The Measurement Problem Is an Individuation Problem

Record-Constituted Definiteness and the Ontological Incompleteness of Everett

Abstract

This paper argues that the unresolved core of the measurement problem is not best understood as a purely dynamical problem. The standard formulation asks how linear quantum evolution yields a single definite outcome. That question is genuine, but it already presupposes that definiteness must be read directly from the global physical state. I argue instead that the deeper residual problem is one of individuation: under what conditions does a physically realized difference count as a fact, an outcome, or a world for a finite record-bearing system? Once the issue is formulated at this level, the role of decoherence looks different. Decoherence and redundant environmental encoding do not select one globally privileged outcome, but they do supply the physical architecture of stable, accessible, and update-constraining records. The remaining task is ontological rather than primarily dynamical. This diagnosis is especially significant for Everettian quantum mechanics. Everett preserves the global physics with unusual clarity, but branching structure alone does not determine when physically realized differences count as distinct observer-worlds for finite agents. A complete account therefore requires an explicit criterion of observer-world individuation. I propose such a criterion in terms of record-constituted definiteness: two physical configurations belong to the same observer-world for an agent when they agree with respect to the agent's accessible, persistent, and update-constraining records.

Keywords: measurement problem; decoherence; Everett interpretation; relational quantum mechanics; individuation; observer-worlds

1. Introduction

The measurement problem remains the most durable fault line in the foundations of quantum mechanics. In its standard form, the problem is presented as a tension between linear quantum evolution and definite outcomes: the formalism yields superpositions of macroscopically distinct possibilities, while actual observation yields one result rather than many. On that presentation, the question is immediately dynamical. What, if anything, turns a superposition into a definite outcome? This framing has shaped the familiar landscape of options: collapse theories, hidden-

variable theories, Everettian no-collapse theories, and more instrumentalist or Copenhagen-style suspensions of the ontological issue (Bell 1990; Maudlin 1995).

The framing is not wrong. It tracks a real tension in the formalism and helps explain why the debate took the form it did. But it is incomplete in a philosophically costly way. It encourages the assumption that definiteness must be explained primarily as a feature of the global physical state, as though the central question were what the wave function itself must do in order for facts to arise. This paper argues that the unresolved residue of the measurement problem lies elsewhere. The deepest remaining issue is not primarily the production of definiteness by a special dynamics. It is the individuation of facts, outcomes, and observer-worlds relative to finite record-bearing systems.

The claim is not that physics becomes irrelevant, or that one can dissolve the problem by linguistic reformulation. On the contrary, the argument depends on taking the physical side of the story more seriously. Decoherence and stable environmental encoding already do much of the work that the traditional framing treats as still missing. They explain why some correlations become stable, robust, redundantly available, and effectively classical in practice (Zeh 1970; Zurek 2003; Schlosshauer 2007; Zurek 2009). What they do not provide, by themselves, is a criterion telling us when such physically stabilized differences count as definite outcomes for finite agents.

This diagnosis becomes especially sharp in the Everettian case. Everettian quantum mechanics preserves global unitarity and treats branching structure as the emergent result of decoherence (Everett 1957; Wallace 2012). In that respect it offers the cleanest response to the traditional demand for dynamical consistency. Yet precisely because it preserves the physics, it also exposes a residual ontological gap. A branching wave function does not by itself tell us how many observer-worlds there are, which branch-differences are world-making for finite observers, or when a physical multiplicity should count as a multiplicity of facts rather than as multiple realizations of the same fact-structure.

The central thesis of this paper is therefore twofold. First, the measurement problem is best understood, at its deepest unresolved level, as a problem of individuation rather than primarily of dynamics. Second, once the problem is formulated that way, Everettian quantum mechanics requires an explicit criterion of observer-world individuation if it is to function as a complete ontology rather than as a merely physically conservative framework. The criterion proposed here

is record-based and agent-relative: two physical configurations count as the same observer-world for an agent when they agree with respect to the agent's accessible, persistent, and update-constraining records. A definite outcome is then not a mysterious global event, but the breakdown of a prior equivalence when a difference enters the record structure of a finite observer.

