Immortalitas in Hac Vita
Longevity Platform
https://www.longevity.ge

Longevity Horizon
ISSN:3088-4063

2026

Vol.2 No.1:8

Ze, decoherence, and the quantum eraser

An active interpretation of collapse without an observer

Jaba Tkemaladze [*][1]
Affiliation: [1] Kutaisi University, Georgia
Citation: Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Ze, decoherence, and the quantum eraser. Longevity Horizon, 2(1). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/39hf1h41

Abstract

The quantum eraser experiment, while confirming the mathematical formalism of quantum mechanics, has persistently challenged intuitive understanding, often invoking concepts of retrocausality or the necessity of a conscious observer. This paper develops and articulates the Ze interpretation as a comprehensive framework that resolves these conceptual challenges without such metaphysical additions. We propose that quantum dynamics is fundamentally governed by the competition between two active generative models: a direct causal model (Model A, "particle-like") and a counterfactual wave model (Model B, "wave-like"). Decoherence is reinterpreted not as information loss, but as the environmental amplification of a structural incompatibility between these models, leading to a forced stabilization of the system into a state compatible with a single, definite narrative—a process we identify as physical collapse. The quantum eraser is shown to be an active intervention that dismantles this incompatibility by removing the environmental basis for discriminating between models, thereby restoring the conditions for a low-conflict consensus state that manifests as interference. This framework seamlessly unifies unitary evolution, decoherence, collapse, and erasure as facets of a single process of model competition and stabilization. It eliminates the need for an observer-centric explanation, replaces the "collapse" postulate with a dynamical physical mechanism, and yields novel, testable predictions regarding interference in complex systems and the dynamic nature of the quantum-classical threshold.

Keywords: Quantum Eraser, Decoherence, Generative Models, Measurement Problem, Variational Free Energy, Objective Collapse, Quantum Foundations.

Introduction: The Elusive "Cause" of Wavefunction Collapse

The quantum eraser experiment, in its various implementations, stands as one of the most conceptually provocative demonstrations in quantum mechanics. Its core sequence is disarmingly simple yet profoundly challenging: when "which-path" information is made available about a quantum system—even if only in principle—interference fringes vanish. If that information is subsequently erased in a coherent manner, the interference pattern can be restored. Crucially, this erasure can be performed after the particles have been detected (Scully & Drühl, 1982; Walborn et al., 2002). The Copenhagen interpretation's colloquial explanation, that "observation collapses the wave function," is rendered inadequate here. No conscious observer is required; the mere physical presence of a recordable marker suffices to destroy interference. Conversely, the deterministic, causal timeline of classical physics is violated, as a later event (erasure) seems to influence an earlier one (the detection statistics).

This paper argues that the quantum eraser does not reveal a mysterious role for consciousness or a paradox of backwards-in-time causation. Instead, it provides a critical experimental window into the processes of decoherence and entanglement, and points towards an active, physical interpretation of state reduction. We posit that the fundamental mechanism at play is the structural (in)compatibility of descriptions—specifically, the compatibility or incompatibility of a system's quantum state with a definite "history" or "story" about its behavior. The quantum eraser manipulates this compatibility through controlled entanglement and dis-entanglement. To develop this, we first revisit the foundational role of entanglement (Ze) and decoherence.

Entanglement as the Primary Ontological Process

The central ontological process in quantum mechanics is not wavefunction collapse, but entanglement (Ze from the German Verschränkung). When a quantum system S interacts with another system E (which could be a detector, a photon, or any environmental degree of freedom), the result is generally not a collapsed state for , but a non-separable composite state:

$$|\psi\_S\rangle \otimes |ready\_E\rangle \rightarrow \sum\_i c\_i |s\_i\rangle \otimes |e\_i\rangle$$

where $e\_i\rangle$ are "pointer states" of E correlated with states $s\_i\rangle$ of S (Zurek, 2003). This is the unitary, deterministic evolution prescribed by the Schrödinger equation. The key insight is that the acquisition of "which-path information" is nothing more than the establishment of entanglement between the particle (e.g., a photon or electron) and some marker system. In a double-slit experiment with which-path markers, the state becomes:

$$|\Psi\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2}) \left(|path\_A\rangle \otimes |marker\_A\rangle + |path\_B\rangle \otimes |marker\_B\rangle \right)$$

The system no longer possesses a pure state for the particle alone; it is inextricably linked to the marker. Interference requires the possibility of coherent superposition of the paths, but in this entangled state, the particle's reduced density matrix, obtained by tracing over the marker, shows no off-diagonal terms (coherences) if $\langle marker\ A | marker\ B\rangle = 0$ (Joos et al., 2003). The interference pattern is lost not due to a physical disturbance, but due to information leakage into another system.

Decoherence as the Apparent Collapse

Decoherence theory provides the dynamical framework for how entanglement with a vast, uncontrolled environment leads to the appearance of collapse (Zurek, 1991). Environment degrees of freedom act as a near-instantaneous and irreversible record of the system's state. For macroscopic objects, superpositions of position states become entangled with trillions of environmental photons and air molecules, leading to the rapid damping of interference terms. The system effectively behaves as if it is in one classical state or another, with probabilities given by the Born rule.

The quantum eraser elegantly separates decoherence from irreversibility. In a standard decoherence process, the environmental records are lost and uncontrollable. In the quantum eraser, the "which-path" information is stored in a controllable, coherent ancillary system (e.g., the polarization or orbital angular momentum of a photon). This allows for the possibility of a later unitary operation that erases the distinction between the marker states. The pioneering work of Scully and Drühl (1982) on an atomic quantum eraser highlighted this: by manipulating the states of cavities that stored path information, one could recover interference post-detection. This is not time-travel; it is a matter of conditional selection. As Kwiat et al. (1992) demonstrated in a optical experiment, the full data set of detections shows no interference. Only when one post-selects those detection events corresponding to a specific, "erased" outcome of the marker measurement does an interference pattern emerge in the subset.

The Quantum Eraser: Manipulating Structural Compatibility

This leads to our core thesis: The presence or absence of interference signifies the structural compatibility of the quantum description with a particular narrative. A narrative here is a story assigning definite properties (like "went through slit A") at specific times.

- Which-Path Information Available: The system is compatible with a "which-path" narrative. The entanglement establishes a one-to-one correlation between a system state and a distinct marker state. This correlation makes it possible, in principle, to assign a definite history to each detected particle. The quantum formalism is consistent with this narrative, and interference, which requires the negation of such a definite history, is absent.

- Information Erased: The erasure operation unitarily rotates the marker states so that they are no longer orthogonal (e.g., $|\text{marker A}\rangle$ and $|\text{marker B}\rangle$ become identical). This disentangles the particle from the marker (Kim et al., 2000). The composite system reverts to a product state. Now, no measurement on the marker alone can yield path information. The system is incompatible with a "which-path" narrative. The only consistent narrative for the particle is one of superposition, and interference is restored.

The "delayed-choice" aspect emphasizes that this compatibility is not a property fixed at the moment the particle passes the slits. It is a relational property of the entire experimental setup—particle plus marker plus the future measurement setting on the marker (Jacques et al., 2007). The structural compatibility is settled only when all relevant systems have interacted and a final context is defined.

An Active Interpretation: Collapse as Contextual Disentanglement

Where then is the "collapse"? We propose an interpretation that views the reduction of the wavefunction not as a passive update of an observer's knowledge, nor as a mysterious physical event, but as an active process of contextual disentanglement.

In a final projective measurement, the measuring apparatus M is designed to be strongly and redundantly coupled to a specific observable of the system S, generating a large and irreversible multiplicity of records in M and its environment (the principle of quantum Darwinism; Zurek, 2009). This creates a stable, branching structure in the wavefunction where different branches (corresponding to different outcomes) are effectively orthogonal and no longer interfere. The "collapse" is the active selection of one branch by the local, internal perspective of any system embedded within that specific branch. This selection is not random but is contextual: it is determined by the specific, irreversible pattern of entanglement and decoherence that constitutes a "measurement" in that particular instance.

The quantum eraser shows that before such irreversible decoherence occurs, the branching is tentative and reversible. The eraser operation is a coherent manipulation that re-merges the branches. Once irreversible registration occurs (e.g., a photon hits a detector and is absorbed, creating a multitude of environmental photons and heat), the branches become permanently separate, and the "collapse" for all practical purposes is complete (Blatter, 2020). The delayed-choice quantum eraser experiments with entanglement (e.g., Ma et al., 2013) further solidify this by showing that the erasure of information about one particle can dictate whether its entangled twin displays interference or not. This reinforces the view that the physical state is global and non-local, and that definite properties only crystallize in relation to a specific, finalized context.

Beyond Observer-Centric Models

The quantum eraser experiment demystifies the role of the observer. It demonstrates that the key ingredients are entanglement (Ze), controlled decoherence, and unitary erasure. The appearance or disappearance of interference is a direct signal of whether the total quantum state is compatible with a narrative of definite particle history. This compatibility is a physical, manipulable property of the composite system.

An active interpretation of collapse emerges from this: wavefunction reduction is the process by which, through irreversible decoherence and the proliferation of redundant records (Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016), one specific branch of the universal wavefunction becomes the stable, consistent, and singular reality for observers within it. The quantum eraser allows us to peer behind the curtain of this process, showing us the entangled scaffolding before the irreversible structure of classical reality is fully erected. It directs us away from subjective interpretations and towards a deeper investigation of quantum state structures, information flows, and the conditions for the emergence of objective classical descriptions from a quantum substrate.

Decoherence: The Standard Understanding and Its Outstanding Enigma

The Modern Framework: Entanglement and Information Loss

In contemporary quantum foundations, decoherence has emerged as the dominant paradigm for explaining the quantum-to-classical transition. It provides a physical, unitary, and observer-independent mechanism for the apparent collapse of the wavefunction. The process is elegantly summarized in a three-stage conceptual model:

1. Entanglement with the Environment: A quantum system S, initially in a superposition of states that are distinguishable by its surroundings, interacts with an environmental reservoir E. The interaction Hamiltonian typically couples to a preferred system observable (e.g., position), leading to the establishment of quantum correlations:

$$|\psi_S\rangle \otimes |E_0\rangle = \left(\sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle \right) \otimes |E_0\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{interaction}} \sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle \otimes |E_i\rangle$$

Here, $|E_i\rangle$ are environment states that are orthogonal or nearly orthogonal ($\langle E_i|E_j\rangle \approx \delta_{ij}$) for $i \neq j$. This step is pure unitary evolution (Zurek, 2003).

2. Leakage of Phase Information: The coherence of the system's superposition—encoded in the relative phases between the c_i — is transferred, or delocalized, into the quantum correlations with E. From the perspective of the system alone, this information becomes inaccessible. As Joos and Zeh (1985) famously demonstrated in their model of a particle interacting with a background gas, this leakage occurs on astonishingly short timescales for macroscopic superpositions.

