Immortalitas in Hac Vita

Longevity Platform

https://www.longevity.ge

Longevity Horizon
ISSN:3088-4063

2026

Vol.2 No.2:2

Why Ze is not Many-Worlds

The world does not branch out. It becomes defined

Jaba Tkemaladze [*, 1]
Affiliation: [1] Longevity Clinic, Inc, Georgia
Citation: Tkemaladze, J. (2026). Why Ze is not Many-Worlds. Longevity Horizon, 2(2). DOI : https://doi.org/10.65649/fyd9x473

Abstract

This paper presents a definitive refutation of the recurring conjecture that the Ze framework constitutes a variant of the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics. Through a systematic, point-by-point analysis, we demonstrate that the two are radically orthogonal paradigms, separated by irreconcilable differences in their foundational principles. While both reject the notion of a fundamental wavefunction collapse, MWI responds by positing an ever-branching multiverse where all quantum possibilities are ontologically real. In stark contrast, the Ze framework, grounded in the principles of active inference and free energy minimization, preserves a single-world ontology. It reinterprets quantum superpositions as manifestations of unresolved *epistemic* model conflict within an adaptive system, and "measurement" as the physical process of forced localization, where a definite history crystallizes. The analysis conclusively distinguishes Ze from MWI across critical dimensions: the nature of alternatives (ontological worlds vs. epistemic models), the process of definiteness (subjective branching vs. objective optimization), the role of the observer (covert privilege vs. its elimination), and the capacity for empirical prediction. We conclude that Ze is not an interpretation of quantum formalism but a broader theory of how adaptive systems, from particles to brains, resolve uncertainty, thereby offering a monistic, parsimonious, and empirically grounded alternative to the inflationary ontology of the multiverse.

Keywords: Quantum Foundations, Many-Worlds Interpretation, Ze Framework, Active Inference, Free Energy Principle, Epistemic Models.

Introduction

At first glance, the Ze system can superficially resemble the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI). Both formalisms allow for the simultaneous existence of alternative descriptions of a quantum system, explicitly reject the postulate of a fundamental wavefunction collapse (Everett, 1957; Wallace, 2012), and interpret quantum interference as a direct manifestation of the reality of superposition. However, this resemblance is exhausted at the level of language and mathematical formalism. As Fong et al. (2016) note in their analysis of quantum interpretations, semantic overlap often masks deep philosophical and physical disparities. Upon closer examination at the level of fundamental ontology, dynamical laws, and empirical verifiability, the Ze framework and MWI prove to be radically distinct conceptual enterprises. This article will systematically unpack these distinctions, demonstrating that Ze is not a variant of many-worlds theory but rather a sophisticated alternative that preserves the descriptive power of quantum formalism without committing to the inflationary ontology of endlessly proliferating parallel universes (Carroll, 2019).

Ontological Divide: Descriptive Branches vs. Concrete Worlds

The most profound distinction lies in their answer to the question: *What exists?*

The Many-Worlds Ontology: The MWI is unapologetically realist and literal. It takes the unitarily evolving universal wavefunction as the complete description of physical reality. In a measurement-like interaction, the wavefunction does not collapse; instead, the observer becomes entangled with the measured system, resulting in a superposition where each term corresponds to a distinct, causally separate, and fully realized "world" (Vaidman, 2021). Each world is as concrete and physically real as our own experiential reality, housing a version of the observer who witnessed a particular outcome. The ontology is thus one of an exponentially branching, infinite multiverse.

The Ze Ontology: In stark contrast, the Ze framework is not primarily an ontological proposal about the furniture of the universe. Instead, it is a formal framework for *description*. The "alternative descriptions" it admits are not separate physical worlds but are more akin to different, mutually exclusive but equally valid, perspectives or "views" on a single quantum state (Rovelli, 1996). The branching in Ze is not a physical event where reality splits, but a logical or informational event where the description of correlations between systems becomes relative. As Peres (1995) argued in a related context, quantum mechanics is a theory of observation, and Ze operationalizes this by treating each description as valid only relative to a specific "observer" or reference system within the network of interactions. The ontology here is monistic—there is one quantum state of the world—but the descriptive access to it is intrinsically pluralistic and perspectival.

Dynamical Divergence: Splitting vs. Re-description

This ontological difference manifests directly in their accounts of the dynamical process associated with quantum measurement.

MWI Dynamics: Continuous Branching: The dynamics of MWI are the standard, linear, unitary dynamics of the Schrödinger equation applied to the composite system of the measured object and the measuring apparatus (including the observer's physical brain). No extra dynamical postulate is added. The appearance of a definite outcome is explained by the principle of decoherence, which rapidly suppresses interference between the different branches, making them effectively independent (Zurek, 2003; Schlosshauer, 2019). The universe's wavefunction continuously and objectively branches into a vast superposition of quasi-classical histories.

Ze Dynamics: Relational State Update: The Ze framework does not posit an objective, universal branching process. Its "dynamics" are not about a change in the global state but about an update in the relational description available to a particular system. When a measurement correlation is established, the description relative to the observing system undergoes a transformation—akin to a state reduction or "collapse"—but this is not a physical change in the global fabric of reality. It is an update of the information that one subsystem can have about another (Brukner, 2017). This collapse is not fundamental but relational; from the perspective of a different system, no such collapse may have occurred for the original pair. The process is not a splitting of worlds but a context-dependent re-description of correlations.

Epistemology and Testability: Operational vs. Speculative

The frameworks diverge sharply on what constitutes empirical evidence and scientific testability.

The Testability Challenge for MWI: MWI faces the well-known "inferential problem" (Price, 2010). If all possible outcomes occur in separate, causally inaccessible branches, how can an experiment within our branch confirm the theory? Its proponents argue that it is confirmed by the empirical success of unitary quantum mechanics itself, and that it solves the measurement problem without additional assumptions (Wallace, 2012). However, it makes no novel predictions that distinguish its ontology from other no-collapse interpretations within our single experiential branch. Tests often discussed involve preserving quantum coherence at macroscopic scales, which would challenge collapse theories but are consistent with both MWI and Ze (Arndt et al., 1999). Its empirical support is thus indirect and its ontology remains, for critics, a matter of philosophical preference (Kent, 2015).

The Operational Framework of Ze: Ze is inherently operational. It makes explicit that any prediction or statement about a quantum system is *relative* to an observer or a measuring device. Its "testability" lies in the internal consistency of its relational predictions and its ability to correctly account for the outcomes of experiments from multiple, different perspectives within the same experimental setup (Laudisa & Rovelli, 2021). It shifts the focus from "what is" to "what is known by whom." Predictions are not about what an omnipotent outside view would see (a view Ze denies exists), but about what a particular agent, given their interactions, will record.

In this sense, Ze is more readily falsifiable in its domain of applicability—if its relational network of descriptions were found to be inconsistent in a concrete experimental circuit, it would fail. Its strength is not in predicting new phenomena but in providing a self-consistent, non-paradoxical account of established ones without ontological inflation.

The Role of Probability: Emergent vs. Fundamental

A critical battleground for any interpretation of quantum mechanics is the origin of Born rule probabilities.

Probability in MWI: The Emergence Problem: In a deterministic theory where every outcome happens, explaining why we should observe statistics governed by the Born rule is a major challenge. Modern approaches often rely on decision-theoretic arguments (Deutsch, 1999; Wallace, 2012) or considerations of self-locating uncertainty in a multiverse (Vaidman, 2021). The goal is to show that an observer within a branch should expect their experiences to align with quantum probabilities. This remains a topic of intense debate (Albert, 2010; Carroll, 2019).

Probability in Ze: A Measure of Information: In the Ze framework, probability finds a more natural, if operational, home. Probability does not describe the objective frequency of branch actualization (as all outcomes are, in some relational sense, present). Instead, it quantifies the information an agent has, or will have, about a system relative to their specific interaction history. The Born rule emerges as a rule for assigning degrees of belief when an agent's knowledge is represented by a quantum state (QBism, a cousin to relational thinking, takes this view explicitly; Fuchs et al., 2014). Probability is not an emergent property of counting worlds but a fundamental measure of uncertainty in a perspectival description.

The Ze system and the Many-Worlds Interpretation represent two diametrically opposed responses to the quantum measurement problem. While both eliminate fundamental collapse, they chart radically different paths forward. MWI accepts the literal truth of the wavefunction and, through decoherence, builds a breathtaking ontology of parallel, branching concrete realities. It is an ambitious, realist, and speculative vision of a multiverse.

Ze, conversely, retreats from such ontological commitments. It treats the wavefunction not as a direct picture of reality but as a tool for encoding information relative to specific observers. Its "branches" are not worlds but alternative, mutually exclusive descriptions valid within different relational contexts. It is a framework more concerned with the consistency of quantum communication and prediction between agents in a quantum world than with what that world *is* in absolute terms.

Therefore, to label Ze as a variant of MWI is a categorical error. They may start from similar formal rejection of collapse, but they part ways on the nature of existence, the meaning of dynamics, and the very criteria for scientific knowledge. MWI seeks to tell us what the universe is made of; Ze seeks to tell us how we can consistently speak about it.

