The Personal Blueprint as Universal Coherence Principle From Bacterium to Human, From Individual to Family

J. Konstapel ConstableLeiden, June 3 2026

Abstract

The concept of a "personal blueprint" — the characteristic coherence topology of an individual organism — is commonly treated as specific to complex animals or humans. This paper argues that the personal blueprint is a universal principle operating across all levels of biological complexity, from single-celled prokaryotes to mammals, and that family resemblance, inherited talent, and hereditary disease are best understood as expressions of shared coherence thresholds within a hierarchical field framework. Drawing on Rowlands' nilpotent algebra, Levin's bioelectric morphogenesis, Friston's free energy principle, and Konstapel's 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model (19LQVM), we propose that the genetic code encodes not a deterministic blueprint but a threshold structure — a set of coherence boundaries that define which field states are accessible to a given organism. Heredity transmits shared libraries and shared threshold structures, not actualized identities. The personal blueprint is the time- and place-bound actualization of that threshold structure by a specific coherence field.

1. The Problem with Genetic Determinism

The dominant framework in molecular biology treats DNA as a causal hierarchy: gene → protein → organism. In this view, heredity is the transmission of instructions, family resemblance is the expression of shared instructions, and hereditary disease is the consequence of faulty instructions.

This framework succeeds in explaining a narrow class of phenomena — monogenic diseases, protein synthesis, evolutionary sequence conservation — but fails systematically when confronted with a wider empirical field:

- Monozygotic twins with identical DNA diverge systematically in health, physiology, and disease susceptibility across their lifetimes (Fraga et al., 2005).
- The same genetic variant produces full penetrance in one population and near-zero penetrance in another.
- Spatial body organization in development is controlled by bioelectric field patterns that can be altered without modifying a single DNA base (Levin, 2021).
- Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance transmits physiological dispositions across generations through mechanisms independent of DNA sequence (Heard & Martienssen, 2014).

These are not anomalies at the margins of the framework. They are central phenomena that the framework cannot accommodate without auxiliary hypotheses that increasingly undermine its explanatory coherence.

A deeper framework is required — one in which the genetic sequence is not the top of a causal hierarchy but one layer within a multilevel field system.

2. DNA as Resonance Memory, Genome as Threshold Structure

We have argued elsewhere (Konstapel, 2026a) that DNA is most accurately understood as resonance memory: a stable molecular encoding of the coherence patterns that evolution has found viable at each level of biological organization. The genome does not instruct the organism into existence. It records what the field has found stable.

In this framework, the genome functions as a **threshold structure**: a specification of which coherence field states are energetically accessible and which are not. The analogy is not a blueprint but a landscape — a topographic map of attractors and barriers in coherence space.

This has a precise formal grounding. Rowlands (2007) demonstrates that the 64-codon structure of the genetic code is formally identical to the algebra of a doubled nilpotent space in quantum field theory. The same algebraic constraints that govern the behavior of fundamental particles generate the structure of the genetic code. This is not analogy but formal identity: the genome encodes coherence thresholds using the same mathematical structure that the vacuum uses to constrain field states at the particle level.

The implication is direct: **the genetic code is a coherence constraint system, not an instruction set.** It specifies the boundary conditions within which a coherence field can operate, not the content of that field.

3. The Coherence Hierarchy: From Bacterium to Human

The 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model (19LQVM; Konstapel, 2026b) describes biological organization as a hierarchical stack of coherence levels, each level stabilized by phase-locking with the level below and constraining the degrees of freedom available to the level above.

This hierarchy is universal. Every living organism — from the simplest prokaryote to the most complex mammal — is a complete realization of the coherence principle at its characteristic level of the hierarchy.

A bacterium fully realizes the lower layers of the coherence hierarchy. Its threshold structure is narrow: few degrees of freedom, limited topological richness, but complete and self-consistent within its own coherence domain. A bacterium is not a failed human. It is a complete organism operating at a specific level of the hierarchy.

A human being realizes more layers of the same hierarchy. Critically, the human organism does not replace the lower layers — it contains them. Human mitochondria are former prokaryotes whose threshold structures have been integrated into a higher-level coherence organization. The immune system operates on coherence logic that is structurally continuous with prokaryotic field dynamics. The human organism is a nested coherence hierarchy in which each level remains active and functional within the larger integration.

The **personal blueprint** is therefore not a specifically human phenomenon. It is the characteristic coherence topology of any organism — the specific profile of activated layers within the hierarchy, the particular distribution of eigenvalues across the organism's regulatory domains — as realized at a specific time and place. A bacterium has a personal blueprint. It is simply a blueprint with fewer active layers and less topological freedom.

The difference between species is **topological richness** — the number of coherence layers that are stably integrated — not a difference in kind.

4. Family Resemblance, Inherited Talent, and Hereditary Disease

Within this framework, the phenomena that genetic determinism attributes to shared "instructions" are reinterpreted as expressions of shared threshold structures and shared initial field conditions.

