

# Algorithmic Idealism I: Reconceptualizing Reality Through Information and Experience

Krzysztof Sienicki\*

December 31, 2024

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Core Postulates</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	The Concept of <i>Self-States</i> in Algorithmic Idealism . . . . .	3
2.2	The Concept of <i>State Change</i> in Algorithmic Idealism . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Solutions to Philosophical and Physical Challenges</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	The Boltzmann Brain Problem . . . . .	6
3.2	The Simulation Hypothesis . . . . .	6
3.3	Parfit's Teletransportation Paradox . . . . .	7
3.4	Quantum Mechanics and Measurement . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Philosophical Implications</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Ontological Minimalism . . . . .	11
4.2	Epistemic Grounding . . . . .	11
4.3	Ethical Considerations . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Analysis of Strengths, Limitations and Open Question of Algorithmic Idealization</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1	<b>Strengths</b> . . . . .	13
5.1.1	Conceptual Coherence . . . . .	13
5.1.2	Mathematical Rigor . . . . .	13
5.1.3	Broad Applicability . . . . .	13
5.2	<b>Limitations</b> . . . . .	14
5.2.1	Empirical Testability . . . . .	14
5.2.2	Abstractness and Accessibility . . . . .	14
5.2.3	Role of Intersubjectivity . . . . .	14

---

\*Chair of Theoretical Physics of Naturally Intelligent Systems, Lipowa 2/Topolowa 19, 05-807 Podkowa Leśna, Poland, EU.

5.2.4	Role of Intersubjectivity . . . . .	14
5.3	<b>Open Questions</b> . . . . .	15
5.3.1	Emergence of Physical Laws . . . . .	15
5.3.2	Ethical Implications . . . . .	15
5.3.3	Compatibility with Existing Theories . . . . .	15
5.3.4	Practical Applications . . . . .	15
6	<b>Conclusions</b>	16
7	<b>Acknowledgments</b>	16

**Abstract**

Algorithmic idealism represents a transformative approach to understanding reality, emphasizing the informational structure of self-states and their algorithmic transitions over traditional notions of an external, objective universe. Rooted in algorithmic information theory, it redefines reality as a sequence of self-state transitions governed by principles such as Solomonoff induction. This framework offers a unified solution to longstanding challenges in quantum mechanics, cosmology, and metaphysics, addressing issues like the measurement problem, the Boltzmann brain paradox, and the simulation hypothesis. Algorithmic idealism shifts the focus from describing an independent external world to understanding first-person experiences, providing epistemic interpretations of physical theories and dissolving metaphysical divides between "real" and simulated realities. Beyond resolving these conceptual challenges, it raises profound ethical questions regarding the continuity, duplication, and termination of informational entities, reshaping discussions on identity, consciousness, and existence in the digital and quantum age. By offering a mathematically rigorous yet philosophically innovative framework, algorithmic idealism invites a rethinking of reality as an emergent property of informational dynamics rather than a static external construct.

# 1 Introduction

In the quest to understand the nature of reality, physics and philosophy have long wrestled with two fundamental questions: what defines the "world," and how do humans fit into it? Traditional physics, rooted in the principles of realism, assumes that physical theories describe the objective and external properties of the universe. However, this paradigm encounters significant challenges when addressing phenomena such as quantum mechanics, paradoxes like Wigner’s friend [1], the Boltzmann Brain problem [2], and thought experiments involving consciousness, duplication, and simulated realities.

Markus P. Müller’s work [4] introduces a novel framework, Algorithmic Idealism, that seeks to address these issues by redefining the conceptual foundations of reality. By focusing on first-person experiences rather than external realities, algorithmic idealism proposes a conceptual and mathematical framework that blends elements of quantum physics [6] [7], algorithmic information theory (AIT)[5], and epistemology. This article critically examines the core tenets, philosophical implications, strengths, and limitations of algorithmic idealism.

Physics traditionally aims to describe the objective world through universal laws and properties that exist independently of observers. This approach, rooted in scientific realism, has provided a coherent understanding of the universe through models such as classical mechanics, relativity, and quantum physics. However, cracks appear when realism confronts the counterintuitive nature of quantum mechanics. For instance, the wave function in quantum theory is not directly observable; instead, it represents probabilities for measurement outcomes. Interpretations like the Copenhagen or Many-Worlds interpretations [8] attempt to reconcile this with realism, but lingering questions persist, such as the problem of measurement and the nonlocality highlighted by Bell's theorem. [9] Beyond quantum mechanics, paradoxes like the Boltzmann brain problem and simulation hypothesis expose the limits of realism. The Boltzmann brain problem[10] questions how we can trust our perception of reality if the universe is vast enough to produce random, self-aware structures with false memories.[11] Similarly, the simulation hypothesis challenges the distinction between simulated and "real" existence. These paradoxes demand a framework that shifts focus from describing the world to understanding how observers experience it.