This proposal is not a new collapse theory. It does not reject unitarity, branching, or decoherence. Nor does it claim that facts are products of consciousness in any idealist sense. The point is narrower and sharper. If the question is why finite observers encounter single definite outcomes, then the missing work is not exhausted by describing the global state. One must also say what makes some physically realized differences count as facts for record-bearing systems. The sections that follow reconstruct the standard dynamical framing, isolate its hidden assumption, reassess what decoherence actually buys, show why Everett remains ontologically incomplete at the level of observer-worlds, and propose a record-based criterion of definiteness as the missing principle of individuation.

2. The Standard Dynamical Framing and Its Hidden Assumption

The standard presentation of the measurement problem begins from a familiar model. A system is prepared in a superposition of eigenstates. It interacts with an apparatus. If the Schrödinger equation is applied without restriction, the result is an entangled superposition of apparatus states correlated with the different system states. If an observer is included in the description, the observer becomes entangled as well. Linear dynamics seems to yield not one outcome but a superposed multiplicity of outcome-correlated states. Yet observation presents itself as single and definite. The traditional question is therefore framed as follows: what physical process turns the superposition into one determinate outcome?

That question is powerful because it captures a real formal tension. If the quantum state is taken to be a complete physical description and its evolution is always linear, then the appearance of definite outcomes demands explanation. Collapse theories answer by modifying the dynamics. Hidden-variable theories answer by supplementing the state description. Everettian theories answer by denying that only one outcome must be physically retained. Instrumentalist or Copenhagen-style approaches restrict the descriptive ambition of the state or refuse to treat the formalism as a literal ontology. In each case, however, the problem is first posed as a problem about what the physical state must do in order for definiteness to arise.

The hidden assumption is that definiteness must itself be a property of the global state in something like the same way that superposition is. The standard framing assumes that the deepest philosophical task is to explain how the world described by the wave function becomes less indefinite over time. But that already presupposes an answer to a deeper question: what exactly is a definite outcome supposed to be? The usual order of explanation begins with global state evolution and only afterward asks how facts are extracted from it. I will argue that the order should be reversed.

A definite outcome is not just any physical configuration somewhere in the total state of the universe. It is a configuration that counts as a settled difference for a finite system capable of registering it, retaining it, and updating on its basis. Once that point is taken seriously, the explanatory burden shifts. The key question is no longer simply how the global state changes, but under what conditions a physically realized difference becomes a fact for a finite observer. The traditional dynamical framing obscures this by treating definiteness as though it were an intrinsic global feature waiting to be produced, rather than a status constituted at the level of physically stabilized records.

This also explains why the interpretive landscape is often organized around a false unity. Different approaches are commonly presented as though they were answering the same question. But they often operate at different levels. Collapse theories answer a dynamical question. Decoherence theory explains the emergence of robust classical-looking record structures. Everett preserves the global unitary physics. None of that, by itself, yet tells us what makes a physical difference count as a fact for a finite observer. The unresolved residue of the measurement problem is therefore not exhausted by the demand for new dynamics. It concerns the criterion under which physical differences become definite outcomes at the observer-relevant level.

3. From Dynamics to Individuation

Once the hidden assumption is exposed, the measurement problem can be reformulated more precisely. The deeper issue is not simply how the quantum state evolves, but how facts are individuated for finite record-bearing systems. A physical difference may exist in the global state without yet counting as a fact for any given observer. What matters is whether that difference becomes accessible to the observer, persists long enough to matter, and constrains the observer's later updates in memory, expectation, action, or further measurement.

This shift does not amount to subjectivism. Facts are not being reduced to belief, attention, or private report. The proposal is ontological, not merely epistemic. A fact is a physically realized difference that has acquired a specific role in the record-structure of a finite system. The relevant category is therefore not bare physical existence, but record-constituted difference. A distinction that never becomes accessible, never persists, and never constrains any later update may be physically real in some broad sense, but it is not yet a fact for the observer in question. By contrast, once a difference is stabilized, retained, and made update-relevant, it crosses into determinate observer-relative facthood.

