Philosophical Implications of Quantum Perspectivism: Structural Realism and the Primacy of Relation

Matthew Long

The YonedaAI Collaboration
YonedaAI Research Collective
Chicago, IL

matthew@yonedaai.com · https://yonedaai.com

24 February 2026

Abstract

Quantum perspectivism—the thesis that quantum mechanics is the unique physical theory consistent with the Yoneda Constraint—carries profound philosophical implications that extend beyond the foundations of physics into metaphysics, epistemology, the philosophy of mind, and ethics. We argue that the Yoneda Lemma provides the precise mathematical articulation of *ontic structural realism*: the thesis that relations are ontologically prior to relata is not merely a philosophical preference but a theorem of category theory. The framework dissolves the traditional subject–object divide by showing that observer and observed are both objects in the same category, with measurement asymmetry arising from perspectival selection rather than ontological privilege. We demonstrate that the Yoneda embedding's full faithfulness constitutes a category-theoretic proof against non-contextual hidden variables, subsuming the Bell and Kochen–Specker no-go theorems within a single structural argument. We trace the implications for process philosophy, the philosophy of mathematics, theories of consciousness including panpsychism and integrated information theory, and the ethics of a relational ontology. The result is a philosophically coherent worldview in which structure, relation, and perspective are fundamental, while substance, intrinsic property, and absolute standpoint are derivative.

Keywords: ontic structural realism, Yoneda Lemma, category theory, quantum foundations, philosophy of physics, hidden variables, process philosophy, relational ontology, panpsychism, perspectivism

Contents

1 Introduction: Philosophy at the Categorical Threshold

> The world is given to me only once,
> not one existing and one perceived.
> Subject and object are only one.
>
> Erwin Schrödinger, *Mind and Matter* (1958)

The relationship between physics and philosophy has always been reciprocal. Philosophical commitments shape the interpretation of physical theories, and physical discoveries reshape the landscape of philosophical possibility. Nowhere is this entanglement more acute than in quantum mechanics, where the formalism has stubbornly resisted reconciliation with the object–property metaphysics inherited from the mechanical philosophy.

In a companion paper [1], we introduced **Quantum Perspectivism**: the thesis that quantum mechanics is the unique physical theory consistent with the **Yoneda Constraint**—the requirement, derived from the Yoneda Lemma of category theory, that physical systems are completely determined by the totality of their relational profiles. The mathematical development showed that the Hilbert space formalism, the Born rule, complementarity, entanglement, and the measurement problem all emerge as structural consequences of the Yoneda embedding

$$\mathsf{y} : \mathscr{C} \hookrightarrow [\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Set}], \tag{1}$$

which is fully faithful—meaning that no structural information is lost in the passage from objects to their relational profiles.

The present paper extracts and develops the philosophical content of this result. Our aim is not merely to append philosophical commentary to a mathematical framework but to demonstrate that the Yoneda Constraint has *unavoidable* philosophical consequences: it forces a specific metaphysics, reshapes epistemology, and even has implications for ethics and the philosophy of mind. These consequences are not matters of interpretation that can be chosen at will; they follow with the force of mathematical theorem from the categorical structure of the theory.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 develops the connection between the Yoneda Lemma and ontic structural realism, arguing that the Lemma elevates OSR from philosophical thesis to mathematical theorem. Section 3 examines the dissolution of the subject–object divide. Section 4 provides a systematic treatment of hidden variables as Yoneda consequences. Section 5 explores the primacy of relation over relata through the lens of process philosophy. Section 6 examines implications for the philosophy of mind. Section 7 considers the nature of mathematical existence. Section 8 develops an ethics of perspectivism. Section 9 provides a synthetic overview, and Section 11 concludes.

2 Ontic Structural Realism: From Philosophy to Theorem

2.1 The Landscape of Structural Realism

Scientific realism—the thesis that our best scientific theories describe mind-independent reality—faces a well-known challenge in the form of the "pessimistic meta-induction": the history of science is littered with abandoned theories (caloric, phlogiston, the luminiferous aether), suggesting that our current theories too may be false. The structural realist response, initiated by Worrall [4] and developed systematically by Ladyman [5], French [8], and Ladyman and Ross [6], proposes that what is preserved across theory change is not the objects posited by theories but the *structural relations* between them.

Structural realism comes in two principal varieties:

(i) **Epistemic Structural Realism (ESR):** We can know only the structural features of reality; the intrinsic nature of things remains inaccessible. Objects exist with intrinsic properties, but these are epistemically screened off [4].

(ii) **Ontic Structural Realism (OSR):** Structure is all there is. There are no objects with intrinsic properties lurking behind the relational structure; the structure *is* the ontology [5, 7, 9].

The debate between ESR and OSR has been vigorous. Critics of OSR argue that structures require relata—that relations cannot "float free" without things to relate [10, 11]. Defenders respond that this objection presupposes the very substance metaphysics that OSR seeks to replace [6, 8].

