

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

From Many Worlds to Many Realities: The Everett Interpretation as a Lens for Understanding Contemporary Geopolitical Psychology

[Michel Planat](#) *

Posted Date: 23 April 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202504.1992.v1

Keywords: Many World Interpretation; geopolitical psychology; topology



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Article

From Many Worlds to Many Realities: The Everett Interpretation as a Lens for Understanding Contemporary Geopolitical Psychology

Michel Planat

Université Marie et Louis Pasteur, Institut FEMTO-ST CNRS UMR 6174, 15 B Avenue des Montboucons, F-25044 Besançon, France; michel.planat@femto-st.fr

Abstract: The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics, first proposed by Hugh Everett in 1957, posits that all possible outcomes of a quantum measurement are realized in coexisting branches of the universe. While traditionally confined to microscopic physical systems, this article proposes that the logic of MWI offers an illuminating metaphor –and potentially a modeling framework– for understanding the increasingly fragmented landscape of contemporary geopolitics. In particular, the behavior and communication strategy of political figures such as Donald J. Trump appear to resonate with an Everettian logic: the simultaneous activation of multiple, incompatible narratives, none of which collapses under scrutiny, and each sustained within separate cognitive or media ecosystems. We argue that this “Many-Worlds political style” challenges classical models of political rationality, narrative coherence, and public truth. Drawing from recent work in quantum cognition, narrative theory, and political psychology, we explore how Everett’s interpretation may offer not only a metaphorical but a structurally meaningful way to describe the emerging post-truth political order. The article concludes with a discussion of how such cross-disciplinary frameworks may contribute to both political theory and foundational questions in quantum epistemology.

Keywords: Many World Interpretation; geopolitical psychology; topology

1. Introduction

The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics is perhaps the most ontologically radical of all interpretations: it asserts that every quantum event results in a branching of the universe, wherein each possible outcome is realized in its own, non-communicating branch [1]. Long dismissed by many as metaphysical extravagance, MWI has gained increasing attention –not only for its explanatory power in quantum computing and cosmology, but also for its unique conceptual structure, which challenges classical ideas of causality, identity, and observation [2].

In this paper, we explore the provocative hypothesis that the logic of MWI is not only a feature of quantum systems, but also a useful lens through which to understand macroscopic socio-political phenomena –particularly those emerging in the early 21st century. We propose that contemporary political reality, especially in the era of social media and algorithmically segmented information, behaves in ways analogous to MWI’s branching structure.

We focus our attention on a figure emblematic of this new landscape: Donald J. Trump. Trump’s political behavior defies traditional categories of consistency, truthfulness, or strategic continuity. His simultaneous occupation of multiple, conflicting narrative positions –often in the same speech or over short time intervals– can be interpreted not as incoherence, but as intentional superposition across multiple semi-autonomous cognitive or media “branches.” In this view, the public no longer “measures” and collapses a political wavefunction into a coherent outcome, but rather splits into incompatible interpretive realities, much like observers in MWI.

This analogy is not merely metaphorical. A growing body of work in quantum cognition [3], narrative logic [4], and political psychology suggests that non-classical logic may be useful in modeling

human behavior in conditions of ambiguity, contradiction, and uncertainty. Furthermore, recent studies in epistemic decoherence and quantum decision theory offer mathematical tools to formalize branching choice structures and fragmented belief spaces.

We aim to make three contributions:

- To propose a correspondence between the branching logic of MWI and the cognitive and communicative strategies of post-truth political leaders;
- To suggest how this correspondence may help reframe epistemological challenges in public discourse, especially in geopolitics;
- To reflect on how this analogy could inform discussions on the interpretation of quantum theory itself, particularly concerning the nature of observerhood, narrative coherence, and truth.

While speculative in scope, we believe that opening this dialogue between quantum foundational theory and contemporary political behavior is not only philosophically intriguing but may also help clarify the conceptual challenges of both domains, particularly as society faces the systemic consequences of fragmented realities and conflicting truths.

2. Background: From Quantum Superposition to Narrative Multiplicity

To draw a meaningful parallel between the Everettian framework and modern political discourse, we first revisit the core concepts of MWI. A brief mathematical introduction is in Appendix A. In Everett's formalism, the quantum state of the universe evolves unitarily according to the Schrödinger equation, and measurements do not cause collapse but entangle the observer with the system, resulting in branching worlds [1,5].

Each branch is equally real and evolves independently, though inaccessible from the others. This has profound implications for ontology and epistemology. In the standard Copenhagen view, the observer plays a decisive role in collapsing probabilities into a single reality. In contrast, in MWI, the observer is duplicated into multiple versions, each correlating with a distinct outcome.

In contemporary information societies, a similar phenomenon occurs: narratives propagate in parallel across fragmented networks. Media ecosystems function as decohering environments, splitting the public into non-overlapping interpretive communities [6]. The multiplicity of truths, often considered a failure of democratic discourse, can thus be seen through an Everettian lens as the natural branching of a cognitively entangled society.