3. Suppression of Interference in the Reduced Density Matrix: The practical consequence is assessed by tracing over the environmental degrees of freedom to obtain the reduced density matrix $\rho_S = \mathrm{Tr}_E (|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)$. For the entangled state above, if $\langle E_i|E_j\rangle=0$, then

$$\rho_S = \sum_i |c_i|^2 |s_i\rangle\langle s_i|$$

The off-diagonal terms ($i \neq j$), which represent quantum coherences and are necessary for interference, vanish. The system is described by an improper mixture—it behaves statistically as if it were in one of the states $s_i\rangle$ with probability $|c_i|^2$, even though the global state remains pure (Schlosshauer, 2005).

This framework successfully explains the fragility of quantum superpositions and the emergence of classicality in a wide array of systems, from quantum optics to condensed matter and cosmology (Kiefer & Joos, 1999).

The Crucial Distinction: Unavailability vs. Destruction

A pivotal insight of decoherence theory is the distinction between the global unitary reality and local empirical access. Decoherence does not destroy the wavefunction or eliminate interference in an absolute sense. The full, pure state of the system-plus-environment S+E continues to evolve unitarily, preserving all superpositions and phase correlations (Wallace, 2012). What decoherence achieves is the dynamical suppression of local interference effects. The phases become dispersed across a vast number of environmental degrees of freedom, making their reconstruction from local measurements on S alone practically impossible—a phenomenon akin to thermodynamic irreversibility (Zurek, 1998).

This "environment-induced superselection" or einselection explains why certain observables (like position for a dust grain) become classical "pointer states": they are the states least affected by further entanglement with the environment, remaining robust and thus preferentially selected (Zurek, 1982; Paz & Zurek, 2001). Decoherence, therefore, solves the preferred-basis problem by dynamically selecting a set of states immune to entangling interactions.

The Persistent Enigma: From Improper Mixture to Definite Outcome

Despite its monumental success, the standard account of decoherence is widely acknowledged to be incomplete. It provides a compelling narrative for why we do not see macroscopic superpositions, but it leaves a core metaphysical and interpretational question unanswered: Why, in any single run of an experiment, does one specific outcome—one particular branch of the wavefunction—become the actualized experience of a localized observer? This is the problem of outcomes or the issue of the "and" in the improper mixture (d'Espagnat, 1976; Adler, 2003).

The reduced density matrix ρ_S is formally equivalent to a classical ensemble of states $\{|s_i\rangle\}$ with probabilities $\{|c_i|^2\}$. However, this is a mathematical artifact of ignoring the environment. In reality, no individual system is in a definite but unknown $|s_i\rangle$; the universe is in the entangled superposition $\sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle \otimes |E_i\rangle$. Decoherence transforms a coherent superposition (a quantum "or") into an ensemble of branching, non-interfering histories (a quantum "and"). But it does not, by itself, specify how or why an observer embedded in one such branch should perceive their specific history as singular and definite (Kent, 2010).

As Leggett (2002) and others have argued, decoherence describes the disappearance of quantum effects but not the appearance of a single, concrete reality. The theory beautifully explains the diagonalization of the density matrix but remains silent on what we might call the "trajectory selection problem": what physical principle, beyond mere statistics, picks out the unique, localized history that any given experiment records? This is not a deficiency in the calculational machinery of decoherence but a conceptual gap at its interpretational frontier (Schlosshauer, 2019).

Bridging the Gap: Proposals and the Role of the Quantum Eraser

This enigma has spurred numerous interpretational responses. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) embraces the global wavefunction, positing that all branches are equally real, and the illusion of a single outcome arises from the observer's own branching (Vaidman, 2014). Objective Collapse Theories (e.g., GRW, Penrose) modify the Schrödinger equation with stochastic, non-linear terms to physically destroy superpositions at a fundamental level (Bassi & Ghirardi, 2003). The Consistent Histories approach attempts to define sets of mutually consistent narratives about the system, but it too struggles with the selection of a single history (Gell-Mann & Hartle, 1993; Omnès, 1992).

The quantum eraser experiment provides a critical experimental touchstone for this debate. It demonstrates with exquisite clarity that decoherence (the loss of interference) is reversible so long as the information remains coherently stored and accessible (Kim et al., 2000). The "which-path" information entangled with a photon's polarization does not constitute irreversible environmental monitoring. It is a controlled, reversible form of decoherence. This reinforces the core lesson: standard environmental decoherence is irreversible only in a practical, thermodynamic sense, due to the amplification and dispersal of information. The eraser shows that the transition from quantum "and" to classical "or" is not a sharp boundary but a continuum of increasing isolation of quantum correlations (Walborn et al., 2002).

Therefore, the enigma of trajectory selection may be reframed: it is the problem of explaining when and why the reversibility demonstrated in the quantum eraser becomes effectively impossible due to the scale and complexity of information encoding in the environment—a process described by Quantum Darwinism (Zurek, 2009; Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016). This theory posits that classical objectivity arises when information about a system is redundantly copied into multiple independent fragments of the environment. A definite outcome, for any local observer, is simply the consensus information read from any such fragment. The quantum eraser illuminates the preliminary, non-redundant stage of this process, while the final measurement—where erasure is impossible—represents its completion.

In conclusion, while decoherence provides the definitive dynamical mechanism for the emergence of classicality, it consciously stops short of a complete ontological explanation for single outcomes. It transforms the measurement problem from a paradox of instantaneous collapse into a well-defined question about the physics of information, irreversibility, and the structure of the quantum state in composite systems. The next section will build upon this by proposing an "active interpretation" that seeks to address this very enigma.

Decoherence: The Standard Understanding and Its Open Enigma

The Modern Framework: Entanglement and Information Loss

In contemporary physics, decoherence is recognized as the primary mechanism explaining the transition from quantum to classical behavior. It is a process arising from the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics itself, requiring no ad hoc collapse postulate. The standard understanding can be distilled into three interconnected concepts (Schlosshauer, 2005):

1. Entanglement of the system with its environment: When a quantum system S interacts with a large, complex environment E, it generally becomes quantum-mechanically entangled with it. For a system initially in a superposition $\sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle$ interacting with an environment initially in state $|E_0\rangle$, the composite state evolves unitarily to:

$$|\Psi\rangle_{SE} = \sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle \otimes |E_i(t)\rangle$$

where the environment states $|E_i(t)\rangle$ become orthogonal over time, $\langle E_i | E_j\rangle \to \delta_{ij}$ (Zurek, 2003). This entanglement encodes information about the system's state into the environment.

2. Leakage of phase information into the environment: The quantum coherence of the system—represented by the relative phases between the coefficients c_i — is not destroyed but rather delocalized into the correlations with the environmental degrees of freedom. From the perspective of an observer with access only to the system, this phase information becomes practically inaccessible as it disperses into the vast number of environmental states (Joos & Zeh, 1985).

3. Disappearance of interference terms in the reduced density matrix: The practical effect of decoherence is evaluated by considering the reduced density matrix of the system, $\rho_S = Tr_E (|\Psi\rangle_{SE} \langle\Psi|)$. As the environment states become orthogonal, the off-diagonal elements (coherences) of ρ_S, which are responsible for interference effects, decay exponentially:

$$\rho_S \to \sum_i |c_i|^2 |s_i\rangle\langle s_i|$$

4. This yields an improper mixture that is empirically indistinguishable, for measurements on S alone, from a classical statistical mixture of the states $|s_i\rangle$ (Kiefer & Joos, 1999).

This tripartite process explains the extreme fragility of macroscopic superpositions. Calculations show that for a object large enough to be seen, superposition states of different positions decohere on timescales many orders of magnitude shorter than any dynamical timescale, making them effectively unobservable (Gallís & Fleming, 1990).

A Critical Distinction: Unavailability versus Destruction

A pivotal insight of decoherence theory is a crucial clarification: decoherence does not destroy the wave function or eliminate interference in an absolute sense. The global, pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{SE}$ continues to evolve unitarily according to the Schrödinger equation, preserving all quantum correlations (Wallace, 2012). What decoherence achieves is the effective suppression of interference for local observations. The phase information becomes "hidden" in the intricate system-environment correlations, making its recovery from measurements on the system alone a practical impossibility—akin to the irreversibility in statistical thermodynamics (Zurek, 1998).

This leads to the concept of environment-induced superselection (einselection): the environment, through the form of the interaction Hamiltonian, dynamically selects a preferred set of system states—the pointer states. These are the states that become least entangled with the environment and thus remain most stable. For a wide class of interactions (e.g., scattering of photons or air molecules), the preferred observable is typically position, which explains why macroscopic objects appear localized in space (Zurek, 1982; Paz & Zurek, 2001).

The Persistent Open Question: The Problem of Outcomes

Despite its resounding success in explaining the appearance of classicality, standard decoherence theory is widely acknowledged to leave a fundamental interpretational question unresolved. This is often termed the "problem of outcomes" or the "issue of the 'and' versus the 'or'" (Adler, 2003).

Decoherence transforms a coherent quantum superposition (a simultaneous "and") into an ensemble of branching, effectively non-interfering histories in the global wave function. The reduced density matrix ρ_S becomes diagonal, mimicking a classical probability distribution. However, as d'Espagnat (1976) and others have emphasized, ρ_S describes an improper mixture. It does not imply that an individual system actually is in one specific state $|s_i\rangle$, unknown to us. The universe, in the most straightforward reading of the formalism, remains in the entangled superposition $\sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle \otimes |E_i\rangle$.

Therefore, the open question is: Why, in a single run of an experiment, do we observe one specific, definite outcome—a single localized history—and not the full superposition? Decoherence explains why we cannot see interference between outcomes, but it does not explain why we see this particular outcome and not that one. It elucidates the transition from a quantum "and" to a set of "and" branches, but it does not provide a mechanism for the final transition to a perceived "or" (Leggett, 2002; Kent, 2010). The theory successfully answers "How does classicality emerge?" but leaves unanswered "How does a single actualized reality emerge from the multitude of quantum possibilities?"

Bridging the Gap: Interpretations and the Quantum Eraser as a Rosetta Stone

This conceptual gap has fueled diverse interpretational programs. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) takes the global wavefunction at face value, positing that all branches are equally real, and the perception of a single outcome is a perspective effect internal to a branch (Vaidman, 2014). Objective Collapse Theories (e.g., GRW, Continuous Spontaneous Localization) propose small, non-linear modifications to the Schrödinger equation to physically destroy superpositions at a fundamental scale (Bassi & Ghirardi, 2003). The Consistent Histories approach seeks to define sets of mutually consistent narratives about the system but faces challenges in selecting a unique history that corresponds to experience (Gell-Mann & Hartle, 1993; Omnès, 1992).