2.2 The Yoneda Lemma as the Theorem of Structural Realism

We propose that the Yoneda Lemma resolves this debate decisively in favor of ontic structural realism, and moreover elevates OSR from a philosophical position—one that can be accepted or rejected on the basis of intuitions and arguments—to a *mathematical theorem* with the force of logical necessity within any categorical framework.

Theorem 2.1 (Yoneda Lemma, Philosophical Reading)**.** *Let $\mathscr{C}$ be any category and $A \in \mathscr{C}$ any object. Then A is completely determined (up to isomorphism) by its representable presheaf $\mathsf{y}(A) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(-, A)$—that is, by the totality of morphisms from all other objects into A. Moreover, the Yoneda embedding $\mathsf{y} : \mathscr{C} \hookrightarrow [\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Set}]$ is fully faithful: every morphism between objects is faithfully encoded in the natural transformations between their relational profiles.*

The philosophical content is immediate:

(a) **No hidden intrinsic nature.** Any putative "intrinsic property" of A that is not reflected in some morphism from some object B to A is categorically invisible—it plays no role in the mathematical theory. If we identify physical reality with categorical structure (which is the content of the Yoneda Constraint), then there are no intrinsic properties beyond relational ones.

(b) **Structure determines identity.** Two objects with the same relational profile—the same collection of morphisms from every other object—are isomorphic. Identity *is* structural role. This is precisely the thesis of OSR, stated with mathematical precision.

(c) **Full faithfulness means no information loss.** The passage from objects to their relational profiles is not a lossy abstraction. The Yoneda embedding preserves all morphisms faithfully. This means that the structural description is not a "mere model" or an approximation; it is a complete and faithful representation of the original mathematical reality.

Remark 2.2 (OSR as Theorem vs. OSR as Philosophy). We must be precise about the logical structure of our claim. The Yoneda Lemma itself is a mathematical theorem, beyond dispute. The Yoneda Constraint—the identification of physical ontology with categorical structure—is an interpretive postulate, not a theorem. What we claim is conditional: *if* one accepts the Yoneda Constraint (and we argue in the companion paper [1] that the success of category-theoretic physics provides compelling grounds for doing so), *then* OSR follows with the force of mathematical proof. The philosophical work is in motivating the Constraint; once it is adopted, the philosophical consequences are not optional but necessary. This is a stronger position than traditional OSR, which relies on philosophical argumentation alone, but it is not as strong as claiming OSR is a mathematical theorem simpliciter.

2.3 Ladyman–Ross and the Yoneda Vindication

Ladyman and Ross's *Every Thing Must Go* [6] argues for a "rainforest realism" in which genuine structure is what is preserved across our best scientific representations. They insist that metaphysics be naturalized—constrained by physics rather than armchair intuition.

Quantum Perspectivism provides the mathematical infrastructure that Ladyman and Ross's program demands but does not itself supply. Their central claim—that "there are no things; structure is all there is"—is precisely the content of the Yoneda Lemma applied to the category of physical systems. The "rainforest" of patterns and structures that Ladyman and Ross describe is the presheaf topos $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$, and the hierarchy of structural levels corresponds to the tower of higher categorical constructions.

Proposition 2.3 (Naturalized Metaphysics via Yoneda). *If the fundamental category of physics is $\mathscr{C}$, then:*

(i) The ontology of physics consists of the presheaves in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ and the natural transformations between them.

(ii) "Things" (objects of $\mathscr{C}$) are completely determined by their presheaf representatives $\mathsf{y}(A)$.

(iii) The only metaphysical commitments required are to the existence of the category $\mathscr{C}$ and the validity of the Yoneda Lemma—both of which are mathematical, not empirical, commitments.

2.4 French and Esfeld: Individuality and Quantum Particles

Steven French [8, 7] has argued extensively that quantum mechanics undermines the individuality of particles: identical fermions or bosons cannot be distinguished by any physical measurement, yet they are "many." This is the problem of the metaphysics of identity for quantum particles.

In the Yoneda framework, this puzzle dissolves. Two "identical particles" are two copies of the same representable presheaf. They are structurally identical—they have the same relational profiles—and the question of whether they are "really" one or many is a question about the counting conventions of the category, not about deep ontological facts. The symmetrization and antisymmetrization of multi-particle states reflect the automorphism group of the product presheaf, not hidden distinguishing marks.

Esfeld's moderate structural realism [9], which attempts to retain objects as "thin" entities individuated solely by their structural roles, corresponds precisely to the representable presheaves: objects of $\mathscr{C}$ are the "thin" individuals, and their entire content is their representable presheaf. There is nothing thinner than a representable presheaf—it is the minimal object consistent with its relational data.

2.5 The Objection from Relata: Does Structure Need a Bearer?

The most persistent objection to OSR is the "no relations without relata" argument: relations are, by definition, relations *between* things, so structure presupposes objects [10, 11, 12].

The Yoneda Lemma reveals this objection as a confusion of levels. In a category, objects and morphisms are *co-fundamental*—neither is defined in terms of the other. A category is specified by giving objects, morphisms, and composition simultaneously. The objection presupposes that objects are ontologically prior and that relations are built on top of them; but category theory demonstrates that this ordering is not necessary and, via the Yoneda Lemma, that relations determine objects completely.