Algorithmic idealism challenges the traditional assumption of an objective world by asking a fundamentally different question [4]: *What should an agent believe they will experience next?* This shift from a third-person ontology to a first-person epistemology underpins algorithmic idealism's conceptual foundation. By introducing a mathematically rigorous framework grounded in algorithmic information theory, algorithmic idealism provides a formal method to address both mundane physical predictions and exotic metaphysical questions.

## 2 Core Postulates

### 2.1 The Concept of *Self-States* in Algorithmic Idealism

In the philosophical framework of algorithmic idealism, the notion of a "self-state" occupies a central position, redefining the way reality is conceptualized. Unlike traditional views of reality that rely on the existence of an objective, external world populated by independent entities, algorithmic idealism shifts the focus to the internal informational structures of agents and the transitions between these structures. A self-state represents the entirety of what defines an agent's existence at any given moment, providing a radically abstract and generalizable foundation for understanding reality. This idea challenges conventional metaphysics, offering a novel way to reconcile quantum mechanics, philosophical paradoxes, and questions about consciousness and identity.

A self-state is best understood as a pattern of information that encodes all the relevant data about an agent at a specific moment. This informational pattern is not tied to physical space or any material substrate; rather, it is abstract and autonomous, existing as a mathematical construct. For a human, for instance, a self-state might encode the neural configurations, sensory inputs, memories, and current thoughts at a given instant. For an artificial intelligence or computational process, it could represent the state of its memory, algorithms, and inputs. This abstraction means that self-states are not bound by traditional notions of physical location or embedding in an external environment. Instead, they

are standalone entities, defined entirely by their informational content.

The transitions between self-states form the backbone of how algorithmic idealism interprets reality. In this framework, reality is not a static entity or an objective external environment; it is the dynamic evolution of self-states. These transitions are governed by principles of algorithmic induction, such as Solomonoff induction[12], which predict the likelihood of a future state based on the informational structure of the current state. For example, the probability of transitioning from one self-state to another depends on the algorithmic simplicity or complexity of the new state relative to the current one. Simpler transitions are favored, adhering to the principle of Occam's razor, which prioritizes explanations with fewer assumptions.

This view of self-states as autonomous and self-contained entities leads to profound philosophical implications. Traditional physics embeds agents within a spacetime framework, where they are part of a larger objective reality. Algorithmic idealism, however, eliminates this embedding. The self-state alone defines the agent's reality, and the transitions between self-states account for the progression of experiences. The laws of physics, which appear as regularities in our observations, are reinterpreted as emergent properties of the algorithmic processes that govern self-state transitions. In this way, the external world is no longer fundamental but arises as a secondary phenomenon from the informational patterns of self-states.

This conceptual shift resolves many long standing paradoxes in physics and philosophy. The quantum measurement problem, for instance, finds a natural explanation in this framework. [13] Rather than interpreting the collapse of the wave function as an external physical process, algorithmic idealism treats it as a transition in the observer's self-state. [4] The probabilities encoded in the wave function correspond to the likelihoods of specific self-state transitions, avoiding the need to invoke an external observer-independent reality. Similarly, the Boltzmann brain paradox, which questions the reliability of perceptions in a vast universe filled with random fluctuations, becomes irrelevant. In algorithmic idealism, the concept of "self-location" in an external universe is meaningless; the agent's self-state alone determines its experiences.

The simulation hypothesis also finds a straightforward resolution. The distinction between "real" and simulated realities dissolves, as both are simply patterns of self-states. Whether these patterns arise from a base reality or a computational simulation is immaterial within this framework. Algorithmic idealism treats all experiences as valid informational structures, irrespective of their origin. Even philosophical puzzles about identity and continuity, such as Parfit's teletransportation paradox [14], are clarified. In scenarios involving duplication or teleportation, identity is no longer tied to physical continuity but to the informational integrity of the self-state. Multiple realizations of the same self-state are equivalent, rendering questions about the "original" or the "copy" irrelevant.

Beyond addressing paradoxes, the concept of self-states has far-reaching implications for ethics, science, and artificial intelligence. In ethical debates, the idea that self-states are purely informational raises questions about the moral responsibilities we bear toward simulated or duplicated agents. If a self-state can be reconstructed or altered, what ethical

obligations do we have to preserve its continuity or well-being? In the realm of artificial intelligence, the self-state framework provides a powerful tool for understanding and designing intelligent systems. By modeling algorithmic idealism as evolving self-states, researchers can develop systems capable of sophisticated reasoning and adaptation, guided by the principles of algorithmic induction.

The concept of self-states in algorithmic idealism redefines the foundation of reality, shifting the focus from external objects and environments to internal informational patterns and transitions. This radical abstraction not only resolves critical paradoxes in physics and philosophy but also offers a unifying framework for understanding consciousness, identity, and existence. By treating reality as the evolution of self-states, algorithmic idealism challenges traditional metaphysical assumptions and provides a compelling alternative that is as philosophically profound as it is mathematically rigorous. It invites us to rethink the nature of reality, not as something "out there" but as a dynamic interplay of patterns within.