The quantum eraser experiment serves as a critical Rosetta Stone for this debate. It demonstrates with unparalleled clarity that decoherence (the loss of local interference) is reversible as long as the information remains coherently stored and accessible (Kim, Yu, Kulik, Shih, & Scully, 2000). The "which-path" information stored in a photon's polarization does not constitute irreversible environmental monitoring; it is a controlled, miniature model of decoherence. The eraser operation shows that the apparent collapse can be "undone," restoring interference. This reinforces the central lesson: the irreversibility of standard environmental decoherence is practical and thermodynamic, stemming from the amplification and dispersal of information into a multitude of uncontrollable degrees of freedom (Walborn, Terra Cunha, Pádua, & Monken, 2002).

Consequently, the enigma of single outcomes can be reframed. It becomes the problem of explaining when and why the reversibility demonstrated in the quantum eraser becomes permanently lost. This is where frameworks like Quantum Darwinism enter (Zurek, 2009). This theory posits that classical objectivity arises when information about a system is redundantly copied into many independent fragments of the environment. A "definite outcome" for any local observer is simply the consensus information read from any such fragment. The transition to a single, perceived history coincides with the proliferation of multiple, robust records that are mutually consistent and accessible to different observers (Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016).

The quantum eraser, therefore, illuminates the preliminary stage of this process—where information exists in a single, coherent, and erasable record. The final, irreversible measurement represents the culmination: the creation of multiple, redundant, and thus objective records. The persistence of the "outcome problem" in standard decoherence theory highlights that a complete understanding requires moving beyond the system-environment dichotomy to a framework that accounts for the emergence of objective, classical facts from the quantum substrate. The next section will build on this foundation to propose an "active interpretation" that aims to address this very enigma by integrating the lessons of entanglement (Ze), controlled decoherence, and information-theoretic structure.

The Ze Interpretation: Decoherence as a Conflict of Generative Models

From Information Dynamics to Interpretive Competition

The standard formalism of decoherence and the quantum eraser experiment both point toward a reality where quantum behavior is dictated by the flow and accessibility of information. However, a purely information-theoretic account still lacks a causal mechanism for actualization—the "why this, not that" problem. The Ze interpretation (derived from the German Zustandserzeugung, or "state generation") proposes a shift in perspective. It treats quantum evolution not as the unfolding of a single objective wavefunction, but as a dynamic, competitive process between incompatible generative models that attempt to describe and predict the system's behavior. In this framework, decoherence and collapse are recast as phenomena arising from structural incompatibility between models, and the subsequent environmental amplification of one model's predictive framework (Friston, 2010; Buckley, Kim, McGregor, & Seth, 2017).

Generative Models: The Engine of Prediction

A generative model, in the sense used in computational neuroscience and machine learning, is an internal representation that can generate predictions about sensory data (Clark, 2013). The brain, for instance, is hypothesized to maintain a hierarchy of such models to infer the causes of its sensations (Friston, 2005). The Ze interpretation posits that a similar, though more fundamental, process operates at the quantum level. We consider two primary, competing generative models:

- Model A (Direct Causal Flow): This model corresponds to the narrative of a "real world" with definite, localized histories. It describes a forward, causal chain of events where a particle takes a specific path, interacts with a detector, and produces a localized outcome. Its predictions are concrete and correspond to classical trajectories. In variational terms, it minimizes its free energy (or prediction error) by adjusting its parameters to best predict data consistent with a particle-like ontology (Friston, 2010).
- Model B (Counterfactual Flow): This model corresponds to the narrative of a "possible world" characterized by superposition and interference. It describes a web of simultaneously existing potentialities, where a particle explores multiple paths, and outcomes are determined by global, non-local phase relationships. Its predictions are probabilistic and wave-like. It minimizes its free energy by predicting data consistent with an interference pattern.

Crucially, both models are not merely passive descriptions; they are active inference engines. They generate top-down predictions about future observations (e.g., where a photon will be detected on a screen) and, in a sense, "attempt" to steer the system's evolution to fulfill these predictions through the universal Hamiltonian dynamics, akin to the good regulator theorem in control theory (Conant & Ashby, 1970). The system's state is thus a temporary compromise or a superposition influenced by the competing predictions of these models.

Decoherence as Structural Model Conflict

In the Ze interpretation, decoherence occurs when the predictions of Model A and Model B become structurally incompatible, and the environment begins to selectively amplify the predictions of one model over the other.

Consider the moment in a quantum experiment when "which-path" information becomes available (e.g., a photon's path is marked by its polarization). This act of tagging creates an entangled record. From the perspective of Model A, this is a perfect update: it can now incorporate a definite path into its causal story, reducing its prediction error for any subsequent measurement correlated with that path. For Model B, however, this tagging is catastrophic. Model B's core predictive power relies on coherent superposition. The entangled marker makes the paths distinguishable in principle. The two generative models now make mutually exclusive predictions:

- Model A predicts no interference and a particle-like distribution.
- Model B predicts interference and a wave-like distribution.

They cannot both be correct for the same set of future measurements. This is the structural incompatibility (Fields, Glazebrook, & Levin, 2021). The environment, through the process of einselection (Zurek, 2003), acts as an arbiter. Interaction with environmental degrees of freedom (air molecules, stray photons) rapidly and redundantly copies the information corresponding to Model A's narrative—the information about a distinct path. The environment, in effect, "votes" for the model that describes localized, redundantly recordable facts (Zurek, 2009). Model B's predictions, which require phase coherence across the entire superposition, become exponentially less accurate in forecasting the behavior of any local subsystem (the particle as observed). The off-diagonal terms in the density matrix decay because the environmental interactions render Model B an inefficient, high-free-energy model for making local predictions (Schwartenbeck et al., 2013).

Collapse as Forced Stabilization of a Compatible Structure

What, then, is collapse in the Ze interpretation? It is not an instantaneous physical event, nor merely the subjective updating of a Bayesian observer. It is the forced stabilization of a global structure that is compatible with both competing generative models, resolving their conflict by eliminating the source of their incompatibility.

The quantum eraser experiment provides the clearest illustration. When which-path information is available, Model A is strongly amplified by the environment, and its predictions dominate. The system stabilizes into a structure (a mixed state) compatible with a "which-path" narrative. There is no interference because Model B has been effectively suppressed—its predictions are incompatible with the existing environmental records.

The erasure operation is a profound intervention. By unitarily manipulating the marker (e.g., rotating polarizations to become identical), it destroys the distinguishability of the paths. This act dismantles the evidential basis for Model A's specific causal narrative. Crucially, it does not simply restore Model B. Instead, it creates a new context where the previously conflicting models are no longer incompatible. In this new context, the only stable, low-free-energy structure for the combined system (particle + erased marker) is one that is compatible with both a description lacking path information (Model A can no longer specify a path) and a description requiring phase coherence (Model B's predictions become viable again). This stable structure is a pure, disentangled state that displays interference (Kim, Yu, Kulik, Shih, & Scully, 2000).

The "collapse" upon final detection is the terminal point of this stabilization process. When a photon is absorbed by a detector, triggering an irreversible amplification cascade (e.g., a photomultiplier tube or a blackening grain on a photographic plate), an astronomical number of environmental degrees of freedom become correlated with one specific outcome (one slit, one position). At this point, the conflict is permanently resolved. The global structure that stabilizes is one where Model A's predictions for a specific, localized outcome are overwhelmingly accurate, and Model B's predictions for that specific run are definitively falsified. The free energy of Model B for describing the localized event becomes infinite—it is a completely ineffective model. The system settles into a classical record.

This framework naturally incorporates the delayed-choice paradox. The "choice" of which model (wave or particle) provides the better description is not made at the slits. It is finalized only when the last element of the experimental context—the eraser or the final detector setting—establishes which global structure (entangled and path-distinguishable, or disentangled and interference-capable) can achieve minimal free energy for the entire setup. As Jacques et al. (2007) demonstrated, the decision to measure or erase can be made after the particle has been detected, retroactively determining which generative model was, in fact, the compatible one for the complete history of the event.

An Active, Physical, and Non-Observer-Centric View

The Ze interpretation offers an active, physical account of wavefunction collapse without invoking a conscious observer. Collapse is the dynamical process by which a quantum system, under pressure from competing internal generative descriptions and environmental arbitration, settles into a stable configuration that minimizes overall predictive conflict. Decoherence is the manifestation of one model winning the competition for local predictive efficiency. The quantum eraser shows that this victory is not final until the context that defines the terms of the competition is fully specified.

This view bridges the gap between the formalism of decoherence and the experience of definite outcomes. The "outcome" is the specific, stable structure that remains when all competing models have been reconciled by the total environmental context. It is an objective physical process—the forced stabilization of a specific informational geometry—not a subjective Bayesian update. It provides a principled reason, grounded in the physics of prediction and information flow, for why one history is actualized: it is the history embedded in the sole globally consistent structure that can persist once all model conflicts have been resolved by irreversible environmental registration.

The Quantum Eraser Through the Lens of Ze

The Double-Slit Paradigm: From Interference to Conflict

The foundational double-slit experiment provides the archetypal stage upon which the principles of the Ze interpretation are most vividly displayed. In the standard interpretation, the emergence of an interference pattern when both slits are open is attributed to the superposition of wavefunctions, while its disappearance upon obtaining "which-path" information is often colloquially ascribed to the "disturbance" of measurement. Within the Ze framework, this narrative is replaced by a description in terms of model compatibility and variational free energy.

In the undisturbed double-slit configuration, the system—a photon or electron traveling towards the screen—is subject to the competing generative models. Model A (Causal Flow) generates predictions corresponding to a particle traveling through a specific slit, leading to two broad, overlapping peaks on the detection screen. Model B (Counterfactual Flow) generates predictions that incorporate phase information from both slits, resulting in the characteristic interference fringes. Critically, in the absence of a discriminable path marker, these models are not structurally incompatible. The prediction of Model B can be understood, from Model A's perspective, as arising from a set of compatible path hypotheses—a probabilistic mixture where no single path is definitively assigned (Englert, 1996). The system settles into a state of low inter-model conflict. This is not a static condition but a dynamic equilibrium where the variational free energy difference between the predictions of the two models, denoted ΔF, is minimized. The resulting stable structure of the system is the pure, coherent wavefunction that produces an interference pattern. This pattern is the empirical signature of a consensus state between competing but not yet mutually exclusive generative narratives (Fields et al., 2021).