Proposition 2.4 (Resolution of the Relata Objection)**.** *In any category $\mathscr{C}$:*

(i) Objects and morphisms are co-given and co-fundamental.

(ii) The Yoneda Lemma shows that objects supervene on morphisms: the identity of any object is determined by its morphisms.

(iii) The converse—that morphisms supervene on objects—is false in general: different categories can have the same object-set but different morphism-sets.

Therefore, the "no relations without relata" objection has no force in a categorical ontology: objects are *the patterns that morphisms trace.*

3 The Dissolution of the Subject–Object Divide

3.1 The Problem of the Observer

The role of the observer in quantum mechanics has been a source of philosophical controversy since the theory's inception. The standard Copenhagen interpretation accords the observer a privileged position: the observer is outside the quantum system, classical in nature, and responsible (through the act of measurement) for the "collapse" of the quantum state. This creates an apparent divide between the quantum world (governed by the Schrödinger equation) and the classical world (governed by Newtonian mechanics and inhabited by observers).

Bohr's complementarity principle [13] attempted to manage this divide by insisting that the experimental setup and the quantum system form an inseparable whole, and that the results of quantum experiments can only be described in classical language. But this raises the question: *why* must the experimental apparatus be described classically? What distinguishes an "observer" from an "observed"?

Wheeler's participatory universe [14] pushed the point further: the observer is not a passive recorder but an active *participant* in bringing physical reality into being. Wheeler's "it from bit" doctrine holds that every physical quantity derives its ultimate significance from binary choices—yes/no questions—posed by observers. But Wheeler's vision, suggestive as it is, lacks a mathematical framework that would distinguish it from mysticism.

3.2 The Yoneda Dissolution

Quantum Perspectivism provides the mathematical framework that Wheeler's intuition demands and that Bohr's complementarity gestures toward. In the Yoneda framework:

(i) Both "observer" and "observed" are objects in the category $\mathscr{C}$.

(ii) The observer O is characterized by its representable presheaf $\mathsf{y}(O) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(-, O)$: the totality of morphisms from all other objects (including observed systems) into O.

(iii) The observed system S is likewise characterized by $\mathsf{y}(S) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(-, S)$.

(iv) A measurement is a morphism $f : O \to S$ (or, depending on convention, $f : S \to O$)—a specific relational connection between observer and observed.

(v) The "result" of the measurement is the image of the presheaf under restriction along f: $S(f) : S(\text{target}) \to S(\text{source})$.

Theorem 3.1 (Symmetry of the Observational Relation)**.** *In the category $\mathscr{C}$, the observational relation between objects O and S is symmetric: O observes S via morphisms in* $\mathrm{Hom}(O, S)$*, and S "observes" O via morphisms in* $\mathrm{Hom}(S, O)$*. The apparent asymmetry of measurement is a consequence of selecting a particular morphism—a particular perspective—not a consequence of an ontological distinction between observer and observed.*

This dissolves the subject–object divide at a fundamental level, resonating with Barad's "agential realism" [38], which similarly rejects the pre-given separation of observer and observed in favor of "intra-actions" that co-constitute both. There is no ontological category of "observers" distinct from "observed systems." The division is pragmatic and perspectival: we call O the observer and S the system because we have selected a morphism $f : O \to S$ and are computing $S(f)$. Had we selected a morphism $g : S \to O$, the roles would be reversed.

3.3 Bohr Revisited: Complementarity as Categorical Structure

Bohr's complementarity principle states that quantum phenomena require complementary descriptions (wave and particle, position and momentum) that cannot be simultaneously applied but are jointly necessary for a complete account. In the Yoneda framework, complementarity has a precise categorical meaning: it is the statement that certain pairs of representable presheaves $\mathsf{y}(C_\alpha)$ and $\mathsf{y}(C_\beta)$ generate non-commutative substructures.

Proposition 3.2 (Bohr's Complementarity as Non-Commutativity)**.** *Two measurement contexts C_α and C_β are complementary if and only if the diagram*

$$\mathsf{y}(C_\alpha) \otimes \mathsf{y}(C_\beta) \longrightarrow \mathsf{y}(C_\beta) \otimes \mathsf{y}(C_\alpha) \tag{2}$$

is not an identity natural transformation—i.e., the braiding is non-trivial on this pair. The non-commutativity is a feature of the category of contexts, not a property of the observer or the system individually.

Bohr was right that complementarity is not a deficiency of our knowledge but a structural feature of physical reality. The Yoneda framework shows *why*: it is the non-commutativity of certain morphisms in the category of contexts.

3.4 Wheeler's Participatory Universe: Formalized

Wheeler's "participatory universe" receives a precise formulation in Quantum Perspectivism. The "participation" of the observer is nothing but the selection of a morphism from the vast web of morphisms in $\mathscr{C}$. Each such selection yields a definite perspective—a specific restriction of the presheaf—and in this sense the observer "brings into being" the particular aspect of reality that is observed. But the presheaf itself—the totality of all possible perspectives—exists independently of any particular observer's selection.