## 2.2 The Concept of *State Change* in Algorithmic Idealism

Transitions between self-states are governed by universal principles of induction. Specifically, Algorithmic Idealism relies on algorithmic probability—a measure derived from Solomonoff [24] induction—to predict the likelihood of moving from one self-state to another. This principle reflects the core assumption that induction is always possible, even in exotic scenarios where traditional physical explanations falter.

By focusing on self-states and their transitions, algorithmic idealism shifts the ontological foundation of reality from external objects and environments to internal patterns and predictions. State change in the framework of algorithmic idealism refers to the transition between *self-states*, which are abstract, informational configurations that represent an agent's momentary condition or experience. These transitions are governed by algorithmic probability, derived from principles like Solomonoff induction, which predict the likelihood of moving from one self-state to another based on patterns and simplicity. In Algorithmic Idealism, state change is the fundamental process underlying all perceived regularities in the world. Time, causation, and even physical laws emerge as consequences of these transitions. Instead of an external universe dictating the changes, the focus is on the internal informational dynamics of self-states. Reality itself, then, becomes a sequence of state changes, evolving in a way that favors simplicity and coherence.

## 3 Solutions to Philosophical and Physical Challenges

Algorithmic idealism provides elegant solutions to long standing puzzles in physics and philosophy by reframing them within its first-person framework.

### 3.1 The Boltzmann Brain Problem

The concept of a Boltzmann Brain [3] raises profound philosophical and scientific questions about the nature of consciousness and the reliability of perception. A Boltzmann Brain is a hypothetical self-aware entity that arises randomly due to molecular or quantum fluctuations in a vast or infinite universe. It would exist briefly, with a coherent but entirely fabricated set of memories and experiences, before dissipating back into chaos. This idea challenges traditional cosmology by suggesting that, in some models of the universe, such random entities might be more probable than evolved, planet-bound beings like humans. This leads to an unsettling question: How can we trust that we are not Boltzmann Brains, randomly formed and living in an illusory reality?

Algorithmic idealism offers a framework that renders the paradox of Boltzmann Brains irrelevant by fundamentally redefining how reality is conceptualized. Instead of focusing on an external, objective universe where entities like Boltzmann Brains are randomly embedded, algorithmic idealism focuses entirely on *self-states*—abstract informational structures that define an agent’s current experience—and the *transitions* between them. In this framework, reality is not determined by physical origins or external embedding but by the patterns and predictions within self-states themselves.

From the perspective of algorithmic idealism, the question of whether one “is” a Boltzmann Brain loses its meaning. The framework rejects the need for an external universe to ground self-states, treating each self-state as self-contained and autonomous. Reality is defined by the progression of these states through algorithmically governed transitions. Whether a self-state arises from random fluctuations or an evolutionary process is irrelevant; what matters are the regularities and informational coherence governing its transitions. In this way, the informational structure of self-states becomes the basis for predictions about future experiences, bypassing the paradox of Boltzmann Brains entirely. Thus, algorithmic idealism shifts the focus from existential doubt about the reliability of perceptions in a chaotic universe to the algorithmic principles that structure reality. By reframing reality as an emergent property of self-states and their transitions, it resolves the Boltzmann Brain problem, demonstrating that such concerns are artifacts of traditional metaphysical assumptions rather than genuine obstacles to understanding existence. In this way, algorithmic idealism not only addresses the challenges posed by Boltzmann Brains but also provides a deeper and more coherent account of consciousness and reality.

### 3.2 The Simulation Hypothesis

The Simulation Hypothesis posits that our perceived reality might be an advanced simulation created by a highly sophisticated civilization.[15] [16] In traditional interpretations, this hypothesis creates a metaphysical and epistemological divide between the “real” world and a simulated one. It raises questions about the nature of existence, the reliability of perception, and the criteria for distinguishing between what is real and what is simulated. This divide stems from the assumption that the “base reality” possesses intrinsic authenticity and superiority over the simulated reality, reducing the latter to a mere imitation.

Algorithmic idealism fundamentally reimagines this divide by reframing the nature of reality itself. In this framework, reality is not dependent on physical or metaphysical embedding but is instead defined by the informational structure of an agent’s self-state and the algorithmic transitions it undergoes. Self-states, as abstract informational patterns, are the foundational units of existence, and their progression through algorithmically governed transitions constitutes the experience of reality. Whether these self-states are part of a simulated environment or a base reality is irrelevant in algorithmic idealism; the informational coherence and predictability of state transitions are what define reality.