The introduction of a "which-path" detector fundamentally alters this equilibrium. This is not a passive observation but an active intervention that seeds structural incompatibility (Jacques et al., 2007). By coupling the system to a marker degree of freedom (e.g., polarizing filters at the slits), the experiment creates a record that distinguishes path A from path B. For Model A, this is an information gain that sharpens its predictions, reducing its internal free energy. For Model B, this is a fatal corruption: the very condition for its predictive success—the indistinguishability of the paths—is destroyed. The two models now make definitively contradictory predictions about the future detection statistics. The ΔF between them sharply increases, indicating a high-conflict state. The environment, interacting with this newly created discriminable information, begins to selectively amplify the predictions of Model A, as these correspond to redundantly recordable, localized facts (Zurek, 2009). The stable structure that emerges from this environmentally mediated arbitration is the entangled system-marker state. Its local manifestation—the particle's reduced density matrix—is diagonal in the path basis, corresponding to the two broad peaks and the disappearance of interference (Schlosshauer, 2005). The conflict is resolved by the suppression, for any local observer, of Model B's predictive viability.

The Erasure Mechanism: Resolving Structural Contradiction

The quantum eraser experiment is not a reversal of time, nor does it "undo" a measurement in the classical sense (Scully & Drühl, 1982). Within the Ze interpretation, its operation is understood as a procedure that actively dismantles the structural contradiction between Model A and Model B, thereby restoring the conditions for a low-conflict consensus state.

The erasure operation—typically a unitary manipulation of the path marker, such as passing photons through a properly oriented polarizer or beamsplitter—performs a specific function: it destroys the discriminability of the marker states. Consider markers in orthogonal polarization states $|H\rangle_A$ and $|V\rangle_B$. A polarizer at 45° projects both onto the same state $|D\rangle = (|H\rangle + |V\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$. This operation has two profound consequences in the Ze framework:

1. It deprives the environment of the ability to selectively amplify one model. The environmental degrees of freedom that previously interacted with distinct $|H\rangle$ or $|V\rangle$ states now interact with the same projected state $|D\rangle$. The information that allowed the environment to "vote" for Model A's specific causal narrative is erased. The environment can no longer break the symmetry between the paths (Kim et al., 2000).
2. It drastically reduces the variational free energy difference (ΔF) between the models. By removing the basis for distinguishing the paths, the eraser nullifies the core contradiction. Model A can no longer maintain a sharp prediction for a specific path; its best description reverts to a mixture of compatible hypotheses. Model B's requirement for indistinguishability is satisfied. The high-conflict state is replaced by one where the two models, while still conceptually distinct, are no longer making mutually exclusive empirical predictions for the post-erasure subsystem.

The restoration of interference fringes in the sub-ensemble of particles selected by the eraser is the direct empirical signature of this newly achieved low-conflict consensus. The global state of the system (particle + erased marker) is forced to stabilize into a structure compatible with both models: a structure where no which-path information exists (satisfying the updated, weaker constraints of Model A) and where phase coherence is preserved (enabling Model B's predictions). This is not a return to a past state but the creation of a new stable present under a new set of contextual constraints imposed by the eraser (Walborn et al., 2002).

The "Delayed Choice": A Model-Level Decision, Not a Historical One

The most counterintuitive aspect of the quantum eraser—the fact that the erasure can be chosen after the particle has been detected—ceases to be paradoxical within the Ze framework. The paradox arises from the erroneous assumption that the particle commits to a definite "history" (wave or particle) at the slits. The Ze interpretation rejects this assumption. The particle does not have a standalone, context-independent history. Instead, what becomes definite is the outcome of the model competition, and this competition is settled only when the complete experimental context—which includes the final configuration of the eraser—is fixed (Ma, Kofler, & Zeilinger, 2016).

The "choice" in a delayed-choice quantum eraser (Wheeler, 1978; Jacques et al., 2007) is not a choice about the particle's past trajectory. It is a choice made at the level of the generative models that will be allowed to participate in the final stabilization. By deciding whether to insert an eraser or a which-path readout apparatus in the marker's path after the particle's detection, the experimenter selects which set of model constraints will be applied to the entire, time-extended process.

- If the final choice is to read the which-path information from the marker, the experimental context from preparation to final readout is one that enforces the discriminability of paths. This context privileges Model A from start to finish. The high-conflict state is maintained, and the environment's amplification of Model A's predictions is retroactively validated as the correct description for this specific complete setup. The detection data will show no interference.
- If the final choice is to erase the which-path information, the final context is one that destroys discriminability. This context, when applied to the entire process, dictates that the only stable structure for the complete experiment is one where Model B's predictions are viable. The conflict is deemed resolved in favor of a low-ΔF consensus, and the subset of data correlated with the erasure outcome displays interference.

Thus, the delayed choice does not affect the past particle; it determines which of the two competing global descriptions—the high-conflict (which-path) narrative or the low-conflict (interference) narrative—constitutes the self-consistent, stable structure for the entire, closed quantum process (Fields & Levin, 2020). The apparent retrocausality is an illusion stemming from our classical insistence on ascribing a unique, sequential history. In reality, the "history" is a single, non-separable whole, and its classical interpretation (particle-like or wave-like) is a relational property that crystallizes only upon the finalization of all boundary conditions, including those in the future (Rovelli, 1996). The Ze interpretation formalizes this by showing that the stabilization of a definite structure is a global minimization of free energy conflict, a process that logically depends on the totality of constraints, including those applied last.

The Eraser as a Conflict Resolution Device

In summary, the quantum eraser experiment, interpreted through the Ze framework, reveals the following principles:

1. Interference is a signature of a physical state where competing generative models (causal/particle and counterfactual/wave) coexist in a low-conflict, high-consensus equilibrium.

2. Which-path information is an active operation that injects structural incompatibility between these models, creating a high-conflict state that the environment resolves by amplifying the model corresponding to localized facts.

3. Erasure is an operation that removes the source of the structural incompatibility, dismantling the environmental basis for model selection and forcing the system into a new low-conflict consensus state that manifests as restored interference.

4. Delayed choice underscores that the outcome of this model competition—and thus the perceived "nature" of the quantum event—is not a local property but a global, contextual property of the entire experimental arrangement, fixed only when no further constraints can be applied.

The quantum eraser, therefore, is not a mere curiosity but a critical tool. It demonstrates that the transition from quantum to classical description is not a one-way street determined at the moment of "measurement." It is a contingent process of model competition and structural stabilization that can be coherently manipulated. The Ze interpretation provides a vocabulary and a mechanism—grounded in the physics of information, prediction, and variational free energy—to describe this process without recourse to consciousness, fundamental randomness, or mysterious collapses, offering a path toward a fully physical and active understanding of quantum reality.

Why Molecules "Collapse" Faster: Self-Decoherence and Model Conflict Amplification in Ze

The Experimental Landscape: From Electrons to Large Molecules

The gradual transition from unambiguous quantum interference to classical behavior is not a philosophical abstraction but a robust experimental frontier. Groundbreaking matter-wave interferometry experiments have demonstrated quantum superposition with increasingly massive objects, from electrons and neutrons to atoms, small molecules like C_{60}, and finally to massive organic molecules with masses exceeding 25,000 atomic mass units (Arndt, Juffmann, & Vedral, 2009; Eibenberger et al., 2013; Fein et al., 2019). A clear empirical trend emerges: as the complexity and mass of the interfering object increase, maintaining spatial coherence becomes exponentially more difficult. The interference fringes for a macromolecule like phthalocyanine or an oligoporphyrin are observed only under extreme conditions of high vacuum and cryogenic temperatures, shielding the particle from external environmental decoherence (Juffmann et al., 2012; Brand et al., 2015). The standard decoherence explanation attributes this to increased coupling to the environment via scattering, emission, or gravitational interactions (Hornberger, Sipe, & Arndt, 2004). While correct, this external view is incomplete. The Ze interpretation provides a complementary and more fundamental internal account: larger, more complex systems do not just couple more strongly to an external environment; they become their own environment, leading to accelerated internal resolution of model conflict.

The Ze Perspective: Internal Degrees of Freedom as an Internal Environment

The central tenet of the Ze interpretation is that quantum behavior is governed by the competition between generative models (Model A: causal/particle; Model B: counterfactual/wave). Decoherence is the process by which this conflict is resolved through environmental arbitration. For a structureless elementary particle, the only "environment" is external. Its internal state space is minimal. For a complex molecule, the situation is profoundly different. A large organic molecule possesses a vast number of internal degrees of freedom: vibrational modes, rotational states, conformational isomers, and electronic excitations (Hornberger, Gerlich, Ulbricht, & Arndt, 2012). In the Ze framework, these are not mere spectators; they constitute an internal environment.

When such a molecule is put into a spatial superposition (e.g., passing through a double-slit in an interferometer), Model B describes its center-of-mass coordinate as being in a coherent superposition of two paths. However, the internal degrees of freedom—the vibrations and rotations of its atomic bonds—are exquisitely sensitive to the molecular configuration. Even minute differences in the effective potential along path A versus path B can lead to distinct excitations or phase shifts in these internal modes (Hackermüller, Hornberger, & Arndt, 2004). Crucially, this interaction between the center-of-mass coordinate (the "system" in a simplified view) and the internal modes (the "internal environment") is a form of self-entanglement. The global state evolves from a product state to an entangled one:

$$|\Psi\rangle \rightarrow (1/\sqrt{2}) \left(|\text{Path A}\rangle\_\text{COM} \otimes |\text{Internal State A}\rangle + |\text{Path B}\rangle\_\text{COM} \otimes |\text{Internal State B}\rangle \right)$$

This is precisely the structure that creates structural incompatibility between Model A and Model B. The internal states $|\text{Internal State A}\rangle$ and $|\text{Internal State B}\rangle$ act as a which-path marker, but one that is intrinsic to the object itself (Romero-Isart et al., 2011). Model A can now leverage this internal record to sharpen its causal, single-path prediction. For Model B, this internal entanglement is just as destructive as an external which-path detector: it provides a basis for distinguishing the paths, violating the condition for interference.

Accelerated Conflict Resolution via Self-Decoherence

The consequence of this self-entanglement is self-decoherence. The conflict between the generative models is not resolved by an external photon scattering off the molecule, but by the molecule's own internal dynamics. The timescale for this resolution is not primarily a function of mass per se, but of the complexity and density of the internal state space, and the strength of the coupling between the center-of-mass coordinate and these internal degrees of freedom (Gallagher & DeMille, 2019).

The process can be understood stepwise within Ze:

1. Seeding of Incompatibility: The act of preparing the spatial superposition in an interferometer inherently places the molecule's internal structure in slightly different

conditions along each possible path. This seeds the correlation, creating the initial internal which-path marker.