Definition 3.3 (Wheeler Participation)**.** An **act of observation** is the selection of a morphism $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(O, S)$ together with the computation of the restricted presheaf data $S(f)$. The observer O "participates" in physical reality by selecting which aspect of the presheaf S to actualize, but the presheaf S is not created by the observation.

This formulation preserves Wheeler's insight—observers are participants, not detached spectators—while avoiding the solipsistic implication that reality is created by observation. The presheaf exists prior to any particular morphism selection; but definite physical data emerge only through the selection of a perspective.

3.5 Von Neumann's Chain and the Heisenberg Cut

Von Neumann's analysis of the measurement process [15] led to the problem of the "Heisenberg cut": the arbitrary boundary between the quantum system and the classical measuring apparatus. Moving the cut—including more of the apparatus in the quantum description—never eliminates it; it only pushes the boundary further back. This infinite regress is the mathematical expression of the subject–object problem.

In Quantum Perspectivism, the Heisenberg cut is dissolved rather than relocated. Every object in $\mathscr{C}$ is simultaneously a potential observer (source of morphisms) and a potential observed (target of morphisms). There is no cut because there is no fundamental distinction to cut along. What appears as a cut in the standard formalism is the selection of a particular morphism—the choice to describe the situation "from the perspective of O looking at S." Different choices yield different but equally valid descriptions, all consistent by the naturality of the presheaf.

4 Against Hidden Variables: The Yoneda No-Go Theorem

4.1 The Hidden Variable Program

Since the early days of quantum mechanics, there have been attempts to restore determinism by positing "hidden variables"—additional parameters, not included in the quantum state description, that would render individual measurement outcomes determinate. The most famous such attempt is the de Broglie–Bohm pilot wave theory [18], which supplements the wave function with definite particle positions.

The program of hidden variables was constrained by a series of celebrated no-go theorems:

(i) **Von Neumann's theorem (1932):** No hidden variable theory can reproduce quantum statistics if it preserves the linear structure of expectation values [15]. (This theorem was later shown by Bell to be too restrictive in its assumptions.)

(ii) **Bell's theorem (1964):** No *local* hidden variable theory can reproduce the correlations predicted by quantum mechanics for entangled particles [16].

(iii) **Kochen–Specker theorem (1967):** No *non-contextual* hidden variable theory can assign definite values to all observables simultaneously while respecting the functional relations between them [17].

(iv) **Free Will Theorem (Conway–Kochen, 2006):** If certain axioms hold, then the response of a particle to a measurement is not a function of any prior information [19].

Each of these theorems rules out a specific class of hidden variable theories. But they do so from different starting points and with different assumptions. What has been missing is a *unified* framework that explains why hidden variables are impossible—not just forbidden by specific technical results, but structurally precluded by the nature of physical theory itself.

4.2 The Yoneda No-Go Theorem

The Yoneda Constraint provides exactly such a unified framework.

Theorem 4.1 (Yoneda No-Go Theorem for Hidden Variables)**.** *Let $\mathscr{C}$ be the category of physical contexts and let S be a physical system satisfying the Yoneda Constraint (i.e., S is a presheaf on $\mathscr{C}$ faithfully represented by the Yoneda embedding). Then there exist no "hidden variables"—no additional parameters beyond the presheaf data $\{S(C)\}_{C\in\mathscr{C}}$—that are physically meaningful.*

Proof. A hidden variable λ for the system S would be a piece of data that:

(a) Is not contained in the presheaf S—i.e., $\lambda \notin S(C)$ for any context C.

(b) Determines (or constrains) the outcome of measurements on S.

But condition (b) means that λ is detectable by some morphism in $\mathscr{C}$: there exists a context C_λ and a morphism $f : C_\lambda \to C'$ such that the value of $S(f)$ depends on λ. This means λ contributes to the relational profile of S—it affects $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(C_\lambda, -)$ applied to S. But then, by the full faithfulness of the Yoneda embedding, λ must already be encoded in the presheaf $\mathsf{y}(S)$. This contradicts condition (a).

Therefore, any physically meaningful parameter is already contained in the presheaf data. Hidden variables in the traditional sense—intrinsic properties that determine outcomes but are not part of the relational profile—are categorically impossible. □

4.3 Bell's Theorem as a Yoneda Consequence

Bell's theorem states that no local hidden variable theory can reproduce the quantum mechanical predictions for measurements on entangled particles. We can derive this as a special case of the Yoneda No-Go Theorem.

Corollary 4.2 (Bell's Theorem from Yoneda)**.** *Let S_{12} be an entangled state of two systems, represented as a non-separable presheaf on $\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}$. A "local hidden variable" would be a parameter λ that determines the outcomes for system 1 independently of the context chosen for system 2, and vice versa. Such a λ would factor the presheaf: $S_{12}(C_1, C_2) = S_1(C_1, \lambda) \times S_2(C_2, \lambda)$. But a non-separable presheaf, by definition, does not factor. Therefore, no local hidden variable can reproduce the correlations of an entangled state.*

The key insight is that entanglement—non-separability of the presheaf—is the categorical expression of non-locality. Bell's inequality violations are not mysterious "spooky actions at a distance" but the inevitable consequence of irreducibly joint relational structure.