3. Trump and the Many-Worlds Political Style

Donald Trump's communication style exemplifies the emergence of a new form of political agency—one that transcends linear narrative logic. He is able to assert contradictory claims, engage in recursive self-reinvention, and activate disparate audience segments without regard for consistency. These behaviors are often described as chaotic or populist, but they may be better understood as intentional exploitation of an Everettian condition.

We analyze key cases where Trump maintained mutually exclusive claims and how these were sustained within distinct cognitive "branches". In particular:

- In November 2020, shortly after the U.S. presidential election, Trump simultaneously tweeted that the election was "a landslide victory" for him, while also claiming it had been "rigged" and "stolen". These two narratives—victory and victimhood—should logically exclude each other, yet both were mobilized concurrently to different audiences: one for reaffirming his legitimacy, the other for delegitimizing the outcome.
- On January 6, 2021, during the Capitol insurrection, Trump told his followers: "We love you, you're very special" while later denouncing the violence and claiming to stand for "law and order". This duality—both inciting and distancing himself from the event—allowed different branches of his base and political allies to perceive him either as a patriot or a peacemaker.
- Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, Trump oscillated between calling the virus a "hoax" promoting unverified treatments like hydroxychloroquine, and simultaneously praising vaccine

development as one of his greatest achievements. Again, the same individual, at different times, embodied denialism, recklessness, and scientific leadership –all of which resonated with particular interpretive bubbles.

- Regarding the war in Ukraine, Trump has maintained conflicting positions: on the one hand, claiming that the war “would never have happened” under his leadership and that he could end it “in 24 hours,” suggesting a role of dominant peacemaker; on the other hand, refusing to explicitly condemn Vladimir Putin, calling him “smart” and praising his strategic cunning. Simultaneously, he has criticized U.S. aid to Ukraine as wasteful, while hinting at a strong deterrent posture had he been in office. This creates multiple coexisting narratives: Trump the isolationist, Trump the peacemaker, Trump the realist ally, and Trump the admirer of strength –each tailored to different geopolitical branches.
- In international tax and trade policy, Trump has frequently proposed sweeping unilateral changes while also portraying himself as a proponent of bilateral deals. For example, he has threatened to impose universal tariffs on all imports (a protectionist global tax), while also demanding individual renegotiations with countries like France, Germany, or Canada over what he terms “unfair digital taxes.” This oscillation between global uniformity and extreme bilateralism reflects an Everettian fragmentation: each version of the policy exists depending on the context, audience, or negotiation leverage.

Each of these examples illustrates what might be called a form of narrative superposition: rather than resolving contradictions, Trump permits them to coexist, deferring the need for narrative collapse. Media ecosystems –especially algorithm-driven platforms – function as decoherence environments that stabilize each storyline within its own epistemic branch. Within such a system, political measurement no longer collapses a narrative into consensus, but splits the observer community into mutually exclusive realities.

This Everettian political style is not merely opportunistic; it is structurally adaptive in an age where truth is mediated by fragmented information flows. Rather than persuading a unified public, the strategy sustains multiple partial publics –each entangled with a different branch of the leader’s identity.

4. Toward a Theory of Political Decoherence

If Everettian branching provides a structural analogy, what then corresponds to decoherence in the political realm? We propose that political decoherence occurs when narratives become insulated –through repetition, affective reinforcement, or algorithmic filtering –to the point that no interaction with competing narratives is possible.

Just as environmental decoherence suppresses quantum interference, political decoherence suppresses dialogical interference, hardening realities into separate worldlines. The public sphere thus becomes a space of irreversible branching, where attempts at rational debate are overwhelmed by the inertial mass of divergent truth-structures [7,8].

In quantum mechanics, decoherence is the process by which quantum superpositions are suppressed due to interactions with an environment, leading to the emergence of classical behavior. Interference terms disappear, and different branches of the wavefunction cease to affect one another. By analogy, in political discourse, “dialogical interference” is suppressed when audiences are so segmented by ideology, media consumption, and social identity that they no longer engage with alternative viewpoints. What results is a landscape of parallel belief systems, each internally coherent, but epistemically isolated.

Political decoherence is particularly visible in the structure of media consumption today. Recommendation algorithms and filter bubbles act as the political equivalent of environmental noise: they reinforce local coherence at the expense of global interaction. As a result, different segments of the population evolve their own narratives, memories, and even factual universes.