4.1 Family Resemblance

Family members share a genomic library — a common threshold structure that makes certain coherence patterns energetically accessible at lower activation cost. Morphological resemblance reflects the fact that the threshold structure constrains embryonic field dynamics: shared constraints produce convergent solutions under Levin's bioelectric morphogenesis. Children resemble parents not because they receive identical instructions but because they operate within similar coherence boundaries, and similar boundaries generate similar attractors in morphological space.

4.2 Inherited Talent and Aptitude

Clustered aptitudes in family lineages — mathematical talent, musical aptitude, administrative precision — reflect shared regions of low threshold in the coherence landscape. A family line with recurrent mathematical talent does not carry a "mathematics gene." It carries a threshold structure in which the coherence patterns associated with analytical pattern recognition are energetically preferred. Whether any individual in that lineage actualizes mathematical competence depends on the time- and place-bound field conditions that complete the activation — education, environment, the specific coherence configuration present at birth.

This explains the consistent observation that talent runs in families but does not determine individuals. The library is shared; the reader and the moment of reading are unique.

4.3 Hereditary Disease and Population Endogamy

Hereditary disease clusters in endogamous populations — communities with restricted genetic exchange over multiple generations — represent a specific coherence phenomenon: **threshold narrowing**.

The case of hereditary disease clusters in historically isolated coastal communities (such as documented in the Netherlands) illustrates this directly. When genomic diversity decreases through repeated endogamy, the threshold structure narrows: fewer alternative coherence pathways are available when the primary pathway is disrupted. Recessive variants that are compensated in heterozygous individuals — one functional copy providing sufficient coherence support — become homozygous, eliminating the compensatory pathway entirely.

In coherence terms: a local resonance disturbance that would normally be absorbed by topological alternatives cannot be rerouted. The coherence hierarchy has insufficient reserve. The result is not a "defective gene expressing itself" but a coherence system with reduced topological freedom encountering a perturbation it cannot route around.

This reframing has clinical implications. It suggests that the relevant intervention target in hereditary disease clusters is not gene correction alone but coherence topology restoration — a target that includes but is not limited to the genomic level.

5. The Personal Blueprint as Time- and Place-Bound Actualization

The central claim of this paper can now be stated precisely:

The personal blueprint is the actualization of a genomic threshold structure by a specific coherence field, at a specific time and place, within a specific level of the coherence hierarchy.

The genome specifies what is possible. The field — shaped by the specific electromagnetic configuration present at the moment of organismic individuation — determines what is actual. This is not mystical but physical: the initial conditions of the electromagnetic environment at the moment a coherence system becomes self-referential determine which attractors in the threshold landscape are first occupied, and those initial occupancies create path dependencies that persist throughout the organism's development.

This framework integrates four previously separate explanatory domains:

- **Rowlands:** the formal algebraic identity between the genetic code and quantum field constraints, establishing that the genome is a coherence constraint system
- **Levin:** the causal primacy of bioelectric fields in morphogenesis, establishing that field states are not downstream of genomic instruction but upstream of genomic expression
- **Friston:** the free energy principle, establishing that biological systems minimize prediction error across a generative model in which the genome constitutes the deepest layer of prior expectations
- **19LQVM:** the hierarchical coherence stack, establishing that complexity differences across species reflect differences in the number of stably integrated coherence layers, not differences in the nature of the underlying principle

Within this integrated framework, the personal blueprint is not a human specialty. It is the universal form that life takes when a coherence field actualizes a threshold structure at a specific moment in a specific place. Every organism — from bacterium to whale — is a personal blueprint.

6. Testable Predictions

This framework generates specific empirical predictions:

1. Epigenetic profiles should be predictable from coherence topology measurements (HRV eigenvalue distribution, EEG coherence mapping) independently of environmental history.
2. Monozygotic twins should diverge most strongly along phenotypic dimensions corresponding to the domains of greatest divergence in their coherence topologies.

3. In endogamous disease-cluster populations, individuals with higher coherence topology richness (measurable via autonomic response profiling) should show reduced disease penetrance despite identical genomic risk variants.
4. Bioelectric normalization of tumor microenvironment (following Levin's protocol) should show greater efficacy in patients whose coherence topology profiles indicate systemic rather than localized field disruption.

References

Fraga, M.F., et al. (2005). Epigenetic differences arise during the lifetime of monozygotic twins. *PNAS*, 102(30), 10604–10609.

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.

Heard, E., & Martienssen, R.A. (2014). Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance: myths and mechanisms. *Cell*, 157(1), 95–109.

Konstapel, J. (2026a). DNA as Resonance Memory: A Field-Theoretic Reframing of the Genetic Code. Constable Research Working Paper.

Konstapel, J. (2026b). The 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model. Constable Research Working Paper.

Levin, M. (2021). Bioelectric signaling: reprogrammable circuits underlying embryogenesis, regeneration, and cancer. *Cell*, 184(8), 1971–1989.

Levin, M., & Martyniuk, C.J. (2018). The bioelectric code: an ancient computational medium for dynamic control of growth and form. *BioSystems*, 164, 76–93.

Rowlands, P. (2007). *Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics*. World Scientific.

Vitiello, G. (2001). *My Double Unveiled*. John Benjamins.