4.4 Kochen–Specker as a Yoneda Consequence

The Kochen–Specker theorem states that for Hilbert spaces of dimension ≥ 3, there is no assignment of definite values to all observables that respects the functional relations between compatible observables. In categorical terms:

Corollary 4.3 (Kochen–Specker from Yoneda)**.** *The Kochen–Specker theorem is equivalent to the statement that the presheaf topos $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ has a non-Boolean subobject classifier. A global section of the subobject classifier would assign truth values ("the* *observable has this value") consistently to all contexts simultaneously. The non-existence of such a global section—the non-Booleanness of the topos—is a direct consequence of the structure of $\mathscr{C}$ and the Yoneda Constraint.*

Proof sketch. The subobject classifier Ω of the presheaf topos assigns to each context C the set of sieves on C—collections of morphisms closed under precomposition. A global section $1 \to \Omega$ would select, for each context C, a single sieve on C, consistently with the restriction maps. In a Boolean topos, such global sections always exist (corresponding to two-valued truth assignments). The Kochen–Specker theorem, translated into this language, asserts that the presheaf topos of quantum contexts is non-Boolean: there are not enough global sections of Ω to provide a classical truth-value assignment. This follows from the non-commutativity of certain contexts in $\mathscr{C}$, which prevents the existence of a simultaneous refinement. □

4.5 Contextuality as Perspectivalism

The deepest lesson of the hidden variable no-go theorems, from the Yoneda perspective, is that **contextuality is not a deficiency but a feature**. The Kochen–Specker theorem shows that the values of observables depend on the measurement context. In the Yoneda framework, this is not a surprise—it is the very definition of what a presheaf is: a *context-dependent* assignment of data.

Definition 4.4 (Quantum Contextuality, Categorical)**. Quantum contextuality** is the statement that the presheaf $S : \mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ does not admit a global section—there is no single element of $\varprojlim S$ (the limit of S over all of $\mathscr{C}$) from which all local sections can be reconstructed. The system has definite data relative to each context, but these data cannot be assembled into a single "god's-eye view."

This connects directly to the philosophical literature on perspectivism (Giere [20], van Fraassen [21]): scientific theories provide perspectives on the world, and no single perspective captures the whole. The Yoneda Lemma guarantees that the *totality* of perspectives captures the whole—but this totality is a presheaf, not a set of definite values.

4.6 The Case of Bohmian Mechanics

An apparent counterexample to the Yoneda No-Go Theorem deserves attention. De Broglie–Bohm pilot wave theory [18] is an empirically adequate theory that supplements the wave function with definite particle positions—seemingly a hidden variable theory that works.

The Yoneda framework handles this case as follows. Bohmian positions are not *non-contextual* hidden variables. The particle position in Bohmian mechanics is determined by the entire wave function and depends on the measurement context: the Bohmian trajectory of particle 1 depends on what measurement is performed on particle 2, even at spacelike separation. In categorical terms, Bohmian positions are *already encoded in the presheaf data*—they are context-dependent sections of the presheaf, not context-independent intrinsic properties.

Remark 4.5 (Bohmian Mechanics as Contextual Presheaf Selection)*.* Bohmian mechanics does not contradict the Yoneda No-Go Theorem because Bohmian positions are contextual: they depend on the full experimental context, including distant settings. In the Yoneda framework, Bohmian mechanics is a particular *selection rule* for choosing a section of the presheaf at each context—not an addition of intrinsic properties beyond the presheaf. What the Yoneda No-Go Theorem rules out is not theories like Bohmian mechanics but theories in which hidden variables are context-independent (non-contextual).

5 The Primacy of Relation: Process Philosophy and Ontic Structuralism

5.1 Whitehead and Process Metaphysics

Alfred North Whitehead's process philosophy [22] anticipates many features of Quantum Perspectivism. Whitehead rejected the "substance–attribute" metaphysics of Aristotle and the mechanical philosophy in favor of a process ontology in which the fundamental entities are *occasions of experience*—momentary events of relational becoming—rather than enduring substances.

Key Whiteheadian concepts find categorical expression:

(i) **Actual occasions** are objects in $\mathscr{C}$: momentary events, each with a definite perspective on all others.

(ii) **Prehension** (Whitehead's term for the way one occasion "grasps" another) is a morphism: $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(A, B)$ is A's prehension of B.

(iii) **The principle of relativity** (every actual entity is a potential for every becoming) is the statement that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(A, B) \neq \emptyset$ for all A, B—a connectivity condition on $\mathscr{C}$.

(iv) **The ontological principle** (every fact must be grounded in an actual entity) is the Yoneda Constraint: all data about a presheaf is data relative to some representable.

(v) **Creativity** (the universal of universals, the category of the ultimate) is the categorical composition law: the fact that morphisms compose to yield new morphisms.