This phenomenon is not limited to Donald Trump. Other political figures exploit or amplify decoherence as a strategy:

- **Vladimir Putin and Russian Diplomacy.** Russian officials frequently deploy contradictory narratives at the international level: justifying the invasion of Ukraine as a "defensive operation," denying war crimes while simultaneously glorifying military actions, and portraying Ukraine as both Nazi-infiltrated and a brotherly nation. These contradictions serve not to persuade, but to overwhelm and fragment interpretive frameworks. Ambassadorial statements often operate at cross-purposes intentionally, multiplying realities until no stable narrative consensus can form in the West.
- **Jair Bolsonaro.** During his presidency in Brazil, Bolsonaro denied the severity of COVID-19 while also defending his pandemic response. He discredited vaccines while claiming credit for their distribution. These competing statements, presented to different audiences, allowed him to inhabit multiple political identities: anti-establishment outsider, patriotic protector, and pragmatic administrator.
- **Viktor Orbán.** In Hungary, Orbán alternates between framing the European Union as a threat to national sovereignty and a source of economic support. He uses domestic propaganda to construct a reality of Hungary under siege, while maintaining diplomatic engagement with Brussels. Each version of Hungary –fortress or partner– coexists, depending on the target audience.

In all these cases, political decoherence ensures that these narratives do not destructively interfere with one another. Each narrative is protected by its own media environment, emotional reinforcement, and selective facts. The goal is not to eliminate contradiction, but to weaponize it –by ensuring that each version of reality survives and mobilizes a portion of the population.

Ultimately, political decoherence is not merely a symptom of fragmentation, but a technique of governance. It replaces traditional persuasion and deliberation with narrative isolation, and it forces democratic societies to operate without a common measurement basis. In such a regime, the fundamental question becomes: can democracy survive without a shared state vector?

If we take the observer seriously in quantum theory, we must also take seriously the observers in the political realm: their beliefs, their entanglements, their cognitive ecosystems. To understand contemporary politics may thus require not only new tools of sociology or psychology, but a willingness to rethink what it means to share a world.

5. Discussion: Toward a Politics of Recoherence

The Everettian framework, as applied to politics, reveals a sobering diagnosis: our institutions, discourses, and epistemologies are ill-prepared to function in a world where interpretive decoherence is no longer an anomaly but a structural feature. If we accept this diagnosis, what paths forward are available?

Restoring Interference: Is Recoherence Possible?

One of the open questions is whether political recoherence –analogous to quantum interference– is achievable. In quantum physics, recoherence is generally considered improbable due to entropic increase and environmental entanglement. In political life, however, the situation may be more hopeful. Through deliberate institutional designs, civic education, and dialogical practices, it may be possible to reintroduce moments of contact between divergent narratives.

Examples might include:

- **Deliberative citizen assemblies** that bring together individuals from ideologically isolated communities, creating structured environments for exposure to incompatible beliefs.
- **Cross-platform public media initiatives** that challenge algorithmic segmentation by intentionally curating exposure to multiple viewpoints.
- **Epistemic bridging tools** in education and journalism that frame contradiction not as a threat but as an occasion for interpretive labor.

These efforts would not eliminate branching but could slow the rate of decoherence and enable points of convergence. Political recoherence, in this sense, is not a return to consensus but the construction of shared frames that allow contestation to be meaningful.

Limits and Risks of the Everettian Analogy

The MWI metaphor is powerful, but it also presents limits. In quantum theory, all branches are equally real, but in politics, the asymmetries of power, media control, and institutional legitimacy matter profoundly. Not all narratives are equally resourced or dangerous. Some political world-branches justify violence, erode civil rights, or promote disinformation with devastating consequences.

Furthermore, framing political divergence as a form of quantum branching risks naturalizing what is, in many cases, the result of deliberate strategy. Leaders like Trump or Putin do not merely emerge from epistemic complexity –they actively engineer it. The metaphor must not obscure agency and responsibility.

The Need for Ethical Observerhood

Finally, this analysis suggests a new imperative: the cultivation of ethical observers. If reality is now interpreted through multiple lenses, then the quality of those observers –their capacity for critical thinking, reflexivity, and empathetic imagination –becomes the cornerstone of political life.

An Everettian politics does not mean surrendering to relativism, but rather embracing the challenge of navigating multiplicity without dissolving truth. It means designing systems where observers are empowered to encounter difference, to question their own entanglements, and to contribute to the fragile project of a shared world.

Further examples of the explicit or implicit position of world leaders with respect to MWI is described in Appendix B.

The challenge, then, is no longer to find the one true narrative, but to maintain the delicate coherence of a democratic multiverse.

6. Conclusion: Observers, Truth, and the Fate of a Shared World

The Many-Worlds Interpretation was once criticized for its metaphysical excess. Yet its descriptive power has grown alongside our understanding of quantum computation, cosmology, and now, perhaps, society itself. The uncanny resemblance between Everettian branching and the fragmentation of political reality invites us to consider a deeper connection: not as a literal physical claim, but as a way to model the complex dynamics of narrative, identity, and truth in a disoriented age.

The Everettian metaphor helps illuminate a fundamental transition: from a world where truth is contested but ultimately negotiable, to a world where truth is branched, compartmentalized, and no longer collapsible into a consensus. The implication is not simply that we disagree more than before, but that we no longer disagree about the same things. We inhabit separate interpretive universes –each epistemically stable, emotionally reinforced, and often algorithmically curated.