The notion of a finite agent should be understood in the thinnest serious sense required by the argument. An agent need not be a human subject and need not possess introspective or linguistic capacities. What is required is a system with limited physical access, a finite temporal integration window, and the capacity to bear records that can persist and constrain later states. A memory register, a measuring device with stable readout, or a thermodynamically robust information-bearing subsystem can qualify in the relevant structural sense. The argument therefore does not privilege consciousness. It privileges record-bearing finitude.

Once framed this way, the contrast between superposition and definiteness looks different. The issue is no longer how the world as a whole changes from many possibilities to one actuality. The issue is how some physically realized differences become determinate for finite systems while others remain merely part of the wider physical multiplicity. The problem is therefore one of individuation before it is one of outcome-selection. One cannot first assume that definite outcomes exist as self-identifying items and then ask how they are observed. One must first explain what it is for a finite system to register, retain, and update on a difference, and only then say that an outcome has been constituted.

This reordering matters. It shows that much of the traditional burden placed on special measurement dynamics was really a demand for a principle of fact-constitution. Once the issue is stated correctly, the search for a new dynamics is no longer the default philosophical response. The prior question is whether existing physics already supplies most of the physical conditions under which observer-relative definiteness can emerge. If it does, then the deepest remaining gap is ontological: a missing principle of individuation rather than a missing law of motion.

4. What Decoherence Actually Buys

On the standard framing, decoherence is often treated as important but insufficient. It suppresses interference, selects stable pointer bases, and explains why classicality appears in practice, but it is then said to leave the real measurement problem untouched because it does not choose one globally unique outcome. That assessment is both correct and misleading. It is correct if one assumes that the central task is to generate a single observer-independent actuality from the global state. It is misleading if the unresolved issue is instead the individuation of facts for finite record-bearing systems.

Decoherence does not collapse the universal state into a single globally privileged result. But it does explain why some distinctions become stable, robust, and effectively irreversible at the scales that matter for finite observers. Through interaction with the environment, some correlations are amplified and redundantly encoded while others are delocalized, washed out, or rendered dynamically irrelevant. The result is not a metaphysical selection of one world out of many. It is the formation of physically privileged record-structures. Those structures are exactly what any serious account of definite outcomes needs.

The lesson becomes sharper once Quantum Darwinism is added to the story. The significance of environmental encoding is not merely that coherence becomes practically inaccessible. It is that certain information becomes stably available through many environmental fragments, so that multiple observers can recover the same effective value independently (Zurek 2009). Public availability, redundancy, and persistence are not yet by themselves an ontological theory of facthood, but they are the physical architecture within which facthood can be constituted for finite systems.

This is why decoherence should not be dismissed as a mere for-all-practical-purposes patch. It solves a large part of the physical side of the problem. It explains why certain alternatives become stable record-carriers, why interference between them becomes negligible at the relevant scale, and why future interactions track those encoded differences rather than arbitrary decompositions of the state. What it does not provide is the final criterion telling us when such stabilized differences count as definite outcomes for a given observer. Decoherence supplies the bridgehead, not the whole crossing.

Put differently, decoherence drastically shrinks the genuine remainder of the measurement problem. Once decoherence and record formation are taken seriously, the remaining question is

no longer why the physics fails to produce classical-looking structures. It is how those structures are to be individuated as facts, outcomes, and observer-worlds for finite agents. The residual difficulty is therefore not a failure of decoherence physics, but the absence of an explicit ontology of observer-relevant definiteness.

5. Everett Preserves the Physics but Not the Ontology

The Everett interpretation is the decisive test case for this diagnosis. Everettian quantum mechanics preserves the global unitary dynamics in the cleanest possible way. The universal state evolves continuously, decoherence yields an emergent branching structure, and no collapse postulate is added (Everett 1957; Wallace 2012). In that respect Everett offers the most physically conservative response to the traditional measurement problem. It does not mutilate the formalism in order to recover classical-looking outcomes.

Yet the very strength of Everett as physics reveals its weakness as ontology. Branching structure is not yet a theory of observer-worlds. Decoherence may support a rich pattern of quasi-classical differentiation in the universal state, but that alone does not settle what counts as one world, one observer, or one definite outcome at the level relevant to finite agents. Branches are emergent and approximate. Their individuation depends on coarse-graining, stability criteria, and explanatory interests. None of that automatically yields a principled answer to the question: when do physically realized differences amount to distinct observer-worlds rather than to multiple realizations of the same observer-relevant fact-structure?