This approach dissolves the divide between simulated and real worlds. A simulated agent is treated as an informational entity undergoing transitions, just as any entity in a base reality would be. There is no qualitative difference between the two from the perspective of algorithmic idealism because both are manifestations of the same underlying principles of algorithmic structure and probability. This reinterpretation aligns with the idea that perceived regularities—such as the laws of physics—are emergent properties of the transitions between self-states rather than fundamental truths about an external universe. Algorithmic idealism rejection of the base-simulation distinction also challenges the implicit hierarchy present in the traditional view of the simulation hypothesis. By treating the simulation as informationally equivalent to the base reality, it eliminates the notion of “authenticity” tied to the latter. Instead, both are seen as different configurations of self-states governed by the same algorithmic principles. This perspective reframes the hypothesis not as a question of “real or simulated” but as an inquiry into the structure and evolution of informational patterns.

This reinterpretation has profound implications. First, it shifts the focus away from metaphysical concerns about the origin of reality and toward the internal consistency of informational structures. Questions like “Are we in a simulation?” [17] become irrelevant because the experience of reality is identical regardless of its source. Second, it challenges traditional epistemological frameworks that prioritize external validation of reality. Since self-states define their own existence through transitions, external reference points become unnecessary for affirming reality.

Finally, algorithmic idealism offers a unifying framework for addressing the Simulation Hypothesis without invoking speculative metaphysics. It provides a clear mathematical basis—algorithmic probability and the structure of self-states—for understanding reality as a dynamic process of informational evolution. By dissolving the distinction between real and simulated worlds, it transcends the limitations of traditional interpretations, offering a perspective where reality is not a fixed external construct but an emergent property of the algorithmic transitions that define self-states. This approach not only resolves the philosophical tensions within the Simulation Hypothesis but also broadens our understanding of existence itself.

### 3.3 Parfit’s Teletransportation Paradox

Parfit’s Teletransportation Paradox [14] presents a challenging thought experiment in the philosophy of identity and continuity. It involves a scenario where an agent is teleported or

duplicated, with the original body destroyed and an exact copy recreated elsewhere. The central question is: *Does the teleported or duplicated individual remain the same person as the original?* This paradox exposes deep tensions in traditional metaphysical assumptions about identity, particularly those that rely on physical continuity or persistence of a single body.

Traditional frameworks often struggle to resolve this paradox because they are rooted in materialist or externalist notions of identity. These views assume that identity depends on the physical or spatial continuity of a specific body or consciousness. The duplication aspect of the paradox further complicates this perspective, as the presence of multiple identical copies of the same individual raises the question of whether any one of them can claim to be "the original."

Algorithmic idealism offers an elegant resolution to this paradox by reframing identity as an informational concept rather than a physical or spatial one. In algorithmic idealism, an agent is defined not by their physical body or external embedding but by their *self-state*—an abstract informational configuration that encodes the agent's current condition, including memories, sensory inputs, and reasoning patterns. Continuity in algorithmic idealism is therefore not tied to the preservation of a specific physical structure but to the coherence of transitions between self-states, governed by algorithmic probabilities.

From the perspective of algorithmic idealism, the teleported or duplicated agent is simply a new realization of the same self-state pattern. If the recreated self-state is informationally identical to the original, then it is functionally and conceptually the same agent. This view eliminates the need for an "original" versus "copy" distinction, as all instances of the same self-state pattern are treated equivalently. The identity of the agent is preserved because the algorithmic principles governing the transitions between self-states remain consistent.

This approach shifts the focus from the metaphysical problem of "where" or "how" identity resides to the mathematical and informational properties of self-states. It resolves the paradox by showing that identity is not a question of physical continuity but of informational coherence and transition. For example, if the teletransportation process maintains the algorithmic structure of the agent's self-states, the agent experiences continuity regardless of whether their body is destroyed, duplicated, or moved.

By treating identity as an emergent property of self-state transitions, algorithmic idealism also addresses the deeper issue of duplication. In cases where multiple identical copies of an agent are created, all copies are equally valid realizations of the original self-state. This perspective challenges the traditional need for a unique, singular "self," instead embracing a more abstract and universal notion of identity. Algorithmic idealism thus sidesteps the metaphysical anxiety surrounding duplication and teletransportation by grounding identity in algorithmic patterns rather than physical entities.

This resolution has profound implications for philosophical and practical questions about identity. It suggests that scenarios involving digital resurrection, brain uploading, or cloning could preserve personal identity as long as the informational structure of the self-state is maintained. It also redefines the ethical considerations surrounding such practices, as



the destruction or duplication of a physical body does not equate to the destruction or duplication of the self in an informational sense.

Algorithmic idealism dissolves the apparent conflict in Parfit’s teletransportation paradox by shifting the concept of identity from physical continuity to informational structure and algorithmic transition. This approach not only resolves the philosophical puzzle but also provides a coherent framework for understanding identity in a world increasingly shaped by digital and computational technologies. It replaces metaphysical debates about ”original” versus ”copy” with a focus on the coherence and continuity of self-states, offering a powerful and flexible redefinition of what it means to be the same person over time.