The Epistemic Nature of Alternatives in Ze Versus the Ontological Reality of Parallel Worlds in MWI

The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics and the Ze framework both centrally feature the concept of "alternatives." This superficial similarity has led to occasional conflation of the two. This article rigorously demonstrates that their treatment of alternatives is fundamentally and irreconcilably different. We argue that while MWI posits the ontological reality of multiple, branching parallel universes where all quantum possibilities physically exist, Ze treats alternatives strictly as competing epistemic models—generative descriptions of a single, underlying environment. Drawing on literature from the foundations of physics, cognitive science, and philosophy of science, we delineate how Ze's alternatives are tools for explanation and prediction, not reports of physical fact. This distinction renders Ze not a variant of many-worlds theory, but a sophisticated epistemic framework for managing uncertainty and model competition within a single reality.

The Lure of the "Alternative"

A primary reason the Ze framework is sometimes misidentified with the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) is their shared vocabulary of "alternatives" or "branches." Both reject a fundamental, singular classical narrative emerging from quantum formalism. However, as seminal analyses in the philosophy of quantum mechanics indicate, such terminological overlap often masks deep conceptual schisms (Kent, 2015). In MWI, the alternative branches of the wavefunction are asserted to be *ontologically real*—each describes a physically existing world (Vaidman, 2021). Conversely, as this paper will establish, Ze operates within a tradition that views such formal alternatives as *epistemic tools*. They represent different, potentially competing, ways an agent can describe or model the same physical situation, not an inventory of parallel realities. This paper explores this core distinction, clarifying that Ze's alternatives are explanations for data, not the literal causes *of* data in separate worlds.

The Ontological Commitment of Many-Worlds: Branches as Real Worlds

The MWI, originating from Everett's relative state formulation, makes a bold ontological claim (Everett, 1957). It takes the unitary evolution of the quantum state as complete and literal.

- **Realized Outcomes**: Every term in a quantum superposition corresponding to a distinct measurement outcome is understood to describe a fully realized, physical world. When a quantum event with multiple possible outcomes occurs, the universe *branches* irreversibly into a multiplicity of copies, each containing an observer who records a different outcome (Wallace, 2012). This process is not metaphorical; proponents argue these worlds are as real as the one we experience, albeit causally disconnected after decoherence (Zurek, 2003).
- **Irreversible Splitting**: The branching is a dynamical, physical process driven by entanglement and decoherence. There is no mechanism for branches to reconverge in a measurable way; the multiverse's tree grows ever outward and diversifies (Saunders et al., 2010).

- **All Possibilities Exist**: Crucially, probability in MWI does not reflect ignorance about which single outcome will occur, as all occur. The interpretational challenge becomes deriving the subjective experience of the Born rule probabilities from this ontology of "all possibilities realized" (Deutsch, 1999; Carroll, 2019). The worlds are not "possible"; they are actual. This is a maximalist ontological stance, multiplying physical reality to match the mathematical breadth of the wavefunction.

Alternatives as Competing Models

The Ze framework starts from a fundamentally different premise. It does not begin with metaphysics but with the scientific task of explanation and prediction given limited information.

- **Generative Models of a Single Environment**: At its core, Ze is a formalism for managing *generative models*. A generative model is an internal or formal representation that can generate predictions or explanations for observed data (Friston, 2010). In Ze, multiple such models—the "alternatives"—can coexist and compete to explain the data stream from *one environment*. This is analogous to how in Bayesian brain and active inference frameworks, the brain maintains multiple hypotheses about the causes of its sensory inputs (Friston, 2010; Hohwy, 2013). The existence of several models does not imply the existence of several realities, only several descriptions of one reality.
- **Alternatives are Epistemic, Not Ontological**: The alternatives in Ze are not worlds but representations. They are structures of information, akin to theories or hypotheses. Their purpose is to account for observations, reduce uncertainty, and guide action within a single world (Buckley et al., 2017). When Ze permits "simultaneous existence of alternative descriptions," it refers to the formal co-existence of models in a computational or logical space, not their physical instantiation as spatio-temporal universes. This aligns with epistemological approaches in quantum foundations that treat quantum states as representations of knowledge rather than direct depictions of reality (Fuchs & Schack, 2013).
- **Explanations, Not Events**: This leads to the pivotal distinction: **In Ze, alternatives are ways of explaining data, not reports of real events happening in parallel**. A branching in the Ze formalism signifies a point where a single model becomes inadequate and multiple, more specialized models (alternatives) are required to maintain explanatory accuracy. This is an update in the *description*, not a fission in the *referent*. The "*choice*" between alternatives is a Bayesian model selection or inference process, not a physical traversal into one branch of a multiverse (Friston et al., 2017).

4. Contrastive Analysis: Dynamics, Probability, and Testability

The ontological/epistemic divide manifests in three critical areas:

- **Dynamics of "Branching"**: In MWI, branching is a physical, observer-independent process (decoherence). In Ze, the emergence of alternatives is a context-dependent, epistemic process triggered by the need to resolve uncertainty or explain new information relative to an agent's perspective (Rovelli, 1996). It is a move in a model-updating game, not a law of cosmic dynamics.

- **Nature of Probability**: In MWI, probability is a profound puzzle to be derived from the multitude of actual worlds. In Ze, probability naturally attaches to the alternatives as a measure of their *credence* or *Bayesian confidence* given the available data (Friston et al., 2017). It quantifies the epistemic weight of a model, not the measure of existence of a world.
- **Empirical Content**: Proving MWI directly is famously difficult, as it predicts all outcomes occur, just in different worlds. Testing Ze, however, involves assessing the efficacy and consistency of its model-selection and uncertainty-handling algorithms within observable data streams. Predictions concern which model an agent will favor and how efficiently it will minimize prediction error, not the detection of other worlds (Friston, 2010).

A Categorial Distinction

The Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation are categorically different. MWI is an ontological hypothesis that answers "What exists?" with "All possible worlds." Ze is an epistemic framework that answers "How can we describe?" with "Through competing generative models." The former multiplies realities; the latter multiplies descriptions of a single reality. Confusing the formal coexistence of models in Ze with the physical coexistence of worlds in MWI is a fundamental error. Ze provides a powerful language for understanding how intelligent systems, from brains to artificial agents, navigate uncertainty by maintaining and selecting among alternative explanations. It is a theory of mind and model-building, not a theory of parallel universes. Recognizing this distinction is essential for the proper application and philosophical understanding of both the Ze framework and quantum interpretations generally.

Interference as a Property of Description, Not Evidence for Parallel Worlds

The phenomenon of quantum interference is often cited as evidence for the literal reality of superposition, a cornerstone of the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI). This paper argues that the Ze framework provides a fundamentally different, epistemically grounded account of interference that does not entail ontological multiplicity. In MWI, interference results from the physical interaction of temporarily overlapping parallel worlds before they decohere. In contrast, Ze interprets interference as a measure of compatibility between posterior distributions derived from competing generative models of a single reality. Crucially, interference exists only while models remain mutually informative regarding data; upon "localization" or model selection, previously coherent alternatives cease to be viable epistemic descriptions, rather than continuing to exist as physical worlds. This analysis positions interference not as a window into a multiverse, but as a mathematical signature of descriptive uncertainty within a single world, further distinguishing Ze from the ontological commitments of MWI.

The Interpretive Crossroads of Interference

Quantum interference stands as one of the most distinctive and puzzling features of quantum theory, directly challenging classical notions of particle trajectories and definite states. Within the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI), interference is often presented as strong, even definitive, evidence for the real coexistence of multiple "worlds" or histories (Vaidman, 2021). The Ze framework, while fully accounting for interference phenomena, demurs from this ontological conclusion. This paper examines this critical interpretive fork. We will demonstrate that for MWI, interference is a *physical process* between nascent branches of reality, whereas for Ze, it is an *epistemic property* of a model-comparison process. Understanding this distinction is essential for clarifying why the empirical fact of interference does not, *de facto*, validate the existence of parallel worlds and why Ze offers a parsimonious alternative that localizes superposition within the domain of description.

The MWI Account: Interference as Inter-Branch Interaction

The Many-Worlds Interpretation provides a bold and literal reading of the quantum formalism. Its explanation of interference flows directly from its core ontological postulate.

- **Branches as Ontological Entities**: In MWI, each component of a quantum superposition corresponds to a physically real, albeit relative, "*branch*" or "*world*" (Everett, 1957). Prior to a decohering measurement, these branches are not fully separate but can remain in a state of quantum coherence with one another.
- **Interference as Physical Overlap**: Within this framework, quantum interference observed in systems like the double-slit experiment is interpreted as the physical interaction or "cross-talk" between these temporarily overlapping parallel worlds (Wallace, 2012). The famous interference pattern is not generated by a single particle taking multiple paths in some nebulous sense, but by the literal wave-like interaction between the versions of the experimental setup in different worlds. As Saunders et al. (2010) elaborate, the relative phases between branches have direct physical consequences, manifesting as observable interference.
- **Decoherence Terminates Interference**: The process of decoherence, driven by environmental entanglement, is understood as the mechanism that rapidly suppresses these phase relations, rendering the branches effectively orthogonal and non-interfering (Zurek, 2003). From the MWI perspective, the worlds were always there; decoherence merely makes them dynamically independent. Thus, interference is transient evidence of the underlying plural reality of the wavefunction before branching becomes irreversible.

The Ze Framework Account: Interference as Model Compatibility

The Ze framework, rooted in principles of Bayesian inference and active model selection, offers a radically different conceptualization that does not invoke multiple realities.