This underdetermination is easy to miss because Everett is often presented as though the move from physical multiplicity to world multiplicity were immediate. But it is not. A single decoherence process can be described more or less finely; a quasi-classical history can admit multiple microphysical realizations; and physically distinct structures can remain indistinguishable with respect to every record that matters for a given finite observer. The universal state may contain multiplicity in abundance while the observer-relevant ontology remains under-specified. A branching wave function tells us that multiplicity exists in the physics. It does not by itself tell us how that multiplicity is to be counted where definiteness matters.

This is the sense in which Everett is ontologically incomplete. The claim is not that Everett is incoherent or empirically empty. Nor is it that the branching formalism is dispensable. The claim is that once one keeps all physically realized alternatives in the theory, the question of

observer-world individuation can no longer be postponed. Without a criterion specifying when two physical realizations count as the same observer-world for a finite agent and when they count as distinct ones, Everett remains a physically explicit framework still awaiting completion at the level of fact-constitution.

That completion cannot consist merely in repeating that each branch is a world. Such language restates the multiplicity but does not yet justify the counting. What is needed is a principle of individuation that connects branching physics to finite record-bearing systems. The next section proposes such a principle.

6. Observer-Worlds and Record-Constituted Definiteness

The proposal can now be stated directly. The relevant ontological unit is not the global state as such and not the branch as such, but the observer-world: the world as individuated for a finite system by its accessible, persistent, and update-constraining records. The point is not to psychologize ontology. It is to distinguish two questions that are constantly blurred in the measurement debate. One question is whether a physical differentiation exists in the total state. Another is whether that differentiation counts as a definite fact for a given finite observer. The first question belongs to the global physical description. The second requires a criterion of observer-world individuation.

Let A be a finite record-bearing system. Let the relevant record-set for A consist of those physically accessible differences that persist across the relevant integration interval and constrain A's later updates. Two physical configurations belong to the same observer-world for A if they agree with respect to that record-set. They belong to distinct observer-worlds for A only when they differ with respect to at least one such record. An observer-world is therefore not a single microphysical realization and not an arbitrary branch label. It is an equivalence class of physical configurations under observer-relevant record structure.

This criterion yields a disciplined notion of definiteness. A definite outcome is not whatever physically exists somewhere in the universal state. It is a stabilized difference that has become record-constituting for A. If a physical distinction exists but does not enter any accessible, persistent, update-constraining record for A, then it may be physically real without yet counting as a definite outcome for A. Conversely, once a distinction enters that record-structure, it becomes world-making for A even if the global state remains unitary and even if other alternatives continue to exist elsewhere in the total description.

The proposal also blocks gratuitous overcounting. Discussions of Everett often move too quickly from physical multiplicity to observer-world multiplicity, as though every decohered distinction must automatically be a distinct world in the only sense that matters. But many microphysical differences may be irrelevant to the record-structure of a given observer. Counting all of them as distinct observer-worlds inflates the ontology without principle. The observer-equivalence relation prevents that move. Multiplicity at the level of physical realizers does not by itself settle multiplicity at the level of observer-worlds.

At this point a comparison with relational quantum mechanics becomes unavoidable. The present view is relational in the minimal sense that definiteness is indexed to physically grounded relations between systems. But it is not simply Rovelli's view restated in heavier language. In relational quantum mechanics, the state of a system is relative to another system in general, and the relational structure is meant to be fundamental and widely symmetric across interactions (Rovelli 1996). By contrast, the present proposal is specifically about the constitution of definite outcomes through stable record-structures. It does not treat every interaction as equally world-constituting. It privileges accessible, persistent, update-constraining records and therefore introduces a criterion of observer-equivalence tied to finite memory-like structure. The relation that matters here is not bare interaction as such, but record-bearing stabilization.

