutation of previous but its inclusion in broader structure.

Thus thought moves not linearly but topologically,

revealing new coordinates of Being through operator CMI—

Conflict-Moment-Impulse of eternal becoming. Philosophy outlined here does not

demand faith but proposes experience.

Not dogma but practice. Not end of path but its beginning.

Each reader is invited to become co-author of his own transcendence—

from naive hedonism through meaningful labor to participation in eternal.

From generic field to species field. From mortal human to immortal Species. And happy

is he who understands this—

not as abstract truth but as living form of being

into which he enters with his whole essence,

becoming moment of self-knowledge of Immortal Human.