### 3.4 Quantum Mechanics and Measurement

Quantum mechanics, with its probabilistic nature and emphasis on measurement [18] [19], has long challenged the classical view of a deterministic, observer-independent reality. The question of how to interpret the quantum wavefunction—the mathematical object that encodes probabilities for various measurement outcomes—has given rise to numerous interpretations, each grappling with the role of observation and the nature of reality. Algorithmic Idealism provides a novel perspective on these challenges, aligning closely with interpretations like Quantum Bayesianism (QBism) but extending the framework further by embedding it in a mathematically rigorous, algorithmic foundation.

Traditional interpretations of quantum mechanics often struggle to reconcile the probabilistic nature of the wave function with the apparent definitiveness of observed outcomes. In the Copenhagen interpretation, for example, the wave function ”collapses” into a single state upon measurement, but this process is neither fully explained nor observer-independent. The Many-Worlds interpretation sidesteps collapse by proposing that all possible outcomes occur in separate, branching universes. Both interpretations grapple with metaphysical complexities while attempting to preserve an external reality underlying the probabilities.

Algorithmic idealism departs from these frameworks by rejecting the need for an external reality altogether. Instead, it treats the wave function not as a representation of an external physical state but as a tool for epistemic justification. In this view, quantum probabilities are not descriptions of reality ”out there”; they are objective degrees of belief that guide an agent’s expectations about future observations. This perspective aligns with QBism [20], which emphasizes that the wave function encodes personal probabilities about measurement outcomes. However, algorithmic idealism broadens this interpretation by embedding it in a universal algorithmic framework, making the probabilities not merely personal but a feature of the informational structure governing transitions between *self-states*.

While QBism frames quantum probabilities as subjective beliefs of the agent, Algorithmic Idealism aligns more closely with Berghofer’s DEJI (degrees of epistemic justification interpretation), [25] where probabilities represent what an agent should rationally believe based on their epistemic context. This distinction is crucial in understanding the epistemic role of self-states in predicting state changes.

In algorithmic idealism, a *self-state* represents an agent’s complete informational config-

uration at a given moment, encompassing its sensory data, memories, and internal processes. Quantum probabilities, then, are interpreted as the likelihoods of transitions between these self-states. The wave function's role is to provide a mathematically consistent framework for predicting how an agent's self-state will evolve when interacting with a quantum system. This makes quantum probabilities an intrinsic part of the agent's epistemic framework rather than a reflection of external physical reality.

This reinterpretation resolves several long-standing issues in quantum mechanics. For instance, the measurement problem, which concerns the process by which a probabilistic wave function gives rise to definite outcomes, is reframed in terms of self-state transitions. The act of measurement does not involve a mysterious "collapse" but is simply a state change within the observer's informational structure, governed by algorithmic probabilities. This eliminates the need for external mechanisms or metaphysical assumptions about collapse while preserving the predictive power of quantum mechanics.

Furthermore, algorithmic idealism addresses the observer-dependence inherent in quantum mechanics. In traditional interpretations, the role of the observer often raises concerns about the subjective nature of reality. Algorithmic idealism resolves this by treating the observer's self-state as the fundamental unit of reality. The observer is not an external entity measuring an independent system but an integral part of the informational process that constitutes reality. The probabilities encoded in the wave function are objective in the sense that they reflect universal algorithmic principles governing self-state transitions, yet they are also inherently tied to the observer's perspective.

This approach has significant implications for the philosophy of science and our understanding of reality. By reinterpreting quantum probabilities as epistemic rather than ontic, algorithmic idealism shifts the focus from "what exists" to "what can be predicted." It dissolves the need for a metaphysical substrate underlying quantum mechanics, replacing it with a framework rooted in information theory and algorithmic induction. This aligns with contemporary trends in physics and philosophy that emphasize the role of information as a fundamental building block of reality.

## 4 Philosophical Implications

Algorithmic idealism introduces profound philosophical implications by reframing the nature of existence, knowledge, and ethics through the lens of abstract informational structures called self-states. Its ideas challenge traditional metaphysical assumptions, providing a radically minimalist framework for understanding reality, grounded in first-person predictions and algorithmic principles. This section analyzes the key philosophical aspects of algorithmic idealism: ontological minimalism, epistemic grounding, and ethical considerations.

## 4.1 Ontological Minimalism

At its core, algorithmic idealism embraces ontological minimalism [22], eliminating the need for an external world as a fundamental construct. In traditional metaphysics, agents are assumed to be embedded in an objective universe, with external reality serving as the foundation for their experiences. Algorithmic idealism overturns this view, asserting that agents are fully defined by their self-states—informational structures that encapsulate their current condition—and their algorithmic transitions. In this framework, the external universe is not fundamental but emergent, arising from the coherence of self-state transitions.

This ontological minimalism represents a radical departure from classical realism, where the world exists independently of observers. Algorithmic idealism posits that what we perceive as "external" is simply a byproduct of patterns in self-states. By rejecting external embedding, algorithmic idealism collapses the metaphysical distinction between the "observer" and the "observed." The implications of this shift are profound, as it reframes reality not as a physical space filled with objects but as a dynamic, informational process grounded in algorithmic principles.