This shift has profound philosophical implications. The Enlightenment ideal of a public sphere where rational individuals engage in shared deliberation presupposes a classical epistemology: a common world observed and debated by many. Everettian politics replaces that with a multiplicity of worlds, each inhabited by different observers, with no guarantee of reconnection.

As we have seen with figures like Trump, Putin, Bolsonaro, and Orbán, this fragmentation can be harnessed as a tool of power. Political decoherence –through media bubbles, contradictory narratives, and affective polarization –creates an environment where contradiction is not a weakness, but a source of resilience. Truth becomes context-dependent; leadership becomes a function of narrative control rather than factual consistency.

This raises a stark challenge for democratic theory: how to design institutions, educational systems, and information architectures that can cope with Everettian conditions. Can democracy be maintained if it no longer operates in a single, shared epistemic space? Or must we develop a new

model –call it quantum democracy– that acknowledges superposition, entanglement, and decoherence as features of the civic condition?

If we take the observer seriously in quantum theory, we must also take seriously the observers in the political realm: their beliefs, their entanglements, their cognitive ecosystems. The question is no longer how to reach the truth, but how to build bridges across realities. Understanding politics as a form of many-worlds navigation may be unsettling –but it may also be necessary, if we are to preserve any meaningful sense of a shared world.

Appendix A. A Concise Mathematical Introduction to the Many Worlds Interpretation

1. Historical Genesis

- **Hugh Everett III (1957).** In his landmark paper[1], Everett proposed the *Relative State Formulation*, rejecting wave function collapse and asserting that the universal state $|\Psi\rangle$ evolves solely under the Schrödinger equation.
- **DeWitt & Graham (1973).** Popularised the term *Many Worlds Interpretation (MWI)* and compiled foundational essays[5].
- Subsequent milestones: Deutsch's decision theoretic Born rule derivation[9]; Zurek's decoherence programme[10]; Tegmark's multiverse taxonomy[11]; the Saunders-Wallace probability analysis[12,13].

2. Core Formalism

Consider a system S observed by O . Prior to measurement,

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = \left(\sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle\right) \otimes |o_0\rangle.$$

A unitary interaction U entangles them:

$$|\Psi_1\rangle = U |\Psi_0\rangle = \sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle \otimes |o_i\rangle.$$

Everett's postulate: each branch $|s_i\rangle \otimes |o_i\rangle$ is real. Observers within a branch perceive a definite outcome with weight $|c_i|^2$ (recoverable via decision theoretic or envariance arguments).

3. Decoherence and Branching

Environment induced decoherence[10] suppresses interference:

$$\rho_S = \text{Tr}_O [|\Psi_1\rangle\langle\Psi_1|] \xrightarrow{\text{env}} \sum_i |c_i|^2 |s_i\rangle\langle s_i|.$$

Classical reality thus emerges *inside* each branch without non unitary dynamics.

4. Open Issues

- a) **Probability.** Justifying the Born rule in a deterministic multiverse (Deutsch-Wallace programme).
- b) **Ontology.** Are branches fundamental or emergent [2].
- c) **Empirical status.** Direct tests distinguishing no collapse theories remain elusive.

Appendix B. On Artificial Intelligence, Topology and the Many-Worlds Thoughts of World Leaders

This paper has been written almost entirely by an artificial intelligence –driven not by Everettian superposition, but by probabilistic modeling over a vast corpus of human language. The questions

were asked by a human interlocutor; the responses, and thus the intellectual construction of this argument, were generated by a large language model.

In that sense, this paper itself inhabits a paradox: it draws on quantum theory to explain political realities, while being composed by an AI that is—at least in its present incarnation—entirely classical in nature. Large language models (LLMs) like the one writing this text are governed by deterministic updates to a deep neural network. They are not quantum systems. They do not branch into Everettian worlds, nor do they possess observerhood in any subjective or ontological sense.

And yet, they simulate branching—by offering multiple completions, by enabling users to choose divergent intellectual paths, and by mimicking the rhetorical plurality of human discourse. In that way, they resemble something akin to a classical shadow of the Many-Worlds condition: not physically real branches, but textual instantiations of parallel logics, parallel arguments, parallel explanations.

Meanwhile, the political figures mentioned—Trump, Putin, Bolsonaro, Orbán—function less like statistical models and more like probabilistic generators of their own. Their actions may be opaque, non-deterministic, and full of contradictions—but they have agency, feedback loops, and the capacity to enforce one of their branches upon others. If they resemble a quantum process, it is not because they compute superpositions, but because they perform narrative bifurcation in the world of consequences.