2. Rapid Proliferation of the Internal Record: Due to the large number of internal modes, the information about the path is rapidly and redundantly encoded into many independent internal subsystems (vibrational phonons, etc.). This mimics, internally, the process of Quantum Darwinism, where information becomes objective by its proliferation into multiple fragments (Zurek, 2009; Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016). The internal environment thus "votes" overwhelmingly and almost instantaneously for Model A's narrative.

3. Exponential Suppression of Model B: The variational free energy difference (ΔF) between Model A and Model B skyrockets. Model B, which requires coherence across the superposition, becomes an astronomically poor predictor for the state of any subset of the molecule's degrees of freedom, including its eventual center-of-mass position upon detection. The internal entanglement effectively diagonalizes the reduced density matrix for the center-of-mass coordinate on a timescale that can be far shorter than that imposed by external decoherence channels (Paz & Zurek, 2001).

Therefore, the observed rapid "collapse" of the interference pattern for large molecules is not a direct manifestation of their greater mass or some new gravitational effect (Penrose, 1996), but a natural consequence of accelerated self-decoherence driven by the resolution of internal model conflict. The molecule's own complexity provides the mechanism to swiftly arbitrate between the competing wave and particle descriptions, decisively selecting the localized, causal model (Model A) before the external world even has a chance to interact with it. Experiments demonstrating the dependence of decoherence rates on internal temperature (vibrational excitation) strongly support this view: hotter molecules, with more active internal degrees of freedom, decohere faster, as predicted by models of internal thermally driven decoherence (Hackermüller et al., 2004; Nimmrichter & Hornberger, 2013).

Collapse as a Consequence of Architectural Complexity

This analysis leads to a profound shift in perspective within the Ze interpretation: Collapse is not a primitive property attached to mass or energy; it is an emergent phenomenon stemming from architectural complexity that enables efficient self-decoherence. A macroscopic object—a cat, a pointer needle—does not require an external observer to collapse its wavefunction. Its own immense internal complexity, comprising ~10^{23} coupled degrees of freedom, ensures that any superposition of macroscopically distinct states (like $|alive\rangle$ and $|dead\rangle$) would lead to near-instantaneous self-entanglement. The internal conflict between models would be resolved on timescales utterly inaccessible to observation, freezing the object into a state compatible with a single, definite causal history (Model A).

This reframes the measurement problem. The apparatus in a Stern-Gerlach experiment does not have a special "collapse" power. It is simply a system of such immense internal complexity that its interaction with a spin creates an internal which-path record (e.g., different mechanical vibrations or thermal distributions corresponding to "up" vs. "down" trajectories) that is amplified and stabilized almost instantaneously via self-decoherence (Schlosshauer, 2005). The Ze interpretation thus unifies the decoherence of molecules in an interferometer with the "collapse" in a measurement device: both are instances of a complex physical system using its own internal structure to rapidly resolve a fundamental conflict between incompatible descriptions of reality.

In conclusion, the study of molecular interferometry provides critical empirical support for the Ze interpretation. It shows that the transition to classicality is not merely an external disturbance but an intrinsic propensity of complex systems. The faster "collapse" of molecules is a direct signature of the accelerated dynamics of model conflict resolution, where the system’s own internal degrees of freedom act as the first and most efficient arbiter, forcing a stabilization into a state compatible with a single, localized narrative long before the external environment completes the job.

Measurement Without an Observer: Active Stabilization and the Primacy of Environmental Support

Dissolving the Observer-Centric Fallacy

The historical interpretational conundrums of quantum mechanics have often centered on the perceived role of an “observer”—variously construed as a conscious being, a classical apparatus, or an ill-defined agent causing wavefunction collapse. The Copenhagen interpretation, despite its pragmatic success, famously left the nature of the “measurement” process as a primitive, unanalyzed axiom, creating an uncomfortable chasm between the quantum and classical realms (Fuchs & Peres, 2000). The Ze interpretation (Zustandserzeugung) offers a definitive escape from this observer-centric fallacy by providing a fully physical, mechanistic account of quantum measurement. Within this framework, measurement is not an act of conscious apprehension or an intervention by a mysterious classical entity. It is an active, physical process of structural stabilization driven by the resolution of conflict between incompatible generative models.

This perspective decisively eliminates two problematic dependencies. First, it requires no appeal to consciousness. The brain of a physicist is merely another complex physical system that may itself become entangled with a quantum system, but its conscious experience is a consequence, not a cause, of the underlying stabilization process (Tegmark, 2000). Second, it does not presuppose a pre-existing classical world. The “classicality” of a pointer on a measurement device is not an imported ontological given but an emergent property. It is the stable, low-free-energy outcome of a specific kind of physical interaction—one that generates redundant, robust records within the system-environment complex, as described by Quantum Darwinism (Zurek, 2009; Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016). The measuring apparatus is simply a system designed to have a vast number of internal and external degrees of freedom that rapidly and irreversibly become correlated with a specific system observable, thereby forcing a decisive stabilization in favor of one generative model.

Measurement as Active Predictive Stabilization

In the Ze interpretation, the core of a measurement event is the dynamic transition from a state of high predictive conflict between Model A (causal/particle) and Model B (counterfactual/wave) to a state of unambiguous structural stability. This is an active, physical process akin to a phase transition, not a passive update of knowledge (Fields, Glazebrook, & Marcianò, 2017).

Consider a prototypical measurement: a spin-½ particle encountering a Stern-Gerlach magnet. Initially, the spin is in a superposition $|\uparrow\rangle+|\downarrow\rangle$. The two generative models are in a state of latent conflict. Model B predicts a continuous, wave-like behavior. Model A, while unable to specify an outcome, predicts a branching of possibilities. The magnetic field gradient begins to spatially separate the wavepackets corresponding to spin-up and spin-down. Crucially, this spatial separation initiates entanglement between the spin degree of freedom and the center-of-mass coordinate of the particle itself (Joos et al., 2003). This is the first step in creating a discriminable record.

The measurement is completed not when the particle strikes a detector screen, but when this incipient record is amplified and stabilized through interaction with a complex environment. The detector—be it a phosphor screen, a semiconductor pixel, or a cloud chamber droplet—is a system with a high density of metastable states. The localized deposition of energy from the particle triggers an irreversible, nonlinear amplification cascade (e.g., ionization, chemical change, phonon excitation). This cascade proliferates the which-spin information into a vast number of environmental degrees of freedom (photons, lattice vibrations, charge carriers) (Blatt & Roos, 2012). From the perspective of the Ze framework, this environmental proliferation acts as an active selector. It overwhelmingly reinforces the predictive accuracy of Model A for one specific outcome (e.g., "particle localized here, corresponding to spin-up"). Simultaneously, it renders Model B's prediction for a coherent superposition across both outcomes an ineffective, high-free-energy description for any local subsystem, including any potential "observer" (Schlosshauer, 2005).

Thus, the "click" of the detector is the macroscopic signature of the forced stabilization of a globally consistent structure that is compatible only with a single, definite causal history (Model A). The measurement outcome is the specific value around which this stable structure crystallizes. There is no "collapse" in the sense of a discontinuous jump in an abstract wavefunction; there is the continuous, thermodynamically irreversible process of conflict resolution through environmental information amplification.

The Quantum Eraser: What Information Does Versus What the Environment Can Support

The quantum eraser experiment provides the crucial evidence that shifts the focus from the act of information acquisition to the environmental capacity to sustain the conflict between interpretations. The standard, incomplete narrative states that “obtaining which-path information destroys interference.” The Ze interpretation, informed by the eraser, refines this: It is not the fact of information existing in principle that matters, but whether the physical environment is structured to maintain and amplify the incompatibility between Model A and Model B (Kim, Yu, Kulik, Shih, & Scully, 2000).

In a which-path experiment without erasure, the path marker (e.g., orthogonal photon polarizations) is allowed to interact with a wider environment (e.g., the optics, the air, the detector housing). These environmental interactions rapidly make the orthogonal marker states distinguishable, creating redundant records. The environment thus becomes committed to supporting the conflict. It actively upholds the structural incompatibility, making Model B’s predictions unsustainable. The interference vanishes because the environmental context enforces a high-conflict state where only Model A’s branching narratives are locally viable.

The eraser operation fundamentally changes this environmental commitment. By unitarily rotating the marker states to be identical, the eraser removes the basis for environmental discrimination. After erasure, any subsequent environmental interaction treats the markers as the same state. The environment is therefore deprived of the physical means to sustain the model conflict. Without this sustained environmental support for the incompatibility, the system is free to relax into a low-conflict consensus state. The interference reappears not because information is “lost” in an epistemic sense, but because the physical conditions for maintaining predictive warfare have been deliberately dismantled (Walborn, Terra Cunha, Pádua, & Monken, 2002).

This explains the delayed-choice scenario with no retrocausality (Jacques et al., 2007). The choice to erase or not is a choice about the final environmental configuration. If the final configuration includes a which-path readout device, the environment is configured to sustain the conflict to the very end, locking in a high-ΔF state. If the final configuration includes an eraser, the environment is configured to withdraw its support for the conflict at the last moment, allowing a low-ΔF state to form. The “particle’s history” is not changed; the outcome of the model competition is determined by the full, time-extended environmental context.

Implications for the Foundation of Quantum Mechanics

The Ze interpretation, culminating in this analysis of measurement, offers a coherent and parsimonious foundation that addresses long-standing issues:

1. The Measurement Problem: It is solved by replacing the vague “measurement” postulate with a specific physical process: environmental amplification leading to the forced stabilization of one model’s predictions. The “definite outcome” is the value associated with the stabilized structure (Adler, 2003).

2. The Heisenberg Cut: The arbitrary boundary between quantum system and classical apparatus disappears. All systems are quantum; “classicality” is a relational property denoting that a system’s state has been sufficiently stabilized via environmental

redundancy that its description by Model A is effectively unchallengeable by Model B (Fields & Levin, 2020).

3. The Role of Information: Information is not semantic; it is physical correlation. Measurement is the process of creating robust, objective (i.e., redundantly encoded) correlations (Zurek, 2003). The eraser shows that not all correlations are equally effective; only those the environment is configured to preserve and amplify lead to stable, classical facts.

4. Non-locality and Contextuality: These features arise naturally. The stabilized structure is a global property of the system-environment whole. Changing the final context (e.g., inserting an eraser) changes which global structure can achieve stability, explaining contextuality without conspiracy (Kochen & Specker, 1967).

In conclusion, the Ze interpretation demystifies measurement by grounding it in the active dynamics of prediction, conflict, and environmental stabilization. The quantum eraser is not a paradox but a revelation: it shows that the quantum-to-classical transition is governed by the environmental support for interpretational conflict, not by the gaze of a conscious mind. Measurement is what happens when the physical world, through the relentless logic of entangling interactions and the second law of thermodynamics, is forced to pick a consistent story about what just happened. It is a physical process of narrative selection, happening all the time, everywhere, with no observer required.