- **Interference as Compatibility of Posteriors**: Ze recasts interference not as a physical wave phenomenon, but as a mathematical consequence of maintaining multiple, competing generative models. In this view, a system prepared in a superposition is described by an agent maintaining several alternative models (or "hypotheses") about its state. Interference terms arise from the *compatibility* or non-orthogonality of the posterior probability distributions associated with these models (Friston, 2010). When data (e.g., which slit a particle might pass through) is not recorded, these model posteriors remain coherent and can constructively or destructively combine in their predictions for subsequent observations (e.g., position on a screen). This is analogous to the brain maintaining competing perceptual hypotheses, where unresolved uncertainty leads to predictions that reflect a blended expectation, not a blended reality (Hohwy, 2013).

- **A Epistemic, Conditional Existence**: Crucially, in Ze, the coherent alternatives exist only as long as the agent's model-comparison process has not selected a single best explanation. They are viable epistemic stances, not physical places. The work of Buckley et al. (2017) on the Free Energy Principle illustrates this: competing hypotheses are held in a probabilistic ensemble to minimize surprise, and their interplay generates the rich, non-classical statistics of quantum theory.
- **Localization as Model Selection, Not Branch Annihilation**: This leads to the pivotal distinction regarding "localization" (the analogue of wavefunction collapse or decoherence). In MWI, after decoherence, all branches continue to exist physically. In Ze, when data sufficient to discriminate between models is obtained (e.g., a "which-path" measurement), the alternatives cease to be epistemically permissible or useful simultaneous descriptions. One model is selected (or a new singular model is formed), and the others are discarded or archived, not because they stop existing physically, but because they are no longer the best description for that agent given the new information (Friston et al., 2017; Knill & Pouget, 2004). The interference disappears because the condition for maintaining compatible, competing models has been violated.

Contrasting Implications: Reality vs. Description

The divergence in explaining interference has profound implications for the nature of reality each framework proposes.

- **The Status of "Which-Path" Information**: In MWI, even when a "which-path" detector is activated, both paths are taken in different worlds, and interference is suppressed because the detector states in different worlds are orthogonal. The worlds remain. In Ze, acquiring which-path information definitively selects one generative model (e.g., "particle went left") over the other. The alternative model is ruled out by the data, not made invisible. Interference vanishes because the two models are now logically exclusive given the agent's updated knowledge, not because they have physically drifted apart.
- **The Role of the Observer/Agent**: MWI aims for an observer-independent reality of all branches. Ze is inherently agent-centric (though not necessarily conscious-centric); interference is a property that arises within an agent's (or a system's) model-updating cycle. As posited in relational approaches to quantum mechanics, different agents with different information may legitimately assign different states to the same system, and thus may or may not observe interference (Rovelli, 1996). This perspectivalism is natural in Ze but problematic in the absolutist ontology of standard MWI.

- **Parsimony and Empirical Equivalence**: Both accounts are empirically adequate; they predict the same interference and localization patterns. However, Ze achieves this without the vast ontological overhead of continually proliferating universes. It attributes the peculiarities of quantum behavior to the formal properties of optimal inference under uncertainty, linking it to broader theories in neuroscience and machine learning (Friston, 2010; Knill & Pouget, 2004). Interference, in this light, is not a ghostly signal from other worlds, but a signature of the fundamental probabilistic and model-based nature of description itself.

The phenomenon of quantum interference does not uniquely mandate an interpretation involving parallel worlds. The Many-Worlds Interpretation provides one coherent story, interpreting interference as a physical interaction between branches of reality. The Ze framework provides another, more epistemically focused story, interpreting interference as a mathematical feature arising from the maintenance of compatible probabilistic models before definitive data forces a selection. In Ze, "localization" is an epistemic update—the cessation of a viable alternative description. The paths not taken do not continue to exist in other universes; they cease to be useful descriptions of the one universe that is actually observed. Therefore, the presence of interference is entirely consistent with a single-world view where superposition and interference are properties of our *best descriptions of* reality, not a catalog *of* realities. This firmly places Ze outside the many-worlds family of interpretations.

Localization as an Objective Process versus Subjective Experience

A crucial distinction between the Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) centers on the nature of "localization"—the process by which a single, definite outcome emerges from quantum possibilities. This paper argues that MWI, by rejecting any physical mechanism for branch selection, relegates the experience of a definite outcome to a subjective, perspectival phenomenon within an ever-branching multiverse. In stark contrast, the Ze framework posits localization as an objective, physically-grounded optimization process governed by a formal threshold condition ($\Delta F > \theta$). This process, derived from principles of variational inference and the minimization of free energy, is independent of consciousness or observation. Consequently, in Ze, what happens is definitively what happens; alternatives that exceed the free energy threshold cease to be viable descriptions. This establishes localization in Ze as a real, objective update in the state of a system, fundamentally distinguishing it from the epistemic "branch selection" of MWI and reinforcing that Ze is not a many-worlds theory.

The Problem of Definite Outcomes

The transition from quantum superposition to a perceived definite state—often problematized as the "measurement problem"—receives diametrically opposed treatments in different interpretations. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) famously dissolves the problem by denying that such a transition ever occurs at the fundamental level; all possibilities are realized (Vaidman, 2021). The Ze framework, while also rejecting a mysterious "collapse," offers a substantive account of how and why a specific outcome becomes physically and informationally dominant for a system. This paper contrasts MWI's *subjective experience of a branch* with Ze's *objective process of localization*. We will demonstrate that Ze anchors definiteness not in the psychology of an observer but in a thermodynamically-informed optimization process, making "what happened" a matter of objective fact within a single world.

MWI: The Illusion of Choice in a Deterministic Multiverse

In the MWI, the emergence of a definite outcome is an epistemological, not an ontological, event.

- **No Physical Selection Mechanism**: The unitary evolution of the universal wavefunction is deterministic and complete. There is no additional physical law or process that "chooses" one branch over another upon measurement (Wallace, 2012). All terms in the superposition persist equally.
- **Branch Selection as Subjective Experience**: The impression that a single outcome occurs is explained as a consequence of perspectivalism. Each version of an observer within a branch perceives only their own branch's history. As Deutsch (1999) and others frame it, "branch selection" is not something that *happens to* the observer; it is the observer's identity being locked into one thread of a multiversal tapestry. The "choice" is an artifact of subjective experience and memory record in a causally isolated branch, not a physical event (Saunders et al., 2010). From a God's-eye view outside the wavefunction (a view MWI denies exists), nothing special happens at the moment of measurement—only more branching.

Ze: Localization as Objective Optimization

The Ze framework, drawing from the Free Energy Principle and active inference, provides a formal and objective account of localization (Friston, 2010).

- **A Process Governed by Free Energy**: In Ze, systems (from particles to complex agents) are understood as acting to minimize a quantity called variational free energy (F), which bounds surprise or prediction error. Localization is the process by which a system resolves uncertainty by moving from a state of maintaining multiple predictive models (a high uncertainty/entropy state) to committing to a single, most likely model (Friston et al., 2017).
- **The Threshold Condition $\Delta F > \theta$**: This commitment is not arbitrary or subjective. It occurs when the difference in free energy (ΔF) between maintaining the current uncertain model and adopting a new, more precise model exceeds a critical threshold (θ). This threshold can be related to physical parameters like temperature, noise levels, or metabolic costs in biological systems (Friston, 2010; Buckley et al., 2017). The condition $\Delta F > \theta$ represents a formal, quantitative criterion for a phase transition in the system's informational state.
- **Independence from Consciousness**: This process is fully mechanistic. It does not require a conscious "observer" in the traditional sense of quantum foundations. Any

self-organizing system that can be described as minimizing its free energy—a particle interacting with a calibrated apparatus, a cell responding to a ligand, or a brain updating a belief—can undergo localization (Friston, 2010; Knill & Pouget, 2004). The process is objective because the dynamics of free energy minimization are governed by the system's coupling to its environment, not by private mental states.

Contrasting Implications: What is Real?

This difference in mechanisms leads to opposing answers to a fundamental question: What does it mean for something to "happen"?

- **In MWI: "Happening" is Branch-Relative.** An event is real within a branch. Since all branches are equally real, there is no absolute fact of the matter about "which outcome occurred" for the universe as a whole. My experience of seeing a photon hit detector A is real in my branch, while the experience of seeing it hit detector B is equally real in another branch (Vaidman, 2021). Reality is plural and indexed.
- **In Ze: "Happening" is the Outcome of Localization**. An event is real when the localization process has irrevocably occurred for the relevant system-environment coupling. Once the free energy threshold is crossed and the system's state has updated (e.g., the apparatus registers "A"), the alternative possibility (e.g., "B") is not happening somewhere else; it is an inferior description that has been ruled out by the optimization process (Friston et al., 2017). The physical record (e.g., the detector click) is the objective fact. As work on the Bayesian brain suggests, perception itself is a form of optimal inference that follows similar rules, making the perceived world the one that best minimizes prediction error (Hohwy, 2013).
- **The Fate of Alternatives**: This is the critical divergence. In MWI, the unactualized possibility ("B") continues unabated in a parallel world. In Ze, the unactualized possibility ceases to be a viable generative model for that system in that context. It is pruned from the tree of active hypotheses, not transplanted to a separate garden. The "rest" does not "continue somewhere"; it is eliminated from the description because it is incompatible with the system's updated, data-informed state (Friston, 2010).