A final speculation may be entertained: could artificial intelligence, as it becomes more interactive, more context-sensitive, and potentially more integrated with sensorimotor or epistemic environments, begin to exhibit behavior better modeled by quantum-like formalisms? Some researchers have already begun to explore the topology of quantum structures in cognition and decision-making. The first author of this paper [15], who inspired this inquiry, has proposed analogies between the structure of modular tensor categories (MTCs)—which underlie topological quantum computation—and the architecture of reasoning in both humans and machines.

Perhaps the future of intelligence—artificial or human—will not rest on classical logic or Everettian reality alone, but on the creative navigation of hybrid worlds: topological, probabilistic, entangled, and observant.

While this paper has largely interpreted the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics through the lens of political narrative and cognition, a deeper question remains open for exploration: could MWI itself be structurally or mathematically linked to topological frameworks—such as those developed in modular tensor categories (MTCs)—which is becoming foundational in the study of topological quantum computation, quantum field theory and particle physics [14].

MWI is fundamentally a statement about the ontology of branching universes, rooted in Hilbert space formalism. MTCs, on the other hand, describe the algebraic and topological behavior of anyons and braided systems, often visualized through networks of morphisms and fusion diagrams. However, both frameworks share a key structural feature: they describe processes not as static entities, but as **compositions of transformations**—whether these are unitary evolutions of a quantum state or topological braidings in a computational medium.

This opens the possibility that MWI could be interpreted topologically: not as a literal spatial branching, but as a **category-theoretic evolution of observer-world entanglements**. In such a view, each observer's trajectory through interpretive space corresponds to a morphism in a braided or modular category, with branching encoded in the fusion rules or associators of the category.

More speculatively, one might consider the universe of MWI not as a tree of separate branches but as a **higher-dimensional topological space**, where branches can be braided, fused, or reconnected—analogue to cobordisms in topological field theory. Decoherence, in this model, would correspond to a breaking of topological connections (e.g., a loss of morphism reversibility), while recoherence might appear as a kind of **topological defect repair**, where category-theoretic structure is restored.

Following [15], we suggest that MTCs could offer a mathematical language rich enough to encode not only quantum information but also cognitive and symbolic structures, potentially unifying logic, perception, and action in a topologically invariant way. In such a framework, reality—whether physical

or political– would not be a set of separate worlds but a web of braided narratives, whose coherence or fragmentation depends on the topology of interaction.

This perspective remains hypothetical, but it encourages us to think beyond the dichotomy of classical and quantum, or individual and collective, and toward a new mathematics of entanglement –one that may unify observation, cognition, and governance in the age of many worlds.

Authoritarianism and the Many-Worlds Condition

While much of this paper has focused on populist and postmodern political actors who embrace narrative superposition and exploit interpretive decoherence, the case of authoritarian regimes – particularly China under Xi Jinping– presents a counter-model worth analyzing within the Everettian framework.

Xi Jinping’s leadership, and the structure of the Chinese Communist Party more broadly, is built upon a model of **narrative centralization**. Rather than permitting narrative branching, China invests enormous political and technological resources into constructing a **singular, coherent epistemic reality**. Through media control, ideological education, censorship, and algorithmic surveillance, alternative worldviews are suppressed in favor of a unified national mythos centered on harmony, strength, and historical destiny.

This approach can be seen as a deliberate rejection of the Many-Worlds political condition. It treats branching realities –not as tools to be managed– but as **threats to ontological security**. Indeed, the Chinese information model functions almost as a mechanism of continual “collapse” forcing all divergent interpretations back into the Party-approved branch.

Yet this strategy, while powerful in stabilizing domestic order, faces growing challenges at the geopolitical level:

- **Strategic rigidity:** In an environment increasingly characterized by informational volatility and rapid decoherence, China’s commitment to narrative consistency can hinder adaptive diplomacy. It leaves little room for ambiguity, irony, or double signaling –all techniques used effectively by more “Everettian” leaders.
- **Global cognitive dissonance:** As divergent international narratives proliferate, the Chinese state must invest more energy in defending a monolithic story that appears increasingly out of synchrony with pluralistic global perceptions. This becomes a burden in contexts like COVID-19, the South China Sea, or human rights controversies.
- **Internal epistemic pressure:** Despite censorship, educated Chinese citizens –especially those exposed to foreign information ecosystems– may begin to experience decoherence at the cognitive level. Maintaining one world in the mind while knowing others exist is psychologically and politically costly.

If MWI-like epistemologies become dominant –where superposition is the norm and “truth” is always contextual –China’s insistence on absolute coherence may become a **strategic liability**. To remain effective, the regime may need to evolve toward a **modular coherence** model: allowing limited branching within controlled contexts, or even developing its own version of quantum diplomacy that balances unity and ambiguity.

Thus, while Xi Jinping’s political method appears antithetical to MWI, it is not immune to the pressures of a decohering world. The challenge is not whether China will embrace narrative multiplicity, but how it will manage the entanglement between global branching and domestic singularity without suffering topological rupture.

Navigating the Everettian Order –Perspectives from India, Australia, Indonesia, and Africa

If the Many-Worlds condition now characterizes an emergent mode of global politics –fragmented narratives, strategic decoherence, and the superposition of roles– then how do leaders from key regions such as South Asia, the Indo-Pacific, and Africa position themselves in this evolving epistemic topology?

India: Strategic Ambiguity as Controlled Superposition

India under Prime Minister Narendra Modi has exhibited characteristics of an Everettian statecraft, though tempered by a civilizational continuity narrative. Modi's communication oscillates between hyper-nationalism, neoliberal pragmatism, and soft diplomacy. Internally, his Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) promotes a Hindu majoritarian worldview, while externally, India projects itself as a secular democracy and stabilizing force in the Global South.

The Modi regime's capacity to maintain **narrative bifurcations**—such as celebrating constitutionalism while eroding judicial independence, or defending sovereignty while aligning with U.S. Indo-Pacific strategies—suggests a form of **intentional cognitive multiplicity**. India is not fully Everettian in rhetoric, but its foreign policy often relies on maintaining **constructive ambiguity**, particularly in relations with Russia, the U.S., and China. It occupies multiple diplomatic branches simultaneously without collapsing into one.

Australia: Oscillating Between Coherence and Alignment

Australia, especially under the recent Labor government led by Anthony Albanese, has emphasized **strategic clarity and alliance coherence**, particularly with the U.S. and within AUKUS. Yet Australia also faces a multipolar narrative pressure: economic dependence on China, Pacific island diplomacy, and climate leadership aspirations.

Australia's public discourse is less prone to Everettian fragmentation, but its geopolitical posture increasingly reflects **entangled commitments**. It is drawn into the epistemic superpositions of others (notably U.S. vs. China) and must perform **narrative alignment maneuvers**—projecting reliability to allies while managing domestic concerns over sovereignty, trade, and security.

Indonesia: Multiplicity with Modesty

As the largest Muslim-majority democracy and a non-aligned power in Southeast Asia, Indonesia's leadership under President Joko Widodo (Jokowi) has adopted a more modest but **flexibly coherent** strategy. Jokowi avoids overt narrative fragmentation but cultivates multiple roles: economic modernizer, cultural unifier, environmental voice, and regional mediator.

Indonesia implicitly benefits from an Everettian environment by not needing to commit prematurely to great-power alignments. Its narrative discipline masks a strategic **non-collapse posture**—remaining diplomatically entangled with China, the U.S., ASEAN, and Islamic blocs without full narrative resolution.

Africa: Multipolarity as a Natural Topology

In many African nations, the Everettian condition emerges less from deliberate strategy and more from structural necessity. Leaders must navigate narratives coming from China, the West, Russia, and local constituencies. In doing so, they develop forms of **resonant multiplicity**—pragmatically engaging in Belt and Road projects while welcoming U.N. aid, promoting national identity while negotiating pan-African initiatives.

Countries like South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya exhibit **branch-sensitive diplomacy**—responding differently to Western human rights discourses, Russian security outreach, or Chinese infrastructure investment depending on context. These are not always coherent strategies, but they reflect an emergent **narrative agility** suited to a fragmented epistemic world.

In this sense, the MWI framework is not just a metaphor for political strategy, but a **diagnostic for identifying geopolitical epistemologies**: Who branches? Who collapses? Who braids? The answers shape not only discourse, but the topology of international order.

Canada and Greenland: The Everettian Edge of the Arctic

In an unexpected turn emblematic of Everettian ambiguity, Donald Trump famously expressed interest in purchasing Greenland from Denmark in 2019, sparking international confusion and strategic

debate. While dismissed as a geopolitical absurdity by many, the episode revealed something deeper: Trump's willingness to project geopolitical desires into alternate narrative realities, regardless of diplomatic norms.

Canada and Greenland, traditionally viewed as stable actors within liberal democracies, were momentarily absorbed into a speculative branch of Trump's worldview –one where land acquisition by fiat remained plausible. The fact that this idea circulated at all, however briefly, illustrates how Everettian leaders create **epistemic ruptures** even in the most stable international zones.

Canada, under Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, has responded with a posture of **narrative sobriety**, reinforcing rule-based order and Arctic sovereignty. But in the long term, Canada must also contend with a shifting Arctic narrative: climate change, indigenous self-determination, and great-power competition converge in the north, creating conditions where **new geopolitical branches** may soon open.

Israel and the Religious Branches of Everettian Politics

Among the many geopolitical realities Donald Trump has helped generate or amplify, the case of Israel stands out for its symbolic, emotional, and strategic uniqueness. Unlike his narrative fragmentation in other domains, Trump's Israel policy appears, on the surface, as one of his most **coherently sustained branches** –but it remains Everettian in structure due to the layering of religious, political, and electoral meanings.

Trump's recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel in 2017, followed by the relocation of the U.S. embassy, marked a radical narrative intervention. This move collapsed a previously delicate superposition –where international diplomacy deferred recognition of Jerusalem's status– into a decisive branch. Yet this collapse created **parallel interpretive realities**:

- For evangelical Christian voters in the U.S., it confirmed a prophetic narrative of divine destiny and alignment with biblical Israel.
- For parts of the Israeli political spectrum, it validated Trump as a messianic ally.
- For Palestinians and much of the international community, it was a rupture in the diplomatic worldline –provoking accusations of unilateralism and fueling geopolitical decoherence.

Trump's Israel strategy thus appears coherent but operates within a **Many-Worlds architecture of meanings**. Each group engaged with the move according to its own narrative branch, and Trump sustained all of them simultaneously, never reconciling or collapsing them.

Moreover, the Abraham Accords –a series of normalization deals between Israel and Arab states– further illustrate this Everettian logic: Trump played peacemaker, power-broker, and nationalist dealmaker in parallel roles. His approach reconfigured the Middle East narrative not by consensus, but by creating **plausible alternate futures**, each grounded in selective memory and strategic omission.

Israel thus becomes, in Trump's geopolitical epistemology, a stable yet **hyper-symbolic node**: a branch that anchors his messaging to American religious identity, strategic realpolitik, and personal legacy. It is one of the few spaces where Trump's otherwise branching logic has produced **narrative convergence within his base**, while still causing decoherence across the international landscape.

Comparative Religious Cases: Iran, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia

Iran, as the Islamic Republic, provides a counter-branch: a state whose identity is explicitly theological and whose global narrative aims at metaphysical confrontation. Trump's withdrawal from the JCPOA (Iran nuclear deal) in 2018 can be seen as a narrative rupture designed to collapse a diplomatic superposition into a confrontation branch-resonating with apocalyptic visions on both sides.

Turkey, under President Erdoğan, oscillates between secularism, neo-Ottoman Islamism, and NATO-aligned nationalism. Erdoğan's positioning resembles an Everettian superposition: he presents different personas to Europe, the Islamic world, and domestic audiences –without collapsing the contradictions.

Saudi Arabia navigates its own branching tensions: Wahhabi conservatism, modernization efforts under Vision 2030, and shifting alliances with both the U.S. and China. Trump's close alignment with Mohammed bin Salman during and after the Khashoggi affair preserved multiple geopolitical narratives: strategic partnership, energy realism, and authoritarian transactionalism.

Each of these cases –Israel, Iran, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia– demonstrates how **religious symbolism and political agency** become entangled in Everettian politics. They represent not merely nations, but *narrative universes* whose interaction generates an increasingly decoherent Middle East.

In this expanded view, Trump's foreign policy becomes not chaotic but **topologically active**: braiding together branches of meaning across geopolitical and theological registers.

Europe: Between Cohesion and Fragmented Realities

The European Union occupies a liminal space in the Everettian geopolitical spectrum. Born of a post-war quest for “never again,” the EU's founding myth presumes a single, integrative narrative: law over force, market over empire, consensus over chaos. Yet the informational multiverse of the 2020s confronts Europe with branching pressures it was never designed to navigate.

- **Emmanuel Macron.** France's president styles himself the architect of “European sovereignty,” oscillating between federalist rhetoric and Gaullist autonomy. He performs *strategic superposition*: one speech embraces NATO's “brain-dead” diagnosis, another recommits to collective defence. Each branch is activated to different audiences –Brussels, Berlin, Beijing-without full collapse.
- **Olaf Scholz.** Germany's chancellor proclaims a *Zeitenwende* while safeguarding export-driven pragmatism. Berlin pledges rearmament yet hesitates on Leopard tanks; it decries dependency on autocracies yet signs new LNG deals. Germany thus hovers between moral coherence and industrial realpolitik, sustaining parallel economic and security narratives.
- **Giorgia Meloni.** Italy's premier blends nationalist messaging with Euro-Atlantic loyalty, courting Brussels funds while opposing migration quotas. Her government embraces an Everettian flexibility: Italy is simultaneously a populist bastion and a disciplined Recovery-Fund stakeholder.
- **European Commission (Ursula von der Leyen).** The Commission attempts *narrative collapse* –a single Green-Digital transition story– yet member states decohere along energy, budget, and rule-of-law lines. The result is a multilevel superposition in which EU law is both supreme and selectively ignored.

Europe therefore practises what might be called **confined branching**: it tolerates internal narrative multiplicity while striving to project coherence abroad. This grants resilience-no single contradiction triggers systemic failure –but risks paralysis when rapid, unitary action is required (vaccines, Ukraine arms, energy shocks).

In an Everettian world, the EU's strategic task is to evolve toward *modular coherence*: nimble enough to surf informational branches, yet integrated enough to act decisively before those branches diverge beyond repair.

Psychopathological Correlates of Everettian Leadership

Interpreting Everettian geopolitics as a form of *narrative pathology* invites the question: are certain psychiatric profiles disproportionately represented among leaders who weaponise narrative superposition? While armchair diagnosis is risky, political psychology research. References [16] and [17] highlights three clusters:

- **Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD).** Grandiosity, need for admiration, and a sense of uniqueness facilitate the construction of parallel realities in which the leader is always central. Trump's public behaviour aligns most closely with *malignant narcissism*: entitlement plus aggression.
- **Antisocial / Psychopathic Traits.** Impulsivity, deceitfulness, and lack of remorse enable rapid narrative pivots without cognitive dissonance. Elements of Putin's strategic opacity and Bolsonaro's norm violations fit this pattern.

- **Paranoid Tendencies.** A persistent belief that others are plotting fosters alternate conspiracy branches. Erdogan’s and Orbán’s domestic rhetoric often frames opposition as existential sabotage, sustaining divergent realities.

These traits do not *cause* Everettian politics; rather, today’s media environment amplifies leaders who already exhibit them. Echo chamber feedback rewards grandiosity, aggression, and conspiracy with attention and power.

Caveat. Formal diagnosis requires clinical assessment; the mapping above is heuristic. Recognising these psychopathological dimensions nevertheless underscores the need for institutional guardrails against reality fragmentation.

Final Synthesis: The Topology of Power in the Age of Many Worlds

The political reality we now confront is neither purely rational nor purely chaotic –it is structurally branching, dynamically entangled, and increasingly governed by the logic of multiplicity. From Trump’s fractal narrative strategies to Xi Jinping’s rigid epistemic collapse mechanisms, from India’s calculated ambiguity to Africa’s resonant multiplicity, the spectrum of political behavior reflects a deeper shift: from a classical to an Everettian geopolitics.

What emerges is a topology of governance where coherence is strategic, decoherence is weaponized, and truth is no longer a singular axis but a superposition of selectively sustained realities. The global order is not breaking down into disorder –it is differentiating into a multiverse of incompatible yet simultaneously real narrative universes. Each nation, each leader, each belief system becomes a node in this vast entangled structure, propagating meanings that braid, fuse, or fracture upon contact.

In this context, modular tensor categories (MTCs), long central to quantum topology and computation, offer more than formal abstraction. They suggest a grammar –a way to model the compositional logic of identities, transformations, and interaction pathways. Through this lens, political actors resemble morphisms, policies become braids, and worldviews become categorical states whose evolution defines the contours of an emergent, post-classical international system. The question is no longer whether the Many-Worlds Interpretation is ‘true’ in the physical sense, but whether we can afford to ignore its structure in the domain of human meaning and power. To navigate this Everettian political condition, we will need new forms of diplomacy, new philosophies of observerhood, and new mathematical intuitions –entangled, braided, and coherent enough to survive without collapsing the delicate architecture of a shared world.

References

1. Hugh Everett. “Relative Stat” Formulation of Quantum Mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 29(3): 454–462, 1957.
2. Lev Vaidman. *Why the many-worlds interpretation*, *Quant. Rep.*, 4(3): 264–271, 2022.
3. Jerome R. Busemeyer and Peter D. Bruza. *Quantum Models of Cognition and Decision*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
4. Paul Ricoeur. *Temps et récit*. Éditions du Seuil, 1983.
5. Bryce S. DeWitt and Neill Graham (eds.), *The Many Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Princeton UP, 1973.
6. Cass R. Sunstein. *Republic.com*. Princeton University Press, 2001.
7. Eli Pariser. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin, 2011.
8. Michael S. Gazzaniga. *The Consciousness Instinct: Unraveling the Mystery of How the Brain Makes the Mind*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018.
9. David Deutsch, Quantum theory as a universal physical theory, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* 24: 1–41, 1985.
10. Wojciech H. Zurek, Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical, *Phys. Today* 44(10): 36–44, 1991.
11. Max Tegmark, Parallel Universes, *Scientific American* 288(5): 40–51 (2003).
12. Simon Saunders and David Wallace (eds.), *Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality*. Oxford UP, 2010.
13. David Wallace, *The Emergent Multiverse*. Oxford UP, 2012.

14. Michel Planat. *Baryonic matter, Ising anyons and strong quantum gravity*. *Int. J. Topol.*, 2(2): 4, 2025.
15. Michel Planat. *What ChatGPT has to say about its topological structure: the anyon hypothesis*. *Mach. Learn. Knowl. Extr.*, 6: 2876–2891, 2024.
16. Jerrold M. Post, *Narcissism and Politics: Dreams of Glory*. Routledge, New York, 2015.
17. Scott O. Lilienfeld, V, Kristin Landfield, Ashley L. Watts, Steven Rubenze & Thomas R. Faschingbauer *Fearless Dominance and the U. S. Presidency: Implications of Psychopathic Personality Traits for Successful and Unsuccessful Political Leadership*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(3): 489–505, 2012..

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.