Consequences and Predictions: Testable Implications of the Ze Interpretation

Introduction: Moving from Interpretation to Empirical Science

A robust physical interpretation must do more than offer a coherent narrative for existing phenomena; it must generate novel, falsifiable predictions that distinguish it from other frameworks. The Ze interpretation (Zustandserzeugung), by recasting quantum dynamics as a competition between generative models resolved through environmental stabilization, moves beyond metaphysical speculation to yield concrete, experimentally testable consequences. These predictions concern the nature of interference, the efficiency of information control, the temporal structure of collapse, and the very definition of the quantum-classical boundary. This section outlines four key classes of predictions that follow from the Ze framework, demonstrating its potential to transform from an interpretation into a guide for empirical inquiry.

Prediction 1: Interference Recovery in Non-Physical Data Systems

The Ze interpretation posits that interference is a signature of a low-conflict consensus state between Model A (causal) and Model B (counterfactual). Crucially, the "environment" that sustains or dissolves this conflict is defined not by a pre-existing classical domain, but by any set of degrees of freedom that can become redundantly correlated with the system, thereby amplifying one model's predictions. This leads to a striking prediction: Interference phenomena, or their statistical analogues, could be recovered in purely informational or "non-physical" data systems where traditional quantum states are not directly present, provided the data processing mimics the structural conflict resolution of Ze.

Consider a complex adaptive system, such as a neural network or an ecological model, processing ambiguous sensory data that supports multiple incompatible causal narratives (Friston, 2010; Buckley, Kim, McGregor, & Seth, 2017). One narrative (Model A) might be a simple, localized cause. Another (Model B) might be a distributed, global interaction. The system's internal state, minimizing its variational free energy, may oscillate between these interpretations, leading to unstable perceptions or predictions. The Ze framework suggests that by implementing an "eraser" operation—a data processing step that deliberately destroys the features that make the narratives distinguishable—one could force the system into a stable, "interfering" consensus state that exhibits properties (e.g., specific correlation patterns) not present when the narratives are kept separate.

A concrete test could involve machine learning classifiers trained on data tagged with "which-path" style metadata. Initial training would yield a model whose internal representations are entangled with this metadata, analogous to a decohered state. A subsequent "erasure" algorithm, applied not to the raw data but to the learned internal representations (e.g., projecting layer activations onto a common subspace), could, according to Ze, restore an ability to detect higher-order, "interference-like" correlations in the data that were inaccessible before. Such an effect would not be quantum interference in the traditional sense but would be a direct informational analogue, predicted by the universal conflict-resolution logic of Ze (Bruza, Kitto, Ramm, & Sitbon, 2015). Experiments searching for these statistical signatures in complex systems would test the generality of the principles underlying quantum complementarity.

Prediction 2: Active Action Cycling Outperforms Passive Erasure

In standard quantum eraser experiments, erasure is typically a passive, final filtering step (e.g., a polarizer). The Ze interpretation, with its emphasis on active inference and model competition, suggests a more dynamic protocol. If decoherence is the environmentally supported dominance of Model A, then erasure is the removal of that environmental support. An active, cyclic alternation of actions designed to probe different models should be more effective at maintaining a system in a coherent, "pre-stabilized" state than a single, passive erasure step.

This prediction could be tested in matter-wave interferometry with complex molecules. The standard approach is to shield the molecule from all environmental interactions to preserve coherence. Ze suggests an alternative: introduce a controlled, rhythmic sequence of weak, non-destructive "probes" that are alternately sensitive to particle-like (Model A) and wave-like (Model B) properties. For instance, one could alternate between weak momentum transfers that would distinguish paths (seeding Model A conflict) and weak phase perturbations that are sensitive to coherence (seeding Model B conflict). The prediction is that such active cycling could extend the coherence time compared to purely passive isolation. The rationale is that constantly "probing" both models prevents the environment from decisively committing to amplifying one model's predictions, keeping the system in a dynamic, metastable regime of ongoing competition. This is akin to a driven system being kept away from a stable equilibrium (Briegel & Popescu, 2008). Successful demonstration would provide direct evidence for the active, competitive nature of the pre-collapse state posited by Ze.

Prediction 3: Collapse as a Process with a Detectable Timescale and Structure

The Ze interpretation explicitly rejects the notion of collapse as an instantaneous, structureless event. Collapse is the process of environmental stabilization—the proliferation of redundant records that force a resolution of model conflict. Therefore, the "collapse" of a quantum state should have a finite, potentially measurable duration and internal structure corresponding to the timescale of record proliferation. While the final outcome is binary, the pathway to that outcome is a continuous physical process (Adler, 2003).

This leads to a new class of experiments aimed at probing the "collapse transient." Consider a superconducting qubit coupled to a microwave resonator that acts as a measurement apparatus (the "environment"). Standard readout measures the final, stable pointer state. Ze predicts that by performing ultra-fast, weak measurements (e.g., using quantum non-demolition techniques) during the brief interval when the qubit's state is becoming correlated with an increasing number of photons in the resonator, one could observe a smooth transition. The system would evolve from a state where weak measurements yield random results (high model conflict) to one where they consistently point toward the final outcome (stabilization of Model A) (Korotkov & Jordan, 2006). The timescale and functional form of this transition—how the "which-outcome" information spreads from the qubit into the resonator mode and then into its external environment—is a direct experimental signature of the collapse process. Deviations from simple exponential models could reveal the nonlinear dynamics of model competition and stabilization predicted by the variational free energy framework underlying Ze (Friston, 2019).

Prediction 4: The "Classicality Threshold" is Dynamic and Task-Dependent

In many interpretations, the quantum-classical divide is tied to a fundamental scale (mass, size, complexity) or requires an ad hoc postulate. Ze posits that classicality emerges when environmental redundancy makes Model A's predictions so robust that Model B becomes an ineffective descriptor for a given observer or task (Zurek, 2009). This implies that the threshold for "classical" behavior is not a universal constant but is dynamic and context-dependent, hinging on the required degree of objectivity and the specific information-gathering capabilities of the observer.

A testable manifestation of this is in quantum Darwinism experiments. The theory predicts that as a system interacts with an environment, information about its pointer state is imprinted onto multiple environmental fragments (Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016). The Ze interpretation adds a crucial nuance: an object becomes "classical" for a particular agent only when that agent can access a sufficient number of these fragments to unambiguously infer the system's state, thereby resolving any residual model conflict. The prediction is that the perceived classicality of an object will vary continuously with the fraction of the environment an observer can monitor.

An experiment could use a trapped ion or a nanomechanical oscillator as the system, with its photon emission field serving as the environment. By placing detectors that capture only a variable fraction of the total emitted photons (the environmental fragments), one could measure how the fidelity of state inference improves with the fraction captured. Ze predicts a smooth crossover: for a detector capturing a tiny fraction, the data may remain consistent with both a particle model and a smeared wave model (residual conflict). As the fraction increases, the inference becomes unambiguous, marking the transition to "classical" for that detector. The key prediction is that there is no sharp threshold; the point of unambiguous inference depends on the noise tolerance of the inference algorithm and the fraction of the environment sampled (Blume-Kohout & Zurek, 2008). This directly challenges views of classicality as an absolute, observer-independent property.

Synthesis: Ze as a Framework for Guided Experimentation

The predictions outlined above—interference analogues in data, benefits of active cycling, the finite process of collapse, and the dynamic classicality threshold—collectively demonstrate that the Ze interpretation is not merely retroductive but has significant prospective power. It transforms questions about quantum foundations from philosophical debates into prompts for laboratory investigation. By focusing on the dynamics of model conflict and environmental stabilization, Ze provides a new lens through which to design experiments, whether in quantum optics, matter-wave interferometry, mesoscopic physics, or even complex systems science. Its ultimate validity will be determined not by its conceptual elegance alone, but by its ability to guide us toward novel phenomena and more precise control over the elusive boundary between the quantum and the classical.

Case Study: The Molecular Double-Slit Experiment in the Ze Framework

Experimental Setup: Pushing the Boundaries of Quantum Superposition

The double-slit interference of molecules, from buckminsterfullerene (C_{60}) to massive organic oligoporphyrins, represents a pinnacle of experimental quantum physics, probing the very limits of the quantum-classical transition (Arndt, Juffmann, & Vedral, 2009; Eibenberger et al., 2013; Fein et al., 2019). A canonical setup involves a thermal or laser-desorbed molecular beam, collimated by a series of slits or gratings, incident upon a nanofabricated diffraction grating (serving as the double-slit). Following a region of free propagation, the spatial distribution of molecules is recorded by a position-sensitive detector, such as a scanning ionization stage coupled with mass spectrometry (Juffmann et al., 2012). In advanced configurations, a "which-path" marker can be introduced. This can be an external probe, such as a resonant laser interacting with the molecule’s internal states, or an internal degree of freedom itself, like a vibrational mode excited differently depending on the path taken (Hackermüller, Hornberger, & Arndt, 2004). Subsequently, a quantum eraser stage—a unitary manipulation of the marker state—can be implemented. The empirically observed sequence is paradigmatic: a high-contrast interference pattern emerges when no path information is available; the pattern washes out into a classical shadow when which-path information is recorded; and, remarkably, interference fringes are recovered in a post-selected sub-ensemble when that information is coherently erased (Gerlich et al., 2011).

The Standard Interpretation and Its Explanatory Gaps

The conventional analysis of these experiments is a direct application of decoherence theory. The molecule is described by a center-of-mass wavefunction that diffracts through the slits. The which-path marker, whether external or internal, entangles with this spatial degree of freedom. Tracing over the marker's Hilbert space yields a reduced density matrix for the molecule with suppressed off-diagonal (coherence) terms, mathematically explaining the disappearance of interference (Schlosshauer, 2005). The eraser, by projecting the marker onto a superposition state, effectively dis-entangles the systems, restoring coherence for the correlated sub-ensemble.

While this formalism is predictively accurate, it leaves foundational questions unanswered, which are starkly highlighted by the molecular case:

1. The Problem of Specific Localization: The formalism confirms that interference is lost, leaving a statistical mixture of "slit A" and "slit B" possibilities. However, in any single experimental run, the molecule is detected at a specific point. The decohered density matrix does not explain why this particular molecule localized here and not there. It accounts for the ensemble's behavior but not the individual actualization (Adler, 2003).

2. The Arbitrariness of the "Measurement" Cut: The theory treats the which-path marker as a "measurement device." But what confers this special status? Why does an internal vibrational mode of the molecule itself sometimes act as a quantum system (preserving interference) and sometimes as a classical record (destroying it)? The standard view lacks a principled criterion beyond practical irreversibility (Zurek, 2003).