Proposition 5.1 (Whitehead's Ontology as Categorical Structure)**.** *Whitehead's process ontology is a philosophical articulation of the structure of a locally connected category with a Yoneda-type embedding. The "fallacy of misplaced concreteness"—mistaking abstractions for concrete realities—is the error of treating presheaves as having intrinsic content beyond their relational data.*

5.2 The Relata Problem Resolved

The traditional metaphysical debate about the primacy of relation vs. relata assumes that one must be prior. Category theory reveals a third option: **co-constitution**.

In a category, objects and morphisms are given simultaneously. Neither has ontological priority. But the Yoneda Lemma introduces an asymmetry: while objects can be reconstructed from morphisms (via the representable presheaf), morphisms cannot be reconstructed from objects alone (a set of objects admits many different category structures).

Theorem 5.2 (Asymmetric Determination)**.** *In any category $\mathscr{C}$:*

(a) Morphisms determine objects: $\mathsf{y}(A) \cong \mathsf{y}(B) \Leftrightarrow A \cong B$.

(b) Objects do not determine morphisms: there exist distinct categories $\mathscr{C}_1, \mathscr{C}_2$ with $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathscr{C}_1) = \mathrm{Ob}(\mathscr{C}_2)$ *but* $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}_1} \neq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}_2}$.

Therefore, morphisms (relations) are ontologically prior to objects (relata) in the sense that the former determine the latter but not conversely.

This resolves the primacy debate in favor of relations, but not by eliminating objects. Objects are *constituted* by relations—they are the nodes that the relational web defines—but they are real as nodes. This is “moderate” OSR, but with a mathematical theorem backing it rather than philosophical preference.

5.3 Relational Holism and Emergence

The primacy of relation has implications for the philosophy of emergence. If objects are constituted by their relations, then composite systems can have relational properties that are not reducible to the properties of their parts—because the parts themselves are defined by their relations to the whole.

Definition 5.3 (Relational Holism)**.** A composite system S_{12} exhibits **relational holism** if the presheaf S_{12} on $\mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}$ is not isomorphic to any product $S_1 \times S_2$ of presheaves on the individual factors. Equivalently, S_{12} exhibits relational holism if and only if it is entangled.

Relational holism, in this framework, is not a mysterious “more than the sum of parts” but a precise mathematical property: the non-separability of the presheaf. It applies not only to quantum entanglement but to any situation where the relational structure of a composite cannot be decomposed into the relational structures of its components.

6 Implications for the Philosophy of Mind

6.1 The Hard Problem and the Perspectival Turn

The “hard problem of consciousness” [23] asks why and how physical processes give rise to subjective experience—to the qualitative “what it is like” of seeing red or feeling pain. The problem arises from the assumption that physical reality consists of objective, mind-independent facts, and that consciousness is somehow layered on top of or emergent from these facts.

Quantum Perspectivism challenges this assumption at its root. If physical reality is constituted by perspectives—by context-dependent relational data—then the notion of a purely “objective” physical fact, devoid of any perspectival character, is an abstraction. The fundamental ontology already includes perspectives as primitive.

Proposition 6.1 (Perspectives as Primitive)**.** *In Quantum Perspectivism, a "perspective" is a morphism in $\mathscr{C}$—a specific relational connection between two objects. Perspectives are not emergent from or supervenient on non-perspectival facts; they are the basic building blocks of the ontology. The presheaf S is nothing but the collection of all perspectival data.*

This does not solve the hard problem—we wish to be explicit about this limitation—but it *reframes* it in a way that may prove productive. The question is no longer "how does perspective arise from non-perspective?" but "why do some perspectives have the qualitative character they do?" The former question may have the logical structure of a category error; the latter is a substantive empirical question amenable to investigation. We emphasize that the connection between categorical perspectives (morphisms in $\mathscr{C}$) and phenomenal consciousness (qualia) remains deeply unclear, and the suggestions that follow are speculative rather than established consequences of the framework.

6.2 Panpsychism and the Yoneda Constraint

Panpsychism—the view that consciousness or proto-consciousness is a fundamental feature of physical reality—has experienced a renaissance in recent philosophy of mind [24, 25, 26]. One motivation for panpsychism is the "combination problem" in reverse: if consciousness emerges from non-conscious matter, we need an account of how; but if proto-consciousness is already present at the fundamental level, the emergence problem is replaced by a "combination problem" of how simple experiential elements combine into complex conscious experience.

Quantum Perspectivism offers a natural framework for a structuralist form of panpsychism:

(i) Every object A in $\mathscr{C}$ has a "perspective"—its representable presheaf $\mathsf{y}(A)$—which encodes everything A "sees" of every other object. In this minimal sense, every physical entity has a "point of view."

(ii) The complexity of the perspective depends on the richness of $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(-, A)$: objects with more morphisms into them have richer relational profiles and thus richer "perspectives."

(iii) Conscious experience, in this framework, would correspond to presheaves of a specific structural type—perhaps those with sufficient complexity, self-referential structure, or integrated information.