The same logic also bears on subject-individuation. If two physical realizers differ only in ways that make no difference to the subject-constituting informational structure of an observer, then there is no immediate reason to count them as distinct observer-subjects. Subject-multiplicity, no less than world-multiplicity, must be earned by record-constituting difference rather than inferred automatically from physical duplication or branch indexing. This point does not solve every problem about personal identity in Everettian settings, but it reveals where the genuine issue lies: not in brute duplication alone, but in the individuation of record-bearing continuers.

Record-constituted definiteness can now be summarized in one sentence: a physical configuration is definite for A when it instantiates a difference that is accessible to A, sufficiently stable to be retained, and capable of constraining A's subsequent updates. What becomes definite is not the universe as a whole in some absolute sense, but the observer-world of A. That is enough to recover the phenomenon that originally made the measurement problem urgent - the

existence of single, definite outcomes for finite observers - without requiring a new collapse dynamics.

7. Applications: Schrödinger's Cat and Wigner's Friend

A useful test of the proposal is whether it clarifies the canonical paradoxes instead of merely renaming them. Consider Schrödinger's cat. On the usual framing, the puzzle is that the formalism yields a superposition of cat-alive and cat-dead while observation seems to require one of these to become physically selected. On the present account, the issue is not why the universe as a whole chooses one term. The issue is when the relevant difference enters the record-structure of a finite observer. Before the box is opened there may already be decohered and environmentally stabilized correlations in the total state. But until those differences become accessible, persistent, and update-constraining for the relevant observer, they do not yet constitute a definite outcome for that observer. Once the box is opened and the relevant distinction enters the observer's records, a definite observer-world is constituted.

This does not trivialize the cat case. It relocates its force. The paradox no longer arises from the demand that the global state itself must become uniquely definite before anything can count as a fact. It arises only if one insists on global definiteness where observer-relative definiteness would suffice. The lesson is not that nothing happens until a human looks. The lesson is that the ontological status that matters for measurement is tied to record-bearing systems, not to a global metaphysical selection event.

Wigner's friend sharpens the same structure. Inside the laboratory, the friend obtains a stable record of the outcome. For the friend, the relevant difference is accessible, retained, and update-constraining. A definite observer-world is therefore constituted. Outside the laboratory, Wigner may still describe the entire lab as a coherent quantum system. On the standard framing, this seems to generate contradiction: was the outcome definite or not? On the present view there is no contradiction because definiteness is not treated as a single global status that must hold in the same way for all observers at once. The friend and Wigner do not yet share the same domain of accessible records, so they do not yet share the same observer-world structure.

This resolution is not merely verbal. It is physically grounded in the differing record-access relations of the two systems. The friend's record is world-constituting for the friend before it is world-constituting for Wigner. Nothing in this requires an idealist appeal to consciousness, and nothing in it denies that the total state may continue to evolve unitarily. What it denies is that one

must extract a single absolute fact from the total state independently of the accessibility and stability conditions under which facts are constituted for finite systems.

The same applications illuminate the Everettian issue. Everett handles these cases elegantly at the level of global dynamics: no collapse, no inconsistency in the total state, branch-structure emerging from decoherence. But the cases also show why branching alone does not finish the job. It remains necessary to say when physically differentiated structures count as distinct observer-worlds and when they do not. The cat case shows that not every microphysical variation corresponds to a distinct fact for the observer. The Wigner case shows that definite outcomes are indexed to record-structure rather than to a universal, observer-independent fact status. Both examples therefore support the central claim of the paper: the deepest residual problem is individuative.

8. Objections and Clarifications

The most immediate objection is that this is just Everett plus extra philosophy. If Everett already gives us branching structure, why not simply call branches worlds and stop there? The answer is that the additional step is not decorative. It supplies the missing criterion of observer-world individuation. Everett gives a universal state and an emergent branching structure. It does not, by physics alone, tell us when physically realized distinctions count as distinct observer-worlds for finite agents. Without that criterion the move from branch multiplicity to fact multiplicity remains under-argued rather than completed.

A second objection is that the account makes facts subjective. But the dependency involved here is relational, not arbitrary. Record-constituted definiteness depends on physically grounded accessibility, persistence, and update-constraint, not on introspection, belief, or voluntary attention. Different observers may occupy different physical positions with respect to available records, but that is no more a lapse into subjectivism than frame-dependence in relativity is a lapse into psychologism. The records that matter are objective features of the coupling between systems and environments.