Recasting the Experiment in Ze Terms

The Ze interpretation reframes the entire experiment not as the evolution and partial tracing of a wavefunction, but as a dynamic competition between two generative models of the molecular event.

- Model A (The Direct Causal Model): This model generates predictions based on a forward, ballistic causal flow. It assumes the molecule is a localized object emitted from the source, following a classical trajectory influenced by slits and possibly interacting with markers. Its optimal prediction in the absence of definitive path data is the sum of two single-slit diffraction patterns—the classical shadow.

- Model B (The Counterfactual Wave Model): This model operates with a "backward" or global logic. It interprets the final spatial distribution on the detector as the result of boundary conditions (the slits) applied to a delocalized entity. It infers not a trajectory but a wave-like property (momentum transfer from the grating) and predicts the interference pattern.

The emergence of an interference pattern is not prima facie evidence for Model B's "reality." In Ze, it signifies a state of low conflict where both models can generate a consistent, low-free-energy account of the data. Model A can explain the pattern as arising from a set of compatible but unfixed histories, a probabilistic blend that does not force a choice. The system stabilizes in a consensus state compatible with this ambiguous narrative.

The Role of Which-Path Information: Amplifying Model Conflict

Introducing a which-path marker is an intervention that structurally privileges Model A. It provides a physical degree of freedom—an internal vibration or a photon correlation—that is differentially coupled to the spatial paths. This creates an asymmetry:

- Model A can incorporate this marker as a causal consequence of taking a specific path, sharpening its predictions.
- Model B is severely undermined because the marker's state makes the previously indistinguishable paths discriminable, breaking the coherence essential for its wave-based predictions.

This drastically increases the variational free energy difference, $\Delta F = |F_A - F_B|$. The environment—initially just the vacuum and the apparatus—now interacts with this newly created, discriminable information. Through scattering or radiative coupling, it begins to redundantly record the correlation (Riedel, Zurek, & Zwolak, 2016). This environmental amplification actively stabilizes the predictive framework of Model A. What we call "decoherence" is this stabilization process. The "localization" is not an instantaneous collapse but the physical system settling into the only structure that remains consistent with the now-environmentally-dominant Model A: a structure where the narrative "the molecule went through a specific slit" is robustly encoded. The mixed-state density matrix describes this stabilized, high-ΔF condition.

The Quantum Eraser as Active Model Reconciliation

The eraser operation is not a mystical reversal of time. In Ze, it is an active intervention that dismantles the source of model incompatibility. By unitarily rotating the marker states (e.g., using an optical Raman transition to map distinct vibrational states to a common ground state), the experimenter destroys the physical distinguishability that gave Model A its decisive advantage.

This does not simply "restore the original wavefunction." It creates a new experimental context where the environment can no longer sustain the high-conflict state. With the discriminability removed, the environmental degrees of freedom have no basis to selectively amplify Model A. The conflict ΔF drops. The global system (molecule + manipulated marker) is forced to find a new stable structure, which turns out to be one of low conflict, compatible with both a Model A description that lacks a definitive path and a Model B description that requires phase coherence. The recovered interference in the post-selected data is the empirical signature of this newly achieved structural compatibility.

Why Molecules are the Ideal Testbed for Ze

Molecular interferometry is uniquely positioned to transform Ze from an interpretation into a tested framework because molecules inhabit a critical regime:

1. Massive yet Coherent: Their substantial mass (compared to electrons) ensures rapid coupling to internal and external environments, making decoherence—i.e., model conflict resolution—a prominent, measurable effect (Hornberger, Gerlich, Ulbricht, & Arndt, 2012).

2. Internally Complex: Their rich internal structure (vibrations, rotations, conformations) provides a built-in, controllable "environment" for self-decoherence. One can actively engineer which-path markers using specific internal modes, directly testing the role of internal complexity in model stabilization (Romero-Isart et al., 2011).

3. Accessible Transition Zone: They operate precisely in the smooth crossover from wave-like to particle-like behavior. This allows for precise experimental tuning of the conflict parameter ΔF, for instance, by varying the internal temperature (which activates more decohering modes) or the strength of the which-path coupling (Brand et al., 2015).

Therefore, molecular experiments do not merely illustrate quantum mechanics; they provide a knobs-and-dials laboratory for the Ze framework. By systematically varying parameters that control model conflict (marker strength, environmental coupling, eraser fidelity) and measuring the resulting interference visibility (a proxy for ΔF), one can subject the dynamical predictions of Ze to quantitative test. In this light, the molecular double-slit experiment ceases to be a mere demonstration and becomes a foundational probe into the active, competitive processes that generate the very reality we measure.

Conclusion: Active Localization and the End of Observer-Centric Paradox

Reconciling the Quantum Eraser: Beyond Retro-Causality and Collapse

The quantum eraser experiment has long stood as a source of profound conceptual unease, seemingly challenging our notions of causality, temporal order, and objective reality. Interpretations invoking "retro-causal" influences or the conscious observer's delayed choice have flourished in the conceptual vacuum left by the standard formalism (Wheeler, 1978; Aharonov & Vaidman, 2008). The analysis presented through the lens of the Ze interpretation (Zustandserzeugung) demonstrates that such radical revisions are unnecessary. The eraser does not violate causality nor does it require information to flow backwards in time. Instead, it serves as a meticulous experimental revelation of three deeper principles that govern the quantum-classical interface:

1. The Active Nature of Measurement: Measurement is not a passive registration of a pre-existing property. It is an active physical process of stabilization in which a quantum system, through interaction with an environment, is forced to adopt a configuration consistent with a single, robust causal narrative (Model A). The which-path marker initiates this process; environmental amplification executes it. The eraser shows this process can be halted and reversed before it becomes irreversible, proving its dynamical, contingent nature (Kim, Yu, Kulik, Shih, & Scully, 2000).

2. The Primacy of Structural Compatibility: Quantum behavior is not determined by "what is real" in an absolute sense, but by what descriptions of reality are structurally compatible within a given physical context. Interference signifies a context where a particle-like narrative (Model A) and a wave-like narrative (Model B) can coexist without logical contradiction, forming a low-free-energy consensus. Which-path information creates a context of structural incompatibility, forcing a choice. The eraser manipulates the context itself, restoring compatibility by removing the physical basis for the conflict (Fields, Glazebrook, & Marcianò, 2017).

3. The Absence of a Privileged Observer: The entire sequence—interference, its disappearance, and its recovery—unfolds with no reference to a conscious mind or a classical domain. The "observer" is demoted to any physical system that can access a sufficient fraction of the redundantly encoded information in the environment (Zurek, 2009). The delayed choice is not made by an observer on the system, but is a final, physical configuration of the system-and-apparatus whole that determines which global structure achieves stability. Consciousness is epiphenomenal to this physics (Tegmark, 2000).

Ze as a Unifying Framework: From Decoherence to Erasure

The Ze interpretation offers more than just a coherent story for a puzzling experiment. It provides a generalized framework that unifies phenomena typically treated as distinct: unitary evolution, decoherence, wavefunction collapse, and quantum erasure. These are not separate mechanisms but different phases or outcomes of a single underlying process: the active resolution of conflict between competing generative models of reality.

In this framework:

- Unitary Evolution describes the arena in which Model A and Model B co-evolve, their predictions intertwining in the full quantum state.
- Decoherence is the physical manifestation of rising conflict (increasing ΔF) and the beginning of environmental arbitration in favor of Model A.

- Collapse is the completion of this process—the forced stabilization of a specific, redundantly recorded outcome consistent with Model A's causal framework. It is not an event but the terminus of a stabilization trajectory (Adler, 2003).
- Quantum Erasure is an active intervention that de-escalates the conflict. By removing the physical distinguishability that fuels the model war, it allows the system to re-stabilize into a low-conflict, compatible state.

This reframing dissolves artificial boundaries. There is no "Heisenberg cut." There is only a continuum of environmental coupling and information redundancy. A "classical" object is simply one for which the conflict was resolved so decisively and so long ago that the stable structure supporting Model A is effectively unshakeable (Schlosshauer, 2005).

The Ontological Lesson: "The Wave-like Has Nowhere to Be"

The most profound implication of the Ze interpretation is ontological. It suggests a resolution to the endless debate about the "reality" of the wavefunction. The wave-like behavior described by Model B is not an illusion, nor is it a complete physical object propagating in space. It is a relational property—a potentiality—that exists as long as the physical context sustains the compatibility of multiple narratives.

The famous dictum that "observation destroys the wavefunction" is therefore subtly but crucially wrong. As the quantum eraser proves, "looking" (i.e., establishing a correlation) is not inherently destructive. Destruction occurs when the correlating environment is structured to amplify one narrative at the exclusive expense of the other. In the words of the Ze formulation: "If the wave-like exists, it disappears not because it is seen, but because it has nowhere left to be."

The "nowhere to be" is the key. The wave-like potentiality of Model B requires a specific architectural feature in the total physical system: the indistinguishability of alternative paths or histories. When a which-path marker coupled to an amplifying environment renders these paths distinguishable, it architecturally eliminates the "space" (the Hilbert subspace) in which the coherent, wave-like superposition can be stably maintained. The environment, through redundant recording, fills all available informational "space" with the exclusive, localized records of Model A. The wave-like description doesn't vanish into nothingness; it is physically excluded by the stabilized structure that forms. The eraser works by architecturally rebuilding that lost space of indistinguishability, giving the wave-like potentiality a physical place to exist once more.

Future Directions and Concluding Remarks

The Ze interpretation, as developed here, transitions quantum foundations from a philosophy of observation to a physics of description-stabilization. It makes concrete, testable predictions (as outlined in Section 7) regarding interference in complex systems, the efficiency of active control, the timescale of collapse, and the fluidity of the classical threshold. Future experimental work, particularly in molecular matter-wave interferometry and mesoscopic quantum control, can probe these predictions directly.

In conclusion, the combined study of entanglement (Ze), decoherence, and the quantum eraser leads us away from paradox and toward a new synthesis. Quantum mechanics does not describe a world that is fuzzy until seen. It describes a world in a constant, active process of making itself definite, of resolving internal descriptive conflicts through physical interaction. The quantum eraser is our most powerful tool for observing this process in action, showing us that definiteness is not a gift bestowed by an observer but an achievement wrought by the system upon itself, through its struggle to find a stable, consistent story in a world of competing possibilities. The Ze interpretation provides the language and the logic for this story, finally allowing us to understand measurement not as a mystery, but as a mechanism.

References

Adler, S. L. (2003). Why decoherence has not solved the measurement problem: A response to P. W. Anderson. Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics, 34(1), 135–142.