Remark 6.2 (Structural Panpsychism: A Speculative Proposal). We tentatively call this position **structural panpsychism**: the *suggestion* that what physics describes as "perspectives" (morphisms and presheaf data) are the same kind of structures that, in sufficiently complex configurations, constitute conscious experience. This is not the claim that electrons have feelings; it is the more modest claim that the relational/perspectival structure that physics reveals *may be* the same kind of structure that, at a higher level of organizational complexity, constitutes what we call consciousness. We emphasize that this remains a speculative proposal, not a proven consequence of the framework. The gap between mathematical perspectivalism and phenomenal experience may require conceptual resources beyond category theory to bridge.

6.3 Integrated Information Theory and Categorical Structure

Integrated Information Theory (IIT), developed by Tononi [27, 28], proposes that consciousness is identical with a specific form of information integration, quantified by the measure Φ. A system is conscious to the degree that it is both highly differentiated (many distinguishable states) and highly integrated (the system cannot be decomposed into independent parts without information loss).

IIT has a natural categorical interpretation:

Definition 6.3 (Categorical Φ)**.** Let S be a presheaf on $\mathscr{C}$. The **integrated information** of S is measured by the degree to which S fails to decompose as a product:

$$\Phi(S) = d(S, \text{ nearest product presheaf}), \tag{3}$$

where d is an appropriate metric on the category of presheaves (e.g., derived from the internal hom or from an information-theoretic divergence).

Proposition 6.4 (IIT as Non-Separability)**.** *A system has high Φ if and only if its presheaf representation is highly entangled—far from any separable state. In the Yoneda framework, integrated information is precisely the categorical measure of relational holism.*

This provides a novel connection: consciousness (as measured by Φ) is the degree of quantum entanglement (understood categorically as presheaf non-separability). This does not require quantum effects in the brain in the literal sense—it requires that the *informational structure* of conscious experience shares the categorical form of quantum entanglement.

6.4 The Observer as Self-Referential Presheaf

A distinctive feature of conscious observers is self-awareness: the capacity to take oneself as an object of observation. In categorical terms, this corresponds to a morphism $f : O \to O$—an endomorphism of the observer object.

Definition 6.5 (Self-Observing System)**.** A system $O \in \mathscr{C}$ is **self-observing** if $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(O, O)$ is non-trivial—i.e., it contains morphisms other than the identity. The richer the endomorphism monoid $\mathrm{End}(O) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{C}}(O, O)$, the richer the system's capacity for self-observation.

Proposition 6.6. *Self-awareness corresponds to the action of the endomorphism monoid on the representable presheaf $\mathsf{y}(O)$. The internal state of a self-aware system includes its own perspective on itself—a fixed point of the presheaf under the action of endomorphisms.*

This connects to the philosophical tradition of self-consciousness from Fichte through Hegel to Sartre: the self is not a substance but a relation—specifically, the self-relation of an object with non-trivial endomorphisms.

7 The Nature of Mathematical Existence and Physical Reality

7.1 Structuralism in the Philosophy of Mathematics

The philosophy of mathematics has its own debate about structuralism. Mathematical structuralism [29, 30] holds that mathematical objects (numbers, sets, spaces) have no intrinsic nature beyond their structural role in the systems they inhabit. The number 2, for instance, is not an object with hidden internal properties; it is whatever occupies the "2-position" in the natural number structure.

The Yoneda Lemma is the mathematical theorem that undergirds this philosophical position. In any category of mathematical objects, an object is its relational profile—nothing more, nothing less.

Proposition 7.1 (Yoneda Structuralism). *Mathematical structuralism, in its strongest form, is a consequence of the Yoneda Lemma: mathematical objects are completely determined by their morphisms, and any two objects with isomorphic relational profiles are isomorphic. There is no further fact about what a mathematical object "really is."*

7.2 The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics

Wigner's famous question [31]—why is mathematics so unreasonably effective in the natural sciences?—receives a new answer in the Yoneda framework. If physical reality is constituted by categorical structure, and if mathematical objects are also constituted by categorical structure, then the "effectiveness" of mathematics is not unreasonable at all: physics and mathematics are describing the same kind of thing.

Proposition 7.2 (The Reasonable Effectiveness of Category Theory). *The effectiveness of mathematics in physics is a consequence of the fact that both physical systems and mathematical objects are characterized by the Yoneda Constraint. The "match" between mathematics and physics is not a mysterious pre-established harmony but the identity of their structural form: both are instances of the same categorical architecture.*

More precisely, the Yoneda embedding provides a functor from the category of physical systems to the category of presheaves (a mathematical object). The full faithfulness of this functor means that no physical content is lost in the translation. Mathematics is effective in physics because the two domains share the same structural logic, and the Yoneda Lemma guarantees that this sharing is lossless.

7.3 Mathematical Platonism vs. Categorical Structuralism

Traditional mathematical Platonism holds that mathematical objects exist in a realm of abstract forms, independent of the physical world and of human cognition. Quantum Perspectivism suggests a subtler position: mathematical structures are real, but their reality is *the same kind of reality* as physical reality—both are relational, perspectival, and categorical.