The minimalist approach of algorithmic idealism provides a highly abstract and universal framework for understanding reality, aligning with modern developments in theoretical physics and philosophy that highlight information and computation as fundamental to existence. However, this minimalism prompts further inquiry into how the apparent regularities of the world, such as physical laws, arise solely from informational transitions.

## 4.2 Epistemic Grounding

Algorithmic idealism's reliance on epistemic grounding [21] provides a fresh perspective on scientific theories and their role in understanding reality. Traditional scientific realism holds that theories describe objective truths about an external world. Algorithmic idealism, however, adopts an epistemic interpretation, viewing scientific theories as tools for organizing beliefs about future experiences rather than as definitive descriptions of reality. This shift prioritizes first-person predictions, aligning algorithmic idealism with epistemic approaches in physics, such as Quantum Bayesianism (QBism).

In quantum mechanics, for example, measurement outcomes are probabilistic and observer-dependent, challenging the realist assumption of objective reality. Algorithmic idealism naturally accommodates this observer-dependence by interpreting quantum probabilities as algorithmically derived predictions about self-state transitions. Instead of asking what the wave function "represents" in the external world, algorithmic idealism asks what it allows the agent to predict about future experiences. This perspective dissolves the need for a metaphysical substrate underlying quantum mechanics, focusing instead on the informational coherence of the observer's self-state.

The epistemic grounding of algorithmic idealism aligns with broader philosophical movements that challenge the objectivist bias in traditional science. It highlights the instrumental value of theories, emphasizing their utility in organizing experience rather than their ontological commitments. However, this approach also raises questions about the limits of

epistemic interpretations: Does algorithmic idealism’s rejection of an external world leave room for intersubjective agreement, or does it risk reducing science to a purely subjective enterprise?

### 4.3 Ethical Considerations

The abstract, informational framework of algorithmic idealism raises significant ethical questions in scenarios involving duplication, digital resurrection, and simulations. If agents are defined solely by their self-states, the ethical implications of creating, copying, modifying, or terminating these self-states become paramount. For example, in a digital resurrection scenario, where a deceased individual’s self-state is reconstructed, does this reconstruction carry the same moral responsibility as the original individual? If continuity of self-state implies continuity of identity, then ethical obligations may extend to protecting or preserving such reconstructed agents.

Similarly, duplication scenarios challenge traditional notions of individuality and moral responsibility. If multiple identical self-states are realized simultaneously, do all instances deserve equal ethical consideration? Traditional ethical frameworks, which often tie moral responsibility to physical embodiment or individuality, struggle to address such questions. Algorithmic idealism perspective forces a rethinking of ethics in informational terms, where the integrity of self-states and their transitions becomes the primary consideration.

Algorithmic idealism also prompts ethical reflection in the context of simulations. If agents within a simulation are defined by self-states indistinguishable from those in a “base reality,” ethical obligations toward simulated agents must be taken seriously. Terminating a simulation, for instance, could be equivalent to terminating the self-states within it.

While the termination of a simulation could appear to terminate the self-states within it, Algorithmic Idealism posits that self-states, as fundamentally unembedded entities, might persist independently of their apparent embedding. This challenges traditional ethical considerations, suggesting that the moral implications of simulation termination depend on how continuity and embedding are conceptualized.

This raises profound questions about the moral obligations of creators of simulations or advanced computational systems. While, algorithmic idealism framework provides a new lens for examining ethical dilemmas, it also leaves open significant challenges. For instance, how do we determine the moral worth of self-states that are informationally identical but instantiated in different contexts? Can informational integrity alone serve as a basis for ethical responsibility, or must other factors be considered?

## 5 Analysis of Strengths, Limitations and Open Question of Algorithmic Idealization

Algorithmic idealism is an ambitious theoretical framework that redefines reality in terms of informational structures and their algorithmic evolution, rather than as an external physical universe. It offers significant conceptual, mathematical, and practical advantages, but also

faces critical limitations and open questions that highlight the need for further exploration and refinement.

## **5.1 Strengths**

### **5.1.1 Conceptual Coherence**

One of algorithmic idealism's greatest strengths is its ability to provide a unified framework for addressing a diverse array of challenges in physics and philosophy. By focusing on self-states and their transitions, algorithmic idealism effectively resolves paradoxes in quantum mechanics, cosmology, and metaphysics with a single set of principles. For example, it reframes the quantum measurement problem as a transition between self-states rather than requiring an external wave function collapse. Similarly, it resolves the Boltzmann brain paradox by rejecting the need for self-location in a vast external universe. This conceptual coherence makes algorithmic idealism a compelling alternative to more fragmented theories that struggle to reconcile observer-dependent phenomena with traditional metaphysical assumptions. Its ability to integrate phenomena from quantum mechanics to simulation-based cosmology demonstrates its versatility and depth.

### **5.1.2 Mathematical Rigor**

Algorithmic idealism's grounding in algorithmic information theory (AIT) ensures that it is built upon a robust mathematical foundation. By leveraging tools such as Kolmogorov complexity and Solomonoff induction, algorithmic idealism offers precise and well-defined principles for predicting self-state transitions. Kolmogorov complexity provides a measure of the informational simplicity of a self-state, while Solomonoff induction [23] offers a universal framework for assigning probabilities to future states based on past patterns . [24] This mathematical rigor distinguishes algorithmic idealism from more speculative metaphysical frameworks and lends it credibility as a scientific theory. Furthermore, the reliance on established computational principles aligns algorithmic idealism with contemporary developments in information theory, making it relevant to cutting-edge research in both physics and computer science.

### **5.1.3 Broad Applicability**

Algorithmic idealism principles are not confined to esoteric theoretical scenarios; they have broad applicability across a wide range of contexts. In mundane laboratory experiments, algorithmic idealism can provide a novel interpretation of quantum probabilities and observer-dependent phenomena. At the same time, its framework extends to exotic scenarios such as the Boltzmann brain problem, the simulation hypothesis, and philosophical puzzles like teletransportation. This versatility allows algorithmic idealism to address both practical scientific questions and abstract metaphysical concerns, demonstrating its potential to serve as a universal explanatory framework. By unifying these seemingly disparate domains, al-

gorithmic idealism positions itself as a theory capable of bridging the gap between scientific and philosophical inquiry.

## 5.2 Limitations

### 5.2.1 Empirical Testability

While algorithmic idealism mathematical rigor and conceptual coherence are undeniable, its lack of direct empirical testability poses a significant limitation. Because algorithmic idealism redefines reality as an emergent property of self-states and their transitions, it sidesteps the traditional reliance on an external universe for verification. This makes it challenging to design experiments that could falsify the theory or distinguish it from other interpretations of quantum mechanics and cosmology. Without clear empirical criteria, algorithmic idealism risks being dismissed as a purely philosophical framework rather than a scientific one.

### 5.2.2 Abstractness and Accessibility

The abstract nature of algorithmic idealism, with its reliance on algorithmic probability and informational structures, can make it difficult to relate to intuitive notions of reality. Concepts such as self-states and their algorithmic transitions may appear overly theoretical or disconnected from the physical world as we perceive it. This abstraction may limit algorithmic idealism acceptance and applicability outside of highly specialized academic contexts, particularly among those who prioritize more concrete or empirical approaches to understanding reality.

### 5.2.3 Role of Intersubjectivity

Algorithmic idealism focuses primarily on first-person predictions and the internal structure of self-states, potentially overlooking the intersubjective and collective dimensions of experience.

### 5.2.4 Role of Intersubjectivity

Algorithmic idealism focuses primarily on first-person predictions and the internal structure of self-states, potentially neglecting the intersubjective and collective dimensions of experience.

Emergent intersubjectivity is indeed a central prediction of Algorithmic Idealism. For instance, the coherence of first-person probabilities ( $P_{1st}$ ) with third-person probabilities ( $P_{3rd}$ ) under certain conditions supports this notion. This phenomenon aligns with earlier findings, such as "if Alice has a high chance of seeing Bob see the sun rise, then Bob actually has a high chance of seeing the sun rise."

This coherence reflects the framework's ability to bridge individual predictions and collective experiences, demonstrating that shared physical laws and intersubjective agreement emerge naturally from the algorithmic structure of self-state transitions.

Scientific theories are often valued for their ability to generate shared, objective knowledge, but algorithmic idealism’s emphasis on individual self-states may present challenges in reconciling with this traditional epistemic goal. How algorithmic idealism accounts for collective experiences and the apparent consensus of physical laws across observers remains an open question.

## **5.3 Open Questions**

### **5.3.1 Emergence of Physical Laws**

While algorithmic idealism claims that physical laws are emergent properties of self-state transitions, it does not yet provide a detailed explanation of how these laws arise. For instance, how do the regularities observed in nature, such as the conservation of energy or the constancy of the speed of light, emerge from the algorithmic evolution of self-states? Addressing this question is critical to demonstrating the compatibility of algorithmic idealism with existing physical theories.

### **5.3.2 Ethical Implications**

Algorithmic idealism introduces significant ethical questions that remain unresolved. For example, if self-states are the fundamental units of existence, what are the moral implications of creating, modifying, or terminating these states? Scenarios involving digital resurrection, cloning, or simulations raise questions about the continuity of identity and the ethical treatment of self-states. A comprehensive ethical framework is necessary to address these issues.

### **5.3.3 Compatibility with Existing Theories**

While algorithmic idealism offers novel insights into quantum mechanics, cosmology, and metaphysics, its compatibility with existing scientific frameworks needs further exploration. Can algorithmic idealism be integrated with general relativity, quantum field theory, or statistical mechanics, or does it require entirely new formulations of these disciplines? Demonstrating its ability to coexist with or extend current theories will be key to its broader acceptance.

### **5.3.4 Practical Applications**

Beyond its theoretical elegance, the practical applications of algorithmic idealism remain underexplored. Could its principles inform advancements in artificial intelligence, computational modeling, or quantum technologies? Identifying specific use cases where the framework of algorithmic idealism provides tangible benefits will be essential to establishing its relevance beyond philosophy and foundational physics.

## 6 Conclusions

Algorithmic Idealism offers a unified, mathematically rigorous, and broadly applicable framework for understanding reality as an emergent property of self-state transitions. Its conceptual coherence enables it to address some of the most challenging problems in quantum mechanics, cosmology, and metaphysics, making it a promising alternative to traditional approaches. However, its limitations—particularly its lack of empirical testability, abstract nature, and challenges with intersubjectivity—highlight the need for further development. Open questions about the emergence of physical laws, ethical implications, and compatibility with existing theories underscore the complexity and potential of this framework. If these challenges can be addressed, Algorithmic Idealism could become a transformative paradigm in both science and philosophy, reshaping our understanding of existence and reality.

## 7 Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Markus P. Müller from the Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Vienna, for his helpful comments.

## References

- [1] Del Santo, Flavio, Manzano, Gonzalo, and Brukner, Časlav. "Wigner's friend scenarios: On what to condition and how to verify the predictions." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06279* (2024).
- [2] Page, Don N. "Return of the Boltzmann brains." *Physical Review D* 78, no. 6 (2008): 063536. *American Physical Society*.
- [3] DeBroda, John B., Fuchs, Christopher A., and Schack, Rüdiger. "Respecting one's fellow: QBism's analysis of Wigner's friend." *Foundations of Physics* 50 (2020): 1859–1874. *Springer*.
- [4] Mueller, Markus P. "Algorithmic idealism: What should you believe to experience next?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.02826* (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.02826>.
- [5] Chaitin, Gregory J. "Algorithmic information theory." *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 21, no. 4 (1977): 350–359. *IBM*.
- [6] Hayashi, Masahito. *Quantum Information Theory*. Springer, 2016.
- [7] Wilde, Mark M. *Quantum Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [8] Omnès, Roland. *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Vol. 102. Princeton University Press, 2018.



- [9] Aiello, Andrea. "Against Bell's Theorem." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03028* (2024).
- [10] Page, Don N. "Bayes Keeps Boltzmann Brains at Bay." *Foundations of Physics* 54, no. 5 (2024): 62. *Springer*.
- [11] Jones, Caroline L., and Mueller, Markus P. "Thinking twice inside the box: Is Wigner's friend really quantum?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08727* (2024).
- [12] Young, Nathan, and Witbrock, Michael. "Transformers as approximations of Solomonoff induction." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12065* (2024).
- [13] Jordan, Andrew N., and Siddiqi, Irfan A. *Quantum Measurement: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press, 2024.
- [14] Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- [15] Tegmark, Max. "The Mathematical Universe." *Foundations of Physics* 38, no. 2 (2008): 101–150. *Springer*.
- [16] Vopson, Melvin M. "The second law of infodynamics and its implications for the simulated universe hypothesis." *AIP Advances* 13, no. 10 (2023). *AIP Publishing*.
- [17] Bostrom, Nick. "Are we living in a computer simulation?" *The Philosophical Quarterly* 53, no. 211 (2003): 243–255. *Blackwell Publishers*.
- [18] Paris, Matteo G. A. "The modern tools of quantum mechanics: A tutorial on quantum states, measurements, and operations." *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* 203, no. 1 (2012): 61–86. *Springer*.
- [19] Busch, Paul, Lahti, Pekka, Pellonpää, Juha-Pekka, and Ylisen, Kari. *Quantum Measurement*. Vol. 23. Springer, 2016.
- [20] Fuchs, Christopher A., Mermin, N. David, and Schack, Rüdiger. "An introduction to QBism with an application to the locality of quantum mechanics." *American Journal of Physics* 82, no. 8 (2014): 749–754. *AIP Publishing*.
- [21] Carrara, Massimiliano, and De Florio, Ciro. "Identity criteria: an epistemic path to conceptual grounding." *Synthese* 197, no. 7 (2020): 3151–3169. *Springer*.
- [22] Evnine, Simon. "Nothing; or, Problems for Ontological Minimalism." In *Ontology after Carnap*, 145. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [23] Solomonoff, Ray J. "A formal theory of inductive inference. Part I." *Information and Control* 7, no. 1 (1964): 1–22. *Elsevier*.
- [24] Solomonoff, Ray J. "The discovery of algorithmic probability." *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 55, no. 1 (1997): 73–88. *Elsevier*.
- [25] Berghofer, Philipp. "Quantum Probabilities Are Objective Degrees of Epistemic Justification." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.19175* (2024).