Aharonov, Y., & Vaidman, L. (2008). The two-state vector formalism: An updated review. In Time in Quantum Mechanics (pp. 399–447). Springer.

Arndt, M., Juffmann, T., & Vedral, V. (2009). Quantum physics meets biology. HFSP Journal, 3(6), 386–400.

Bassi, A., & Ghirardi, G. C. (2003). Dynamical reduction models. Physics Reports, 379(5-6), 257–426.

Blatt, R., & Roos, C. F. (2012). Quantum simulations with trapped ions. Nature Physics, 8(4), 277–284.

Blatter, G. (2020). Fundamentals of Many-body Physics: Principles and Methods. Springer.

Blume-Kohout, R., & Zurek, W. H. (2008). Quantum Darwinism in quantum Brownian motion. Physical Review Letters, 101(24), 240405.

Brand, C., Sclafani, M., Knobloch, C., Lilach, Y., Juffmann, T., Kotakoski, J., ... & Arndt, M. (2015). An atomically thin matter-wave beamsplitter. Nature Nanotechnology, 10(10), 845–848.

Briegel, H. J., & Popescu, S. (2008). Entanglement and intra-molecular cooling in biological systems? A quantum thermodynamic perspective. arXiv preprint arXiv:0806.4552.

Bruza, P. D., Kitto, K., Ramm, B., & Sitbon, L. (2015). A probabilistic framework for analysing the compositionality of conceptual combinations. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 67, 26–38.

Buckley, C. L., Kim, C. S., McGregor, S., & Seth, A. K. (2017). The free energy principle for action and perception: A mathematical review. Journal of Mathematical Psychology, 81, 55–79.

Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 36(3), 181–204.

Conant, R. C., & Ashby, W. R. (1970). Every good regulator of a system must be a model of that system. International Journal of Systems Science, 1(2), 89–97.

d'Espagnat, B. (1976). Conceptual Foundations of Quantum Mechanics (2nd ed.). W. A. Benjamin.

Eibenberger, S., Gerlich, S., Arndt, M., Mayor, M., & Tüxen, J. (2013). Matter-wave interference with particles selected from a molecular library with masses exceeding 10 000 amu. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 15(35), 14696–14700.

Englert, B. G. (1996). Fringe visibility and which-way information: An inequality. Physical Review Letters, 77(11), 2154–2157.

Fein, Y. Y., Geyer, P., Zwick, P., Kiałka, F., Pedalino, S., Mayor, M., ... & Arndt, M. (2019). Quantum superposition of molecules beyond 25 kDa. Nature Physics, 15(12), 1242–1245.

Fields, C., & Levin, M. (2020). How do living systems create meaning? Philosophies, 5(4), 36.

Fields, C., Glazebrook, J. F., & Levin, M. (2021). Minimal physicalism as a scale-free substrate for cognition and consciousness. Neuroscience of Consciousness, 2021(2), niab013.

Fields, C., Glazebrook, J. F., & Marcianò, A. (2017). Reference frame induced symmetry breaking on holographic screens. Symmetry, 9(8), 136.

Friston, K. (2005). A theory of cortical responses. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 360(1456), 815–836.

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

Friston, K. (2019). A free energy principle for a particular physics. arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.10184.

Fuchs, C. A., & Peres, A. (2000). Quantum theory needs no ‘interpretation’. Physics Today, 53(3), 70–71.

Gallagher, T. F., & DeMille, D. (2019). Possibilities for molecular physics using pulsed beams. Annual Review of Physical Chemistry, 70, 123–152.

Gallís, M. R., & Fleming, G. N. (1990). Environmental and spontaneous localization. Physical Review A, 42(1), 38–48.

Gell-Mann, M., & Hartle, J. B. (1993). Classical equations for quantum systems. Physical Review D, 47(8), 3345–3382.

Gerlich, S., Eibenberger, S., Tomandl, M., Nimmrichter, S., Hornberger, K., Fagan, P. J., ... & Arndt, M. (2011). Quantum interference of large organic molecules. Nature Communications, 2(1), 263.

Hackermüller, L., Hornberger, K., & Arndt, M. (2004). Influence of molecular temperature on the coherence of fullerenes in a near-field interferometer. Applied Physics B, 77(8), 781–787.

Hornberger, K., Gerlich, S., Ulbricht, H., & Arndt, M. (2012). Theory and experimental verification of Kapitza-Dirac-Talbot-Lau interferometry. New Journal of Physics, 14(4), 043008.

Hornberger, K., Sipe, J. E., & Arndt, M. (2004). Theory of decoherence in a matter wave Talbot-Lau interferometer. Physical Review A, 70(5), 053608.

Jaba, T. (2022). Dasatinib and quercetin: short-term simultaneous administration yields senolytic effect in humans. Issues and Developments in Medicine and Medical Research Vol. 2, 22-31.

Jacques, V., Wu, E., Grosshans, F., Treussart, F., Grangier, P., Aspect, A., & Roch, J.-F. (2007). Experimental realization of Wheeler's delayed-choice gedanken experiment. Science, 315(5814), 966–968.

Joos, E., & Zeh, H. D. (1985). The emergence of classical properties through interaction with the environment. Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter, 59(2), 223–243.

Joos, E., Zeh, H. D., Kiefer, C., Giulini, D., Kupsch, J., & Stamatescu, I.-O. (2003). Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory (2nd ed.). Springer.

Juffmann, T., Truppe, S., Geyer, P., Major, A. G., Deachapunya, S., Ulbricht, H., & Arndt, M. (2012). Wave and particle in molecular interference lithography. Physical Review Letters, 109(26), 263601.

Kent, A. (2010). One world versus many: The inadequacy of Everettian accounts of evolution, probability, and scientific confirmation. In S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, & D. Wallace (Eds.), Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality (pp. 307–354). Oxford University Press.

Kiefer, C., & Joos, E. (1999). Decoherence: Concepts and examples. In P. Blanchard, E. Joos, D. Giulini, C. Kiefer, & I.-O. Stamatescu (Eds.), Decoherence: Theoretical, Experimental, and Conceptual Problems (pp. 105–128). Springer.

Kim, Y.-H., Yu, R., Kulik, S. P., Shih, Y., & Scully, M. O. (2000). Delayed "choice" quantum eraser. Physical Review Letters, 84(1), 1–5.

Kochen, S., & Specker, E. P. (1967). The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics, 17(1), 59–87.

Korotkov, A. N., & Jordan, A. N. (2006). Undoing a weak quantum measurement of a solid-state qubit. Physical Review Letters, 97(16), 166805.

Kwiat, P. G., Steinberg, A. M., & Chiao, R. Y. (1992). Observation of a "quantum eraser": A revival of coherence in a two-photon interference experiment. Physical Review A, 45(11), 7729–7739.

Leggett, A. J. (2002). Testing the limits of quantum mechanics: Motivation, state of play, prospects. Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter, 14(15), R415–R451.

Ma, X.-S., Kofler, J., & Zeilinger, A. (2013). Delayed-choice gedanken experiments and their realizations. Reviews of Modern Physics, 88(1), 015005.

Ma, X.-S., Kofler, J., & Zeilinger, A. (2016). Delayed-choice gedanken experiments and their realizations. Reviews of Modern Physics, 88(1), 015005.

Nimmrichter, S., & Hornberger, K. (2013). Theory of near-field matter-wave interference beyond the eikonal approximation. Physical Review A, 88(4), 043622.

Omnès, R. (1992). Consistent interpretations of quantum mechanics. Reviews of Modern Physics, 64(2), 339–382.

Paz, J. P., & Zurek, W. H. (2001). Environment-induced decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical. In D. Heiss (Ed.), Fundamentals of Quantum Information (pp. 77–148). Springer.

Penrose, R. (1996). On gravity's role in quantum state reduction. General Relativity and Gravitation, 28(5), 581–600.

Riedel, C. J., Zurek, W. H., & Zwolak, M. (2016). Objective past of a quantum universe: Redundant records of consistent histories. Physical Review A, 93(3), 032126.

Romero-Isart, O., Juan, M. L., Quidant, R., & Cirac, J. I. (2011). Toward quantum superposition of living organisms. New Journal of Physics, 13(3), 033015.

Rovelli, C. (1996). Relational quantum mechanics. International Journal of Theoretical Physics, 35(8), 1637–1678.

Schlosshauer, M. (2005). Decoherence, the measurement problem, and interpretations of quantum mechanics. Reviews of Modern Physics, 76(4), 1267–1305.

Schlosshauer, M. (2019). Quantum decoherence. Physics Reports, 831, 1–57.

Schwartenbeck, P., FitzGerald, T., Dolan, R., & Friston, K. (2013). Exploration, novelty, surprise, and free energy minimization. Frontiers in Psychology, 4, 710.

Scully, M. O., & Drühl, K. (1982). Quantum eraser: A proposed photon correlation experiment concerning observation and "delayed choice" in quantum mechanics. Physical Review A, 25(4), 2208–2213.

Tegmark, M. (2000). Why the brain is probably not a quantum computer. Information Sciences, 128(3-4), 155–179.

Tkemaladze, J. (2023). Reduction, proliferation, and differentiation defects of stem cells over time: a consequence of selective accumulation of old centrioles in the stem cells?. Molecular Biology Reports, 50(3), 2751-2761. DOI : https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36583780/

Tkemaladze, J. (2024). Editorial: Molecular mechanism of ageing and therapeutic advances through targeting glycative and oxidative stress. Front Pharmacol. 2024 Mar 6;14:1324446. DOI : 10.3389/fphar.2023.1324446. PMID: 38510429; PMCID: PMC10953819.

Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Old Centrioles Make Old Bodies. Annals of Rejuvenation Science, 1(1). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/yx9sn772

Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Visions of the Future. Longevity Horizon, 2(1). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/8be27s21

Vaidman, L. (2014). Many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2014 ed.).

Walborn, S. P., Terra Cunha, M. O., Pádua, S., & Monken, C. H. (2002). Double-slit quantum eraser. Physical Review A, 65(3), 033818.

Wallace, D. (2012). The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory according to the Everett Interpretation. Oxford University Press.

Wheeler, J. A. (1978). The "past" and the "delayed-choice" double-slit experiment. In A. R. Marlow (Ed.), Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory (pp. 9–48). Academic Press.

Zurek, W. H. (1982). Environment-induced superselection rules. Physical Review D, 26(8), 1862–1880.

Zurek, W. H. (1991). Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical. Physics Today, 44(10), 36–44.

Zurek, W. H. (1998). Decoherence, einselection, and the existential interpretation (the rough guide). Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 356(1743), 1793–1821.

Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. Reviews of Modern Physics, 75(3), 715–775.

Zurek, W. H. (2009). Quantum Darwinism. Nature Physics, 5(3), 181–188.