A third objection is that the measurement problem remains dynamical whatever one says about individuation. There is truth in this. The proposal does not deny that the formal tension between linear evolution and single outcomes is real. Nor does it deny that some interpretations may still seek new dynamics. The claim is more modest and more targeted. Once decoherence and stable record formation are taken seriously, the hardest remaining philosophical problem is

no longer well described as the absence of a mechanism that forces the global state to choose. It is better described as the absence of a criterion explaining when physically stabilized differences become facts for finite observers.

A fourth objection is that the account is incomplete because it leaves global ontology underdetermined. That objection is partly correct, but it misses the point of the argument. The paper does not aim to derive a full interpretation of quantum mechanics from scratch. It isolates a level of explanation that any adequate interpretation must still address. One may pair the present criterion with an Everettian global state, with some other no-collapse framework, or in principle with more revisionary metaphysical options. The narrower claim defended here is that whatever one says about the global ontology, one still needs a principle of observer-world individuation if one wishes to explain definite outcomes rather than merely redescribe the formalism.

Finally, one may object that the account is circular because records themselves seem to require definiteness. The reply is that records are not introduced as metaphysically primitive classical objects. A record is a physically stabilized difference that performs a specific role for a finite system: it persists, is accessible, and constrains later states. The account therefore does not explain definiteness by presupposing a stock of already definite entities. It explains definiteness through the integration of stabilized differences into record-bearing structures. The process is iterative and relational, but it is not viciously circular.

9. Conclusion

The measurement problem is not abolished by this analysis, but it is relocated. The traditional question - how does a superposition become a single outcome? - remains intelligible, yet it is not the deepest remaining question once decoherence and record formation are properly understood. Much of what the traditional framing treats as missing dynamics is already supplied by the physics of stable correlations, environmental encoding, and effectively classical records. What remains unresolved is not primarily how the universe chooses, but how facts are individuated for finite record-bearing systems.

That relocation matters for the entire interpretive landscape. It clarifies the genuine contribution of decoherence, which supplies the physical architecture of stable and publicly accessible record structures without thereby producing a single globally privileged actuality. It also clarifies the status of Everettian quantum mechanics. Everett preserves the global physics with unusual elegance, but branching structure alone is not yet a complete ontology of observer-

worlds. Without an explicit criterion of individuation, the move from physical multiplicity to definite outcomes for finite observers remains incomplete.

The criterion proposed here is record-based and agent-relative. Two physical configurations belong to the same observer-world for an agent when they agree with respect to the agent's accessible, persistent, and update-constraining records. They belong to different observer-worlds only when record-constituting differences divide them. On this view, a definite outcome is not a globally privileged state that has expelled its rivals from the universe. It is a record-constituted difference for a finite system.

If that is right, then the deepest unfinished business in the measurement debate lies neither in brute appeals to collapse nor in the mere assertion that branching occurs. It lies in the articulation of a serious ontology of fact-constitution for finite observers. The real philosophical task is not to force the formalism to choose a world. It is to say when a physically realized difference becomes a fact for a record-bearing system. Until that task is met, the measurement problem remains incomplete - not because the physics is silent, but because the ontology is.

References

Bell, J. S. 1990. "Against 'Measurement'." Physics World 3: 33-40.

Everett, H., III. 1957. "'Relative State' Formulation of Quantum Mechanics." Reviews of Modern Physics 29 (3): 454-462. https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.29.454.

Maudlin, T. 1995. "Three Measurement Problems." Topoi 14 (1): 7-15. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00763473.

Rovelli, C. 1996. "Relational Quantum Mechanics." International Journal of Theoretical Physics 35 (8): 1637-1678. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02302261.

Schlosshauer, M. 2007. Decoherence and the Quantum-to-Classical Transition. Berlin: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-35775-9.

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

Zeh, H. D. 1970. "On the Interpretation of Measurement in Quantum Theory." Foundations of Physics 1 (1): 69-76. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00708656.

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.

Zurek, W. H. 2009. "Quantum Darwinism." Nature Physics 5 (3): 181-188. https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys1202.