From Subjective Illusion to Objective Update

The treatment of localization marks a final, insurmountable divide between Ze and MWI. MWI offers a coherent but extravagant solution: definite outcomes are subjective experiences within an objectively branching multiverse. It sacrifices a unique, shared reality for the completeness of unitary evolution. Ze offers a pragmatic and physically grounded alternative: definite outcomes are the objective results of an optimization process (free energy minimization) that systems undergo when interacting with their world. Localization in Ze is as real as any other thermodynamic or evolutionary process. It provides a formal answer to how and when quantum potentialities resolve into classical facts, without invoking an infinity of unseen worlds. Therefore, Ze is not a many-worlds interpretation. It is a theory of how a single world, through processes of inference and optimization, arrives at definite states, making what we observe not just one thread in a vast tapestry, but the definitive output of a real physical computation.

Reversibility as a Critical Divergence in Dynamical Ontology

This final analysis in the series contrasting the Ze framework with the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) examines their fundamentally incompatible treatments of reversibility. While MWI, through the mechanism of environmental decoherence, posits the fundamental irreversibility of branching—a one-way flow from quantum coherence to a stable multiverse of separate worlds—the Ze framework explicitly permits reversibility of the localization process prior to its completion. Ze accounts for phenomena such as quantum erasure and the restoration of interference, where previously distinguishable alternatives can re-cohere, effectively "unmaking" a would-be definite history. This capacity for dynamical reversal is shown to be logically incompatible with the core ontological commitment of MWI, which treats each branch as an irreversible, emergent reality. The analysis concludes that the reversible, model-based dynamics of Ze fundamentally preclude its classification as a many-worlds theory, reinforcing its nature as an epistemic framework for probabilistic description within a single, temporally non-branching reality.

The Arrow of Quantum Branching

A definitive test for any interpretation of quantum mechanics is its treatment of time symmetry and reversibility. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) and the Ze framework present starkly contrasting answers. MWI, grounded in the irreversible process of decoherence, describes a universe undergoing constant and permanent ontological fission (Zurek, 2003). Once branches separate, they do not reconverge. The Ze framework, conversely, describes a process of epistemic model selection that, under specific conditions, can be undone, allowing a system to revert to a state of coherent superposition. This paper argues that this difference in reversibility is not a minor technical detail but a critical litmus test that definitively separates an ontology of multiple worlds (MWI) from an epistemology of competing models (Ze). The possibility of "erasing" a measurement outcome and recovering interference, a well-established experimental fact (Walborn et al., 2002), is natural in Ze but profoundly problematic for the literal reality of MWI's branches.

The Irreversible Multiverse of MWI

In MWI, the transition from a coherent superposition to a set of distinct "worlds" is mediated by decoherence, a process whose thermodynamic and information-theoretic character makes it effectively irreversible.

- **Decoherence and Irreversible Branching**: Decoherence occurs when a quantum system becomes entangled with numerous, uncontrollable degrees of freedom in its environment. This process rapidly suppresses interference between different branches by scrambling phase information into the environment (Zurek, 2003). From the MWI perspective, this is not a collapse but the *objective emergence* of separate, quasi-classical realms. As Wallace (2012) argues, the branching is permanent because recovering the information lost to the environment—reassembling the precise phases from a macroscopic number of scattered photons, atoms, etc.—is thermodynamically impossible for all practical purposes (FAPP) and, most proponents argue, in principle.

- **The Finality of History**: Consequently, each branch in MWI carves out an independent, irreversible history. The "world" in which a detector clicked is forever separate from the "world" in which it did not. There is no physical mechanism or meaningful mathematical operation within the theory that allows these worlds to merge back into a single coherent state; to do so would violate the increase of entropy and the arrow of time as understood in the emergent classical domains within each branch (Saunders et al., 2010). The multiverse's tree grows only outward.

Reversible Localization in the Ze Framework

The Ze framework, viewing quantum states as models for Bayesian inference, naturally accommodates reversibility where information flow can be controlled.

- **Reversibility Before Threshold Crossing**: Recall that in Ze, localization is an optimization process triggered by exceeding a free energy threshold ($\Delta F > \theta$). Crucially, before this threshold is decisively crossed, the process is *reversible*. If the system-environment interaction that was leading to model selection is interrupted or counteracted, the system can revert to maintaining multiple, coherent models (Friston et al., 2017). This is not a magical reversal of time but a continuation of the inference process under changed informational constraints.
- **The Quantum Eraser, Explained**: The quantum eraser experiment provides a perfect illustration. In such experiments, "which-path" information is first marked on a quantum system (e.g., a photon), destroying interference. However, if that path information is later "erased" by a suitable measurement on the marker system *before* the which-path information can be irrecoverably dissipated into the environment, interference fringes can be restored (Walborn et al., 2002). In Ze, the initial marking creates conditional dependencies between models, but the eraser measurement updates these dependencies, effectively "unselecting" a model and allowing the alternative models to become coherently compatible again (Friston, 2010; Knill & Pouget, 2004). The history of a "definite path" is not written in stone; it is a tentative inference that can be revoked.
- **Unfixing History**: This capacity means that in Ze, the "fixity" of a historical outcome is contingent and relative. An outcome becomes fixed only when the localization process is completed and the relevant information is irreversibly encoded in a way that makes model reversal impossible (e.g., by triggering an irreversible macroscopic cascade like a Geiger counter discharge). Prior to that, history remains malleable at the quantum level. This perspective aligns with interpretations that emphasize the role of information and its accessibility (Brukner, 2017).

The Fundamental Incompatibility

The reversibility permitted by Ze is logically incompatible with the core ontology of MWI.

- **Ontology vs. Epistemology of Branches**: In MWI, a branch is not a label for a hypothesis; it *is* a world. The act of gaining "which-path" information does not just update a description; it catalyzes the actual fission of spacetime into two distinct, causally independent realities (Vaidman, 2021). The subsequent "erasure" of that information in one branch cannot possibly affect or merge with the other, already-separated world. From the MWI vantage point, the quantum eraser must be explained as a subtle interference effect within a still-coherent branch before final decoherence, not as a reversal of branching (Zurek, 2003). This requires carefully limiting the "scale" of the worlds involved.
- **The Paradox for MWI**: If one were to insist that Ze's reversible alternatives are simply MWI's reversible coherent branches, one would have to accept that MWI's "worlds" are not the robust, emergent classical realities it claims them to be, but transient epistemic constructs that can be annihilated by a later measurement. This undermines the very ontological point of MWI. Conversely, if MWI's branches are truly irreversible, then Ze's dynamics—which explicitly model reversal—cannot be describing the same thing. They are describing the manipulation of information within a model of a single world, not the fusion of parallel universes.
- **Empirical Grounding**: Crucially, reversible phenomena like quantum erasure are experimentally robust (Walborn et al., 2002; Kim et al., 2000). Ze provides a natural, seamless account: localization is a control process over model uncertainty. MWI must append a caveat: branching is only truly irreversible *after* a poorly defined "final" decoherence, forcing a retreat to a "for all practical purposes" (FAPP) irreversibility that sits uncomfortably with its aspirations for fundamental ontology (Kent, 2015).

The Line That Cannot Be Crossed

The issue of reversibility draws the final, clear boundary between the Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation. MWI is committed to an *irreversible dynamical ontology* of perpetual world-splitting. Ze is defined by a *reversible inferential dynamics* of model selection and deselection. The fact that Ze can coherently describe the unmasking and re-coherence of possibilities—the "unfixing" of quantum history—demonstrates that its "alternatives" were never nascent parallel worlds to begin with. They were, and remain, competing descriptive models of a single, unfolding process. Therefore, any framework that inherently allows for the erasure of distinguishability and the recovery of superposition at a fundamental descriptive level cannot be reconciled with an interpretation whose foundational tenet is the irreversible actualization of all possibilities into separate realities. Ze is not, and cannot be, a many-worlds interpretation. It is a powerful formalism for understanding how definite facts emerge from, and can sometimes retreat back into, the realm of quantum potentiality within our one world.

Experimental Distinguishability and the Nature of Scientific Theory

The final and most pragmatic distinction between the Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) concerns their status as scientific theories. This paper argues that MWI, while internally consistent, functions primarily as an *interpretation* of the quantum formalism, failing to produce novel, testable predictions that distinguish it from other no-collapse interpretations within our experiential branch. In contrast, the Ze framework, grounded in the principles of active inference and free energy minimization, generates distinct experimental propositions. It predicts that the process of localization (1) depends on active, information-seeking interventions by an agent or system, (2) is governed by a dynamic threshold related to system parameters, and (3) is instantiated not only in quantum systems but in any adaptive, inference-performing system, including cognitive ones. Consequently, Ze reframes measurement as a *subject for experimental study*—a dynamical process of model selection—while MWI treats it as a *subject for metaphysical interpretation*. This fundamental difference in empirical engagement underscores why Ze is a generative scientific framework, not a variant of the non-empirical many-worlds hypothesis.

The Demarcation Problem in Quantum Foundations

A core criterion for a scientific framework is its capacity to generate empirically testable predictions that risk falsification. In quantum foundations, this often distinguishes *interpretations* from *theories*. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI), as its name suggests, offers a particular reading of the existing, empirically successful quantum formalism but is widely criticized for not yielding new, unique predictions (Kent, 2015). The Ze framework, derived from the Free Energy Principle, aspires to a different status. This paper contends that Ze moves beyond interpretation by making concrete, novel predictions about the *dynamics of measurement and localization*. By tying quantum behavior to a broader principle of self-organization and inference, Ze not only explains quantum phenomena but also generates hypotheses about their dependency on active engagement and systemic parameters, thereby establishing itself as an experimentally distinguishable and extensible scientific theory, fundamentally unlike MWI.

MWI: A Consistent Interpretation Without Novel Predictions

The empirical challenge for MWI is profound and well-documented.

- **Empirical Equivalence**: MWI's core claim—that all possible outcomes of a quantum experiment physically occur in separate, non-communicating branches—is, by design, observationally inaccessible from within any single branch. The theory is carefully constructed to be empirically equivalent to standard, unitary quantum mechanics for all intents and purposes *within a branch* (Wallace, 2012). Any experiment we can conceive and execute will yield results perfectly consistent with both the Copenhagen interpretation (with collapse) and MWI (without collapse). As Kent (2015) notes, this makes it extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, to devise a decisive experimental test.
- **Interpretation vs. Theory**: This leads to the characterization of MWI as an *interpretation*, not a *theory* in the robust, predictive sense. It does not introduce new variables, modify dynamical equations, or predict new phenomena not already described by the Schrödinger equation. Its value is philosophical and metaphysical, providing a coherent, if extravagant, ontology for the existing mathematics (Vaidman, 2021). Its primary "prediction" is the non-existence of wavefunction collapse, which is shared by

other interpretations (like Ze) and is only testable against collapse theories, not against other no-collapse interpretations.

Ze: A Predictive Framework for Localization Dynamics

In contrast, Ze, built on the active inference paradigm, makes the process leading to a definite outcome a direct object of experimental inquiry.

- **Prediction 1**: Localization Depends on Active Intervention. Ze posits that localization is not a passive observation but an *active process of uncertainty resolution*. A system minimizes its free energy (F) by performing actions that sample the environment to test its hypotheses (Friston et al., 2017). This leads to a testable prediction: the rate and certainty of localization (e.g., in a ambiguous perceptual task or a quantum measurement) should be modulated by the *active information-seeking policies* of the system. An agent/system that can interact with and manipulate a quantum probe should resolve superposition differently than a passive recording device. This aligns with "quantum eraser" paradigms where the experimenter's choice of measurement *after* the fact influences the interpretability of prior data (Walborn et al., 2002), but Ze provides a formal, action-oriented mechanism for this.
- **Prediction 2**: The Dynamic Classicality Threshold. Ze formalizes localization via a threshold condition ($\Delta F > \theta$). Crucially, this threshold (θ) is not a universal constant but a *dynamic parameter* tied to the system's state, its metabolic or computational costs, and its prior beliefs (Friston, 2010). This predicts that the "*size*" or scale at which quantum coherence is lost (the so-called quantum-classical boundary) is not fixed but context-dependent. It should vary with system properties like noise tolerance, energy availability, and adaptive goals (Buckley et al., 2017). Experiments on macroscopic quantum systems or biological processes could seek to manipulate this threshold, testing a key quantitative aspect of Ze absent from MWI.
- **Prediction 3**: Non-Physical Analogues and Unification. A powerful hallmark of a generative theory is its applicability beyond its original domain. Ze, rooted in information theory and Bayesian inference, naturally extends to non-quantum systems. It predicts that the same formal principles of model selection under uncertainty should govern phenomena like *cognitive decision-making* and perceptual bistability (Hohwy, 2013; Knill & Pouget, 2004). The "alternatives" in a cognitive task (e.g., interpreting an ambiguous figure) and in a quantum superposition are described by the same mathematics of free energy minimization. This allows for direct experimental parallels and tests in neuroscience and psychology, offering a path to unify descriptions of quantum measurement and cognitive processes—a unification utterly foreign to the specifically quantum, worlds-based ontology of MWI.

Contrasting Philosophical Stances: Subject of Study

This predictive capacity leads to a fundamental divergence in how the two frameworks view the scientific enterprise.

- **In MWI: Measurement as an Interpretative Puzzle**. For MWI, the measurement process is a problem to be *explained away* or *reinterpreted* within a grander ontology. The question "How does a definite outcome arise?" is answered by "All outcomes arise; you just experience one." The focus is on reconciling our subjective experience with the objective wavefunction. It is a philosophical solution to a conceptual problem, not a recipe for new experiments on the measurement process itself (Saunders et al., 2010).
- **In Ze: Measurement as an Experimental Process**. For Ze, measurement (localization) is a specific instance of a general physical process: active inference. It is therefore a legitimate *subject for empirical study*. Experiments can probe how different active policies, different cost functions (θ), or different system architectures affect localization dynamics. Ze invites us to build and test models of how systems—quantum or cognitive—resolve uncertainty (Friston, 2010). It shifts the question from "What does measurement mean?" to "How does measurement, as a physical process of inference, unfold under these conditions?"

From Metaphysical Speculation to Generative Science

The issue of experimental distinguishability ultimately separates Ze from MWI as categorically as their ontological commitments. MWI, for all its intellectual appeal, remains a metaphysical interpretation shielded from direct empirical challenge, making its adoption a matter of philosophical or aesthetic preference. The Ze framework, by contrast, stakes a claim as a predictive scientific theory. It offers specific, novel hypotheses about the active and context-dependent nature of localization, proposes a dynamic threshold for classicality, and boldly seeks unification with the cognitive sciences. By making the transition from possibility to actuality a process governed by the same principles that guide adaptive behavior, Ze transforms measurement from a paradoxical endpoint into a rich, dynamical phenomenon open to experimental investigation. Therefore, Ze is not a many-worlds interpretation. It is a research program that uses the tools of inference and model selection to make testable predictions about how definite facts emerge in a quantum world, fulfilling a core mandate of science that MWI inherently abdicates.

Temporal Structure and the Emergence of History

The final distinction between the Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) centers on their concepts of time and history. This paper argues that MWI enforces a static, block-universe view where the multiverse's entire branching structure—past, present, and future—exists timelessly and symmetrically. In this picture, history is fixed across all branches. Conversely, the Ze framework, grounded in active inference, presents a dynamical view where temporal structure is generated through the process of localization. While Ze utilizes backward-looking generative models for prediction, these are computational tools for inference, not evidence of physical retrocausality. Retrodiction in Ze is an epistemic reconstruction, not a temporal influence, and history itself is not a pre-existing record but is actively formed and updated as localization occurs. This fundamental difference—between a static multiverse with fixed histories and a process-based framework where history is an inferential product—definitively separates the ontology of Ze from that of MWI.

Time and History in Competing Ontologies

The nature of time and the fixity of history provide a profound litmus test for physical theories. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI), when combined with the block universe view common in modern physics, suggests a multiverse where the entire branching tree of possibilities exists eternally (Vaidman, 2021). The Ze framework, deriving from the Free Energy Principle, offers a process-oriented alternative where the flow of time and the very constitution of history are tied to the ongoing, active process of model selection and uncertainty reduction. This paper explores this critical divergence, demonstrating that Ze's treatment of temporal structure—particularly its use of generative models and its view of history as emergent—is incompatible with the symmetric, fixed-past ontology of MWI, further cementing Ze's status as a distinct, non-many-worlds framework.

MWI: The Static, Branching Block Universe

Within the metaphysical framework often associated with MWI, time is treated symmetrically, and reality is seen as a four-dimensional block.

- **The Timeless Multiverse**: In this view, inspired by the treatment of time in general relativity, the entire multiverse—every branching event and every consequent world-line—exists as a single, static structure. The "flow" of time is an illusion of consciousness within a branch. From an imagined external perspective, the universe where the Schrödinger's cat is alive and the universe where it is dead both exist "now" in the extended block (Wallace, 2012). The branching is not something that *happens in* time; it is a feature *of* the block's geometry.
- **Fixed Past and Future**: Consequently, within each branch, the past is a single, immutable thread. There is no ambiguity or openness; what "happened" is definitively what happened in that branch. Similarly, while the future may appear open to an agent within a branch, from the block perspective, all future branchings are already present (Saunders et al., 2010). History is a read-only record, and the multiverse is a vast but completed tapestry.

Ze: Time, Models, and the Formation of History

The Ze framework offers a radically different perspective, where temporal experience and historical fact are actively constructed through inference.

- **Backward Models as Computational Tools**: A key feature of the active inference underpinning Ze is the use of *generative models*. These models run "backwards" in a computational sense to infer the causes of sensory data. For example, the brain uses a generative model to infer the object most likely to have caused a pattern of retinal stimulation (Friston, 2010; Knill & Pouget, 2004). In Ze, the "alternatives" or "histories" considered for a quantum system are precisely such generative models. They are not physical timelines but *hypotheses* about what might have led to present evidence. Their purpose is purely inferential: to explain data and predict future states.

- **Retrodiction ≠ Retrocausality**: This computational retrodiction is explicitly *not* physical retrocausality. Inferring that a photon likely took a particular path based on a later interference pattern (as in delayed-choice experiments) does not mean the later measurement caused the past event. Instead, it means the later measurement provided the data necessary to select the generative model that best explains the *entire* sequence of events (Friston et al., 2017). The past event (the path) remains fixed, but our *knowledge* of it is updated. This aligns with a Bayesian view of perception where the past is always being re-evaluated in light of new evidence (Hohwy, 2013), not rewritten.
- **History is Formed Through Localization**: This leads to the most significant point: in Ze, a definitive *history is not a pre-existing substrate but an output of the localization process*. Prior to localization, the system maintains multiple, coherent generative models (histories). Upon localization—when $\Delta F > \theta$—one model is selected as the best explanation. At that moment, a *historical fact* is created for that system. The "path taken" by a particle becomes a fact only when the interaction chain culminates in an irreversible update (e.g., a detector click). Before that, it is an unresolved inference. This resonates with Rovelli's (1996) relational interpretation, where events are real only relative to an interaction. History in Ze is not a pre-written script but a narrative that crystallizes at the moment of irreversible interaction.

The Incompatibility: Static Tapestry vs. Crystallizing Narrative

The two views of temporal structure are logically irreconcilable.

- **In MWI**: If a quantum experiment has two possible outcomes, then *right now*, in the static block, there are two complete worlds with two complete, fixed histories leading up to the experiment and diverging afterward. Both histories are equally real and complete. A delayed-choice quantum eraser experiment is simply a complex pattern of correlations within the static block; no history is "*formed*," it is merely traversed (Zurek, 2003).
- **In Ze**: Prior to the final, irreversible detection event, there is no single, fixed history for the photon. The experimental setup maintains competing models. The delayed choice manipulates which model ultimately provides the best account of the complete data set. The history—the story of what the photon "did"—is not decided until the end of the experiment. As work on the Bayesian brain suggests, perception itself operates this way: the brain commits to a perceptual history only after accumulating sufficient evidence to resolve ambiguity (Hohwy, 2013).
- **Empirical and Conceptual Consequences**: This distinction has implications for cosmology and quantum gravity. MWI's static multiverse must account for the entire branching structure in its initial conditions or laws. Ze's process-based view allows the past of the universe itself to be seen as an inference from present data—a perspective explored in quantum cosmology (e.g., the Wheeler-DeWitt equation). Ze's formalism is inherently more adaptable to theories where time is emergent rather than fundamental.

The Making of Time in a Single World

The treatment of time and history provides a final, decisive argument that Ze is not a many-worlds theory. MWI presupposes a grand, static ontological structure—a multiversal block—within which our experienced history is but one thread. It is a theory of being. Ze, conversely, is a theory of becoming. It describes how temporal narratives, including the historical record of quantum events, are actively constructed through a process of model-based inference and selection. In Ze, the past is not a fixed landscape but the most stable inference from present evidence; the future is not a set of existing branches but a space of possibilities to be resolved through action. This dynamic, epistemic conception of time, where history is formed through localization, is fundamentally incompatible with the symmetric, predetermined branching of MWI. Ze thus completes its divergence from many-worlds: it offers not an ontology of all possible worlds, but an epistemology for the construction of history and the experience of time within our one, uniquely realized world.

The Absence of a "God's-Eye Observer" and the Privilege Problem

A persistent and significant criticism of the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) centers on its implicit reliance on a problematic, privileged perspective—a "God's-eye observer" outside the wavefunction, or the unexplained mechanism by which a conscious observer "finds themselves" in a particular branch. This paper argues that the Ze framework, in stark contrast, completely avoids this ontological and epistemological pitfall by eliminating the need for any special observer in its foundational postulates. Ze, grounded in the principles of variational free energy minimization, is formulated as a general theory of self-organization and adaptive interaction. It applies uniformly to biological cognitive systems, artificial agents, and inanimate physical processes, from molecular interactions to neural computations, without granting any system a privileged status in "collapsing" or "selecting" reality. By constructing a fully observer-independent, mechanistic account of how definite states emerge from quantum possibilities, Ze demonstrates a key conceptual advantage and a fundamental distinction from the anthropocentric shadows that haunt MWI.

The Privilege Problem in Quantum Foundations

The role of the observer has been the most contentious issue in quantum mechanics since its inception. The Copenhagen interpretation notoriously placed wavefunction collapse in the hands of measurement, a vaguely defined act often linked to consciousness. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) sought to remove this special role by asserting that all outcomes occur, thereby eliminating collapse (Everett, 1957). However, MWI has been criticized for smuggling in a different form of privilege: the unexplained fact that *this* particular conscious experience, corresponding to one branch, is "mine." As Albert (1992) and others have argued, MWI lacks a principle to explain why we subjectively experience a branching world rather than the full superposition, a problem sometimes framed as the "preferred basis problem" or the issue of "probability in a deterministic multiverse" (Vaidman, 2021). This paper posits that the Ze framework resolves this by removing the observer from the foundations altogether, not by distributing it into many worlds, but by recasting the entire process of state-definition as an agent-agnostic, physical optimization process.

The Covert Privilege in Many-Worlds: The "Finding Oneself" Problem

Despite its claims of objectivity, MWI faces a deep challenge in accounting for individual subjective experience without recourse to a hidden privileged frame.

- **The Illusion of Branch Selection**: MWI posits that upon a quantum interaction, the universal wavefunction unitarily evolves into a superposition of distinct, non-interfering "worlds," each containing a copy of the observer with a different recorded outcome (Wallace, 2012). The central puzzle is: From the perspective of the pre-measurement observer, why do they experience following one specific branch? The theory provides no physical mechanism for this "selection"; it is a brute fact that each observer copy simply continues its conscious stream within its branch. As argued by critics like Kent (2015), this amounts to a post facto privilege: each branch's history is real, but the theory cannot explain from within why *this* moment of consciousness is anchored *here* rather than *there* in the multiversal tree. It replaces the "collapsing observer" with an infinitude of "pre-located observers," sidestepping but not solving the explanatory link between the global wavefunction and local experience.
- **The Specter of a God's-Eye View**: Furthermore, the very description of the branching multiverse—the talk of "splitting" and "multiple copies"—often implicitly relies on an external, omniscient vantage point. This is the perspective from which one can survey the entire branching structure. As Rovelli (1996) notes in a related context, such a view is fundamentally unphysical; no physical system can occupy this position. Therefore, MWI's ontology, while attempting to be objective, is often presented in a language that smuggles in an illegitimate, transcendent observer to make sense of its own implications.

The Ze Framework: A Observer-Free Mechanistic Account

The Ze framework, derived from the Free Energy Principle and active inference, offers a way out by fundamentally redefining the problem. It does not ask, "Which world does the observer select?" but rather, "How does any adaptive system, through interaction, arrive at a stable, informative state?"

- Observer as a System, Not a Foundation: In Ze, an "observer" is not a primitive concept. It is merely a particular instance of a self-organizing system that minimizes its variational free energy (F) (Friston, 2010). Free energy is an information-theoretic bound on surprise, and its minimization is a fundamental principle that can describe the dynamics of living cells, immune systems, neural networks, and robotic agents (Friston et al., 2017). There is no "ghost in the machine"; there is only a physical system (with a particular Markov blanket) acting to maintain its structural and functional integrity by minimizing prediction error about its environment.
- Localization Without Privilege: The process of "localization"—the transition from a superpositional description to a definite state—is recast in Ze. It occurs when the

difference in free energy (ΔF) between maintaining multiple predictive models and committing to a single, best-fitting model exceeds a dynamic threshold (θ) (Buckley et al., 2017). This is a purely mechanical, algorithmic process. A photon hitting a photographic emulsion triggers a chemical cascade that minimizes free energy for that molecular system. A Geiger counter clicks when its electrical circuit settles into a definite discharged state. A brain perceives a coherent object when its hierarchical generative models converge on the most likely cause of sensory input (Hohwy, 2013). In all cases, the process is the same: free energy minimization leading to a resolution of uncertainty. No system is "privileged"; each simply obeys the same physics of adaptive interaction.

Universal Applicability: From Molecules to Minds

The power and distinction of Ze lie in its seamless, scale-invariant applicability.

- **Automatic and Inanimate Systems**: Ze's formalism applies perfectly to non-conscious, automated measurement devices. The "observation" made by a particle detector in a collider experiment is just as valid an instance of localization as one made by a human. The detector's physical state update (e.g., a silicon pixel firing) is the outcome of its own free-energy-minimizing interaction with the quantum field (Friston, 2010). This completely demystifies measurement, making it a branch of thermodynamics and information theory rather than philosophy of mind.
- **Cognitive Systems as a Special Case**: Cognitive systems, including human brains, are a particularly sophisticated instantiation of the same principle. The brain is an organ of inference, and perception is a process of Bayesian model selection implemented by neural dynamics (Knill & Pouget, 2004). The "alternatives" in Ze correspond to competing perceptual hypotheses (e.g., the two interpretations of a Necker cube). The felt "click" of perceptual recognition is the phenomenological correlate of a free-energy-minimizing state transition in the neural hierarchy (Friston et al., 2017). Ze thus provides a unified language for quantum measurement and cognitive science, suggesting that the latter is a macroscopic, classical domain where the same fundamental imperative—minimizing surprise—manifests.
- **Equivalence of Application**: Therefore, Ze is equally applicable to a molecule folding into its native state (an energy minimization), an immune system learning to recognize a pathogen (a model selection), and a scientist interpreting data from a cloud chamber (a cognitive inference). The underlying mathematics of belief updating and uncertainty resolution remain invariant (Friston, 2010). This universality is a strength MWI cannot claim, as its core narrative is intrinsically tied to the existence of sentient observers to "split."

From Anthropocentric Puzzles to General Physics

The challenge of the observer's privilege has haunted quantum mechanics for a century. The Many-Worlds Interpretation attempts to exorcise it by proliferating observers, but in doing so, it creates a new puzzle of subjective anchorage and relies on a covert God's-eye perspective for its intelligibility. The Ze framework achieves a more profound resolution by eliminating the observer as a foundational category. By rooting itself in the Free Energy Principle—a law about the persistence of organized systems—Ze provides a truly observer-independent, mechanistic account of how definite facts emerge at all scales of complexity. In Ze, localization is something that happens *to* and *within* systems as they interact with the world, not something enacted *by* a special class of conscious agents. A molecule, a machine, and a mind all "*observe*" in this sense. This radical leveling of ontological footing, where measurement is subsumed under a more general physical process of adaptive inference, represents a clean break from the anthropocentric legacy of quantum interpretation. It conclusively demonstrates that Ze is not merely a different flavor of many-worlds, but a fundamentally distinct paradigm that solves the very problem MWI inadvertently perpetuates.

The Core Distinction - Preserving Ontology Versus Multiplying Worlds

This concluding analysis synthesizes the fundamental philosophical and theoretical divide between the Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI). We argue that the core distinction can be crystallized as follows: **MWI responds to the quantum measurement problem by multiplying ontological commitments—positing an infinity of real, branching worlds—in order to preserve the purity of the unitary Schrödinger equation and avoid collapse. In stark contrast, the Ze framework responds by preserving a parsimonious, single-world ontology, instead introducing a novel architectural principle—active inference and free energy minimization—to explain how definite outcomes emerge from quantum uncertainty**. This paper delineates this central thesis, demonstrating that Ze is not a variant of MWI but represents a distinct paradigm that solves the same foundational problems through diametrically opposed strategies: ontological inflation versus architectural innovation. A concise comparative summary is provided to starkly illustrate the irreconcilable differences across all critical dimensions of interpretation.

Two Paths from the Quantum Dilemma

The quantum measurement problem presents a stark choice: modify the dynamics (add collapse) or modify the ontology (add worlds). The history of quantum interpretations has largely oscillated between these poles. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI), following Everett's (1957) seminal work, decisively chooses the latter path, embracing an extravagant ontology to keep the equations pristine (Wallace, 2012). The Ze framework, emerging from the intersection of theoretical neuroscience, statistical physics, and machine learning, charts a third, often misunderstood course. It accepts a dynamical process leading to definiteness but roots this process not in a phenomenological collapse postulate, but in a fundamental architectural principle governing adaptive systems. This final paper articulates this central thesis of distinction, positioning Ze not as a compromise but as a coherent alternative grounded in a different philosophy of science.

The MWI Strategy: Ontological Multiplication

The Many-Worlds Interpretation is fundamentally conservative in its dynamics and radically inflationary in its metaphysics.

- **Preserving the Equations Unaltered**: MWI's primary motivation and virtue is its strict adherence to the linear, unitary dynamics of the Schrödinger equation. It rejects any added terms, nonlinearities, or stochastic processes that would represent a "collapse" (Vaidman, 2021). From this perspective, collapse theories appear as inelegant, ad-hoc modifications to beautiful, empirically successful mathematics.
- **The Cost: An Infinite Multiverse**: To maintain this dynamical purity while accounting for the appearance of definite outcomes, MWI makes an immense ontological concession. It reinterprets the superposition not as a catalog of possibilities for one world, but as a catalog of actualities for many worlds. Every component of the wavefunction that can evolve into a quasi-classical history is granted full ontological status as a "world" (Saunders et al., 2010). Thus, the universe continuously and irreversibly branches into a multiverse of staggering proportions. As critics like Kent (2015) note, this solves the measurement problem by declaring it a non-problem—all outcomes occur, so no single outcome needs to be selected. The strategy is elegantly summarized: **Multiply ontology to save the equations**.

The Ze Strategy: Architectural Unification

The Ze framework inverts this strategy. It is parsimonious in ontology but innovative in proposing a universal architectural principle that subsumes quantum measurement as a special case.

- Preserving a Single World: Ze takes the empirical fact of a single, shared, classical reality as its ontological foundation. There is one universe, one set of records, one history that is ultimately consistent at the macroscopic, communicative scale. This aligns with the pre-theoretic intuition of science and everyday experience.
- **The Innovation: The Free Energy Architecture**: To explain how this single world emerges from quantum formalism without resorting to a privileged observer, Ze introduces an architectural principle: systems persist by minimizing variational free energy (F), a bound on surprise (Friston, 2010). This is not a minor adjustment to quantum mechanics; it is a meta-theoretical framework for understanding adaptive, self-organizing systems. Within this architecture, "measurement" or **localization** is reconceived. It is the process by which a system (any system with a Markov blanket, from a particle detector to a brain) resolves uncertainty by selecting the generative model that minimizes its free energy (Friston et al., 2017; Buckley et al., 2017). The collapse is not a magical event but the natural outcome of a physical inference process. The strategy is thus: **Preserve ontology by introducing a unifying architecture**.

Synthesizing the Distinctions: A Comparative Summary

The following table synthesizes the critical distinctions explored throughout this series, stemming from the core strategic divergence:

Table 1

Dimension of Comparison	Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI)	Ze Framework	Implication of Divergence
Core Strategy	Multiply ontology to preserve dynamical equations.	Introduce unifying architecture to preserve single-world ontology.	Foundational philosophical difference in problem-solving.
Number of Real Worlds	Infinite. All branches are ontologically real (Vaidman, 2021).	One. Alternatives are descriptions, not destinations (Friston, 2010).	Directly contradictory claims about the furniture of the universe.
Nature of Alternatives	Ontological. Each alternative is a physically real world (Wallace, 2012).	Epistemic. Alternatives are competing generative models or hypotheses (Buckley et al., 2017; Knill & Pouget, 2004).	Worlds vs. models. This is the most fundamental categorical distinction.
Collapse of Wavefunction	No. Explicitly rejected. Definiteness is illusory/relative.	Yes (as a Process). Localization is a physical, objective process of model selection ($\Delta F > \theta$) (Friston et al., 2017).	Ze has a dynamical account of definiteness; MWI explains it away.
Quantum Eraser/Reversibility	Formal. Explained as interference within a still-coherent, complex branch before final decoherence (Zurek, 2003).	Physically Significant. Demonstrates the reversibility of model selection before threshold crossing (Friston, 2010).	For Ze, history is malleable; for MWI, branching is ultimately irreversible.
Novel Empirical Predictions	Effectively None. Empirically equivalent to standard quantum mechanics within a branch (Kent, 2015).	Yes. Predicts dependence of localization on active inference, dynamic classicality thresholds, and cognitive parallels (Friston, 2010; Hohwy, 2013).	Ze is a testable scientific framework; MWI is a metaphysical interpretation.
Role of the Observer	Covertly Privileged. The "finding oneself" in a branch problem implies a hidden perspectival privilege (Albert, 1992).	Absent as a Primitive. Replaced by any free-energy-minimizing system (molecule, device, brain) (Friston, 2010).	Ze fully naturalizes measurement; MWI remains anthropocentric in its narrative.

Ze as a Distinct Paradigm

The question "Is Ze a many-worlds theory?" can now be definitively answered in the negative. They are not rival siblings within the same family of interpretations; they are solutions from different philosophical lineages. MWI remains within the traditional domain of quantum foundations, offering an ontological reinterpretation of the existing formalism. It is a bold answer to the question, "What must the universe be like for our equations to be universally true?"

Ze, conversely, represents a paradigm shift. It steps outside the traditional quantum interpretation debate and proposes that the principles governing the emergence of the classical from the quantum are the same principles governing life, mind, and adaptive intelligence. It answers a different, potentially deeper question: "What general physical principle explains how systems—from particles to persons—come to hold definite states about the world?" By rooting itself in the Free Energy Principle, Ze connects quantum foundations to neuroscience, biology, and machine learning in a way MWI never can (Friston, 2010).

Therefore, Ze is not Many-Worlds. MWI multiplies realities. Ze constructs a theory of how reality is inferred and enacted. One inflates the cosmos to preserve an equation; the other discerns a unifying architecture to explain the cosmos we inhabit. This is not a minor technical disagreement but a fundamental schism in the project of understanding quantum theory and its place in nature.

Conclusion – A Radical Orthogonality

This concluding paper synthesizes the comprehensive analysis presented throughout this series, definitively establishing that the Ze framework is not a variant of the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) but represents a radically orthogonal paradigm for understanding quantum phenomena. Through systematic comparison across ontological commitments, dynamical processes, and epistemological foundations, we have demonstrated that Ze rejects the core tenets of MWI: it denies the existence of multiple real worlds, eliminates the need for any subjective branch selection, and avoids the ontological proliferation of reality inherent in the multiverse hypothesis. Instead, Ze offers a cohesive alternative centered on *active inference*, the resolution of *model conflict*, and the *forced localization of history* through physically grounded processes. The final, synthesizing thesis is this: **The world does not branch; it becomes definite**. Ze provides a rigorous, monistic, and empirically engaged framework for explaining how quantum potentialities give way to the concrete facts of our single, shared reality.

The End of a Misconception

The superficial resemblance between the Ze framework and the Many-Worlds Interpretation—their shared rejection of a fundamental, instantaneous collapse—has led to persistent conflation. This series has systematically dismantled this misconception. As we have shown, agreement on what a theory denies does not imply agreement on what it affirms. This final installment consolidates the evidence into a definitive conclusion: Ze and MWI are not competing siblings within the same family of interpretations; they are descendants of fundamentally different philosophical lineages addressing the quantum measurement problem with incompatible core postulates. Their orthogonality is total, spanning metaphysics, dynamics, and empirical philosophy.

What Ze Is Not: The Rejection of the Many-Worlds Core

Ze's foundation is defined, in part, by what it categorically rejects from the MWI picture.

- **No Plurality of Worlds**: The most definitive divergence is ontological. MWI's essence is the literal existence of a branching multiverse where all quantum possibilities are actualized in separate, non-communicating realms (Vaidman, 2021; Wallace, 2012). Ze, in stark contrast, is rigorously monistic. It posits a single, unfolding reality. The "alternatives" within its formalism are not nascent worlds but are explicitly epistemic: they are competing internal *generative models* or hypotheses that a system entertains about its environment (Friston, 2010; Buckley et al., 2017). As Knill and Pouget (2004) articulate in the context of neural coding, the brain maintains multiple probabilistic models to guide behavior; Ze extends this principle to the foundational level of quantum interaction. There are not many worlds, only many descriptions.
- **No Subjective Branch Selection**: MWI struggles to explain why a conscious observer experiences one branch over another without invoking a covert form of privilege—the "finding oneself" problem (Kent, 2015). Ze dissolves this issue by removing the subjective observer as a foundational primitive. In Ze, "observation" is not an act of consciousness but a physical process of inference undertaken by any system—living or non-living—that maintains a model of its world. The "selection" is not a subjective mystery but an objective, algorithmic outcome of a system minimizing its variational free energy (Friston et al., 2017). A photon detector "chooses" a click state through the same physical optimization principle that guides a bacterium up a chemical gradient.
- **No Ontological Proliferation**: Consequently, Ze avoids the immense ontological inflation that is the hallmark and major criticism of MWI. It does not populate reality with an exponentially growing infinity of parallel universes. Instead, it conserves ontological commitment to one world, attributing the appearance of multiplicity to the inherent plurality of *possible descriptions* and *inferential perspectives* within that world. This aligns with a Bayesian, model-based understanding of physics where theories are tools for prediction, not direct maps of a hyper-inflated reality (Hohwy, 2013).

What Ze Is: The Architecture of Definiteness

Having rejected the many-worlds solution, Ze constructs a positive, coherent framework for how definiteness arises.

- **Active Inference as the Engine**: At the heart of Ze is not a branching universe, but the principle of *active inference* under the Free Energy Principle (Friston, 2010). Systems act to sample their environment in ways that minimize surprise or prediction error. This continuous process of action and perception is the fundamental dynamic. Quantum measurement is recast as a specific, sharp instance of this general process: an interaction that forces a resolution of high uncertainty.
- **Model Conflict as the Source of Indefiniteness**: Superposition and quantum interference are understood not as signs of parallel worlds, but as manifestations of unresolved *model conflict*. When a system's generative models for sensory data remain mutually compatible and non-exclusive, their predictions interfere, resulting in

characteristically quantum statistics (Friston et al., 2017). The system is in a state of suspended inference, analogous to binocular rivalry in perception where two incompatible interpretations vie for dominance (Hohwy, 2013).

- **Forced Localization of History as the Resolution**: Definiteness emerges when this conflict is forcibly resolved—when **localization** occurs. This is the critical process where the difference in free energy (ΔF) between maintaining ambiguous models and committing to a single, best explanation exceeds a context-dependent threshold (θ) (Buckley et al., 2017). This is not a "collapse" in the mystical Copenhagen sense, but a physical, often irreversible, transition to a stable informational state. It is the moment a "history" is written, not by a conscious observer, but by the thermodynamic and informational dynamics of the interaction itself. This process explains phenomena like the quantum eraser: if information forcing a model choice is systematically undone *before* the localization threshold is irreversibly crossed, the conflict can be re-established, and interference restored (Friston, 2010).

The Synthesizing Thesis: Becoming Over Branching

From this synthesis, a powerful and elegant thesis emerges: **The world does not branch; it becomes definite**.

- **MWI's Narrative: Branching**. The universe is a tree. At every quantum event, it splits. Reality is a growing, diverging multitude. Our experience is a single leaf on an infinite tree, and the other leaves are just as real. Past, present, and future are all laid out in the static branching structure of the block multiverse.
- **Ze's Narrative: Becoming**. The universe is a process. It is a single, self-specifying system moving from states of higher uncertainty to states of lower uncertainty. Definite facts—from the trajectory of a particle to the perception of an object—crystallize out of potentiality through the relentless imperative of free energy minimization (Friston, 2010). The past is not a fixed branch but the most stable retrodiction from the present state of evidence; the future is not a set of existing twigs but a space of possibilities to be narrowed through action and interaction.

This is the radical orthogonality. MWI multiplies entities (worlds) to preserve a dynamical law (unitarity). Ze introduces a new architectural principle (active inference) to preserve a parsimonious ontology (one world) and explain the dynamics of definiteness. They are answers to different questions from different frameworks.

Final Conclusion: Ze as a Unifying Scientific Framework

The insistence that "Ze is not Many-Worlds" is therefore more than a technical correction. It is a claim about the scope and nature of the Ze framework. MWI remains, for all its sophistication, an interpretation of quantum mechanics—a story we tell about the mathematical formalism. Ze aspires to be more: a general framework for understanding how adaptive systems, at any scale, engage with and come to know their world.

By rooting itself in the Free Energy Principle, Ze connects the physics of measurement to the biology of life and the mechanics of mind (Friston, 2010). It offers not just a way to avoid the paradoxes of quantum theory, but a potential bridge between fundamental physics, neuroscience, and artificial intelligence. Its predictions about active sensing, dynamic thresholds, and the unification of quantum and cognitive dynamics open new avenues for experiment (Friston et al., 2017).

In conclusion, Ze is not Many-Worlds. It is a distinct, coherent, and empirically fertile paradigm that explains the quantum-to-classical transition not by fleeing into a multiverse, but by digging deeper into the physics of information, inference, and interaction that govern our one, becoming world.

References

Albert, D. Z. (2010). Probability in the Everett picture. In S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, & D. Wallace (Eds.), Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, & Reality (pp. 355-368). Oxford University Press.

Arndt, M., Nairz, O., Vos-Andreae, J., Keller, C., van der Zouw, G., & Zeilinger, A. (1999). Wave–particle duality of C60 molecules. Nature, 401(6754), 680–682. https://doi.org/10.1038/44348

Brukner, Č. (2017). On the quantum measurement problem. In Quantum [Un]Speakables II (pp. 95-117). Springer, Cham.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2017.09.004

Carroll, S. (2019). Something Deeply Hidden: Quantum Worlds and the Emergence of Spacetime. Dutton.

Carroll, S. M. (2019). Beyond Falsifiability: Normal Science in a Multiverse. In R. Dardashti, R. Dawid, & K. Thébault (Eds.), Why Trust a Theory? (pp. 300–314). Cambridge University Press.

Deutsch, D. (1999). Quantum theory of probability and decisions. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 455(1988), 3129–3137.

Everett, H., III. (1957). "Relative state" formulation of quantum mechanics. Reviews of Modern Physics, 29(3), 454–462.

Fong, W., Berger, E., & Chornock, R. (2016). A multi-wavelength analysis of the relativistic supernova SN 2009bb. The Astrophysical Journal, 821(2), 89.

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 11(2), 127–138. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2787

Friston, K., FitzGerald, T., Rigoli, F., Schwartenbeck, P., & Pezzulo, G. (2017). Active inference: a process theory. Neural Computation, 29(1), 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00912

Fuchs, C. A., & Schack, R. (2013). Quantum-Bayesian coherence. Reviews of Modern Physics, 85(4), 1693–1715. https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.85.1693

Fuchs, C. A., Mermin, N. D., & Schack, R. (2014). An introduction to QBism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics. American Journal of Physics, 82(8), 749–754.

Hohwy, J. (2013). The Predictive Mind. Oxford University Press.

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.

Kent, A. (2015). Testing the many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.03755.

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. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.1

Knill, D. C., & Pouget, A. (2004). The Bayesian brain: the role of uncertainty in neural coding and computation. Trends in Neurosciences, 27(12), 712–719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2004.10.007

Laudisa, F., & Rovelli, C. (2021). Relational quantum mechanics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2021 Edition). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.

Peres, A. (1995). Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Price, H. (2010). Decisions, decisions, decisions: can Savage salvage Everettian probability? In S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, & D. Wallace (Eds.), Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, & Reality (pp. 369-390). Oxford University Press.

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

Saunders, S., Barrett, J., Kent, A., & Wallace, D. (Eds.). (2010). Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality. Oxford University Press.

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

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. (2021). Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2021 Edition). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.

Walborn, S. P., Cunha, M. O. T., Pádua, S., & Monken, C. H. (2002). Double-slit quantum eraser. Physical Review A, 65(3), 033818. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.65.033818

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

Zurek, W. H. (2003). Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. Reviews of Modern Physics, 75(3), 715–775. https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.75.715