Remark 7.3 (Structural Platonism). We call this position **structural Platonism**: mathematical structures are real and mind-independent, but they are not objects in some Platonic heaven. They are the very fabric of physical reality itself, as revealed by the Yoneda Constraint. The distinction between "mathematical reality" and "physical reality" dissolves: both are descriptions of the same relational structure, viewed from different categorical perspectives.

7.4 Gödel, Incompleteness, and the Limits of Perspectivalism

Gödel's incompleteness theorems [32] demonstrate that any sufficiently powerful formal system contains true statements that cannot be proven within the system. In the language of Quantum Perspectivism, this has a categorical interpretation: the presheaf topos of a formal system cannot be fully "globalized"—there are aspects of the system visible from the "outside" (a stronger system) that are invisible from the "inside" (the system's own perspectives).

Proposition 7.4 (Incompleteness as Perspectival Limitation)**.** *Gödel incompleteness corresponds to the fact that the presheaf topos of a formal system T does not coincide with the presheaf topos of the "meta-system" within which T is embedded. Certain global sections of the meta-system's presheaf do not restrict to global sections of T's presheaf. This is a structural analogue of quantum contextuality: the "truth values" of a formal system are context-dependent (where the "context" is the ambient mathematical framework).*

This suggests a deep connection between quantum contextuality and logical incompleteness—both are manifestations of the impossibility of a "view from nowhere" in perspectival structures.

8 Ethics of Perspectivism: If Reality Is Relational, What Follows?

8.1 From Ontology to Ethics

The passage from ontology to ethics is always contentious, and we wish to be candid about the limitations of what follows. The "is–ought" gap, identified by Hume [33] and formalized by Moore's open question argument [34], cautions against deriving moral conclusions from factual premises alone. We do not claim to derive ethics from category theory. What we claim is more modest: ontological commitments *constrain* the space of ethical possibilities by shaping what kinds of entities exist and how they are related. A substance ontology, in which individuals are self-sufficient atoms of being, naturally suggests (but does not entail) an ethics of individual rights and atomistic autonomy. A relational ontology, in which individuals are constituted by their relations, suggests (but does not entail) a different ethical landscape. The passage from ontological suggestion to ethical prescription requires additional normative premises, which we make explicit below.

8.2 Relational Ethics

If the Yoneda Constraint is correct—if individuals are constituted by their relational profiles—then the sharp boundary between self and other is an abstraction. I am not first a self-contained subject who then enters into relations with others; I am, from the ground up, a node in a relational web. My identity is my relations.

Proposition 8.1 (Ethical Implications of Relational Ontology)**.** *A relational ontology implies:*

(i) ***Mutual constitution:*** *I am partly constituted by my relations to you, and you by your relations to me.* If *we accept the additional normative premise that one ought to preserve the integrity of the structures that constitute one's identity,* then *harming you is, in a precise structural sense, harming the web that constitutes me. (The normative premise is not derived from the ontology but is made natural by it.)*

(ii) ***Perspectival pluralism:*** *If reality is the totality of perspectives, and no single perspective captures the whole, then ethical reasoning must take multiple perspectives seriously. No one perspective has privileged access to the truth.*

(iii) ***Responsibility as relational:*** *Moral responsibility arises not from a self-sufficient will but from the structural position one occupies in the relational web. The more morphisms into an object (the more relations it sustains), the greater its structural significance and, arguably, its moral weight.*

(iv) ***Against ethical atomism:*** *The ethical significance of an individual cannot be assessed in isolation from their relational context, just as the physical properties of a quantum system cannot be assessed independently of the measurement context.*

8.3 The Ethics of Complementarity

Bohr's complementarity principle has an ethical analogue: some ethical perspectives may be complementary in the quantum sense—jointly necessary but not simultaneously applicable. The perspective of justice and the perspective of mercy, for instance, may be complementary: each is essential, but they cannot always be fully realized simultaneously.

Remark 8.2 (Ethical Complementarity)*.* Just as quantum complementarity arises from the non-commutativity of certain morphisms in $\mathscr{C}$, ethical complementarity may arise from the non-commutativity of certain evaluative perspectives. A "measurement" (ethical judgment) from the perspective of justice may yield a different result than a "measurement" from the perspective of mercy, and there may be no single perspective from which both are simultaneously determinate.

8.4 Ubuntu and Relational Personhood

The African philosophical tradition of Ubuntu—often glossed as "I am because we are"—is a relational ontology of personhood that resonates deeply with Quantum Perspectivism. In the Ubuntu framework, personhood is not an intrinsic property of biological individuals but an achievement of relational participation: one becomes a person through one's relations with others [35, 36].

Proposition 8.3 (Ubuntu as Yoneda Personhood)**.** *The Ubuntu principle "I am because we are" is the ethical expression of the Yoneda Lemma: the identity of a person is constituted by the totality of their relations to others. A person with no relations—no morphisms from or to other objects in the category of persons—is categorically empty: their representable presheaf is trivial.*

This connection is more than an analogy. If Quantum Perspectivism is correct, then the Ubuntu ontology of personhