

Freedom in the many-worlds interpretation

Ovidiu Cristinel Stoica

Dept. of Theoretical Physics, NIPNE—HH, Bucharest, Romania.

Email: cristi.stoica@theory.nipne.ro, holotronix@gmail.com

(Dated: October 17, 2022)

In “The Multiverse Pandemic” ([arXiv:2210.05377](https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.05377)), Gisin makes an interesting case against the many-worlds interpretation (MWI), arguing that it is contradicted by our hard to deny free-will. The counts are: (1) MWI is deterministic, forcing choices on us, (2) in MWI all our possible choices happen, and (3) MWI limits creativity, because everything is entangled with everything else.

I argue that each of these features of MWI provides in fact more freedom than it may seem.

Keywords: Everett’s interpretation; many-worlds interpretation; free-will.

It may be tempting to see individual freedom as “me against the universe”. In the many-worlds interpretation (MWI), this can reach a whole new level, “me against the multiverse”. In a recent very entertaining one-page article [6, 8], Nicolas Gisin raises profound questions about free-will in MWI. He charges MWI on three counts, one for each of the following features it has [3, 5, 17, 18]:

Feature 1 (Determinism). *Since its dynamics is given by the Schrödinger equation only, MWI is deterministic.*

Feature 2 (Multiple alternatives). *Everything that has a nonzero amplitude to happen, happens in some world.*

Feature 3 (High-level of entanglement). *Everything seems to be entangled with everything else.*

I don’t really know how to define free-will or creativity physically, all I know is my own subjective experience of freedom. But we don’t need this, because if whatever we call free-will corresponds to our experience, its compatibility with MWI should boil down to whether MWI supports human beings having the experience of free-will just like in the interpretations of quantum mechanics (QM) considered compatible with free-will.

Count 1. *In a deterministic world, we have no freedom.*

Reply. According to *compatibilism*, it is perfectly possible that our will is compatible with a causally closed world. But this may seem to be a too simplistic semantic trick to avoid the problem, and there is more to be said.

But how can indeterminism allow free-will? How would it help if our decisions are not fully determined by our own present state, but by occasional randomness breaking into the causal chain?

Wouldn’t we be more free if we can determine our next decisions based on how we are now, rather than letting them at the mercy of randomness?

Gisin mentions Descartes’ solution, that “mind” is ontologically distinct from “matter”, and our will affects the physical by some “openings” in its causal chain. But then, the stuff making our mind, our will, should have its own logically consistent laws. And since decision presupposes change, these laws should be those of a dynamical system, deterministic or not. Then, if the “will-stuff” interacts with the physical-stuff, they form together a

larger dynamical system [13], governed by some laws just like physical systems are. The difference is just that it has a double ontology, “matter” and “mind”, but this is irrelevant for how it follows the laws. So we gained nothing, the “openings” in the causal chain are just gates to a larger causal chain, and the questions return.

Also, *even in a deterministic world there is an opening in the causal chain: the initial conditions.* What if the initial conditions are not fully specified at the beginning of time, but are gradually determined as more observations and choices are made? As if God left some blank parameters defining the initial conditions of the deterministic universe, to be filled in later by our own choices. Hofer makes the case for this in classical physics in [10].

Independently, I proposed that these blank parameters may be filled in later, when choosing the measurement settings, so that quantum measurements have definite results without changing the Schrödinger equation, without collapse, without adding new variables, and without creating new worlds [11, 12, 14] (also see [1]).

More recently, Gisin himself used this “causal opening” in the initial conditions of the deterministic laws [7]. His argument is that, since exact real numbers contain infinite information, they can’t describe the universe. He uses the idea of filling in the blanks in the imprecision of numbers, as a way by which potentialities become actualities in a deterministic world. He applies this idea to introduce indeterminism in *Bohmian mechanics* [2, 9] (which, by the way, shares with MWI the Features 1 and 3, and some may say Feature 2 as well [4]). □

Count 2. *If every possibility is realized, all our choices are realized, and we have no freedom.*

Reply. If it seems limiting to be forced by micro-physics to make a particular choice, it should probably feel more limiting to be forced to make all possible choices, even those you don’t want to make.

The argument from my reply to Count 1 applies to laws which, given the initial conditions, determine a single history, while in MWI multiple histories happen. But MWI requires special initial conditions, otherwise branching into worlds would not happen only towards the future, and the Born rule would not be consistent with the records of past measurements kept in the present state

of the world [16]. Not everything happens, only histories containing valid records, and these are an infinitesimal part of all possible histories. Since the initial conditions have to be very restricted in a way that takes into account the dynamical law and future records of the events, the kind of injection of freedom in the initial conditions by filling the blanks later, when our choices take place, may work for MWI too, allowing our will to limit the alternatives. If the compatibilization of free-will with the causal chain by filling in the blanks works for a deterministic world, it should work for MWI too.

But why being restricted to a unique choice would mean more freedom than making all possible choices in different worlds? *A world in which we can choose only one thing and all the others are forbidden restricts our freedom.* MWI allows us to follow Yogi Bera’s advice,

When you come to a fork in the road, take it.

If Alice has to choose between two mutually exclusive options A or B, and wants them both, MWI allows her to choose both of them, albeit in different worlds. In the world where Alice’s choice is A, she experiences doing this by her own free-will, and similarly in the world where her choice is B. The wavefunction has two branches, $a|Alice\ wants\ A\rangle|Alice\ does\ A\rangle$ and $b|Alice\ wants\ B\rangle|Alice\ does\ B\rangle$, where a, b are complex numbers so that $a^2 + b^2 = 1$. If MWI gives Alice the freedom to make both choices, it gives her more freedom. And if Alice wants A and not B, this means that her own disposition when making the choice was to choose A, so that $b = 0$.

It can be objected that, even if MWI allows Alice to make both choices, each version of Alice can enjoy the benefits of only one of these choices in each world. This is consistent with Everett’s idea that each branch correlates with her brain being in a classical state [5].

Can Alice have the experience of enjoying both worlds at once? Can her mind be in such a quantum state? My classical mind writing these words is unable to grasp such a quantum mind, but that’s just my classical mind. \square

Count 3. *“When everything is entangled with everything else, in one big monstrous piece, there is no room left for creativity” (Gisin, [8]).*

Reply. It is said that Leonardo da Vinci worked on the *Mona Lisa* between 1503 and 1517. An artist tries numerous versions, explores numerous potential worlds in a single world. MWI may allow different versions of da Vinci, with different versions of the *Mona Lisa*, including the one we know. If our own history, with a particular version of the *Mona Lisa*, involves creativity, how would the same history lack creativity in MWI, just because multiple other variations happen? If “everything happens” in MWI, how could creativity not happen?

Could it be true that in MWI the histories in which Shakespeare produced randomly both great and bad literature overwhelmingly dominate the multiverse? If

MWI gives the same probabilities as standard QM, Shakespeare should create consistently great or consistently bad literature in most histories.

So how would entanglement limit creativity?

While any interpretation of QM contains entanglement, MWI contains much more, because it is based on decoherence. In each world, the measured system is separated from the environment, so each world has the same amount of entanglement as in standard QM. But in the total wavefunction, containing the many worlds, the observed system is entangled with the environment. Every time new worlds are created, new entanglement is produced. Standard QM avoids this by collapsing the wavefunction at the end of each measurement, so that in the end the observed degrees of freedom are not entangled with the environment. But in MWI, more entanglement is produced with each new measurement. The same amount of entanglement is present in Bohmian mechanics, which requires the same branching structure as MWI, otherwise the “empty branches” will interfere with the one correlated to the Bohmian positions, making objects unstable and violating the Born rule.

In each world, the entanglement is exactly how it has to be in standard QM. And what happens in one world is not affected by the other worlds, unless previously separated worlds interfere again, which would be a bigger problem for MWI than too much entanglement.

Also, in [15] I suggest that background-free quantum gravity enforces the dissociation of the wavefunctional in a preferred basis, which consists of states with definite 3d geometries. Since these states, enforced by background-freedom, consist of local beables, they are ontic and should be counted as independent worlds in a version of MWI, resulting in the Born rule. The vectors from the ontic basis belong to distinct macro-states, which implies that the worlds in MWI are independent, so none of these worlds can restrict creativity in any other world.

Returning to the “opening” in the causal chain that may be needed for free-will, in a deterministic world, even with many-worlds, the more ways to fill in the blanks in the initial conditions, the more possibilities of freedom exist. And entanglement only adds more possibilities, more parameters with more blanks to be filled in.

We are interconnected with the rest of the universe, and it’s up to us if we let these connections enchain us, or we use them as possibilities for us to affect the world.

Whatever abilities we developed during our evolution, including what we call free-will or creativity, are not due to the subsystems alone against the environment, but to the complex interplay between them. *Are these abilities properties of us as subsystems, or of the whole?* \square

Disclaimer. I don’t know what free-will is, beyond my subjective experience of freedom. While I defended its compatibility with MWI, I only expressed some personal views about logical possibilities, using as a starting point Nicolas Gisin’s excellently written, very concise article.

References

- [1] S. Aaronson. The Ghost in the Quantum Turing Machine. “*The Once and Future Turing: Computing the World,*” a collection edited by S. Barry Cooper and Andrew Hodges (in press), 2013. [arXiv:1306.0159](https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.0159).
- [2] D. Bohm. A suggested interpretation of quantum mechanics in terms of “hidden” variables, I & II. *Phys. Rev.*, 85(2):166–193, 1952.
- [3] B.S. de Witt and N. Graham, editors. *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton series in physics, Princeton, 1973.
- [4] D. Deutsch. Comment on Lockwood. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 47(2):222–228, 1996.
- [5] H. Everett. The Theory of the Universal Wave Function. In *The Many-Worlds Hypothesis of Quantum Mechanics*, pages 3–137. Princeton University Press, 1973.
- [6] N. Gisin. L’épidémie du multivers. In *Le plus grand des hasards*, page 184. Belin, 2010.
- [7] N. Gisin. Indeterminism in physics, classical chaos and Bohmian mechanics: Are real numbers really real? *Erkenntnis*, 86(6):1469–1481, 2021.
- [8] N. Gisin. The Multiverse Pandemic. *Preprint arXiv:2210.05377*, 2022.
- [9] S. Goldstein. Bohmian mechanics. In E.N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Spring 2013 edition, 2013. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/qm-bohm/>, last accessed October 17, 2022.
- [10] C. Hofer. Freedom from the inside out. *R. Inst. Philos. suppl.*, 50:201–222, 2002.
- [11] O.C. Stoica. Convergence and free-will. *PhilSci Archive*, 2008. [philsci-archive:00004356/](https://philsci-archive.00004356/).
- [12] O.C. Stoica. Flowing with a frozen river. *Foundational Questions Institute, “The Nature of Time” essay contest*, 2008. <http://fqxi.org/community/forum/topic/322>, last accessed October 17, 2022.
- [13] O.C. Stoica. The negative way to sentience. *Preprint on http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/17036/* - last accessed October 17, 2022, March 2020.
- [14] O.C. Stoica. The post-determined block universe. *Quantum Stud. Math. Found.*, 8(1), 2021. [arXiv:1903.07078](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.07078).
- [15] O.C. Stoica. Counting 3d-spaces: classicality and probability in standard and many-worlds quantum mechanics from quantum-gravitational background-freedom. *Preprint arXiv:2209.08623*, 2022.
- [16] O.C. Stoica. Does quantum mechanics requires “conspiracy”? *Preprint arXiv:2209.13275*, 2022.
- [17] L. Vaidman. Many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics. In E.N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2018. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>, last accessed October 17, 2022.
- [18] D. Wallace. *The emergent multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett interpretation*. Oxford University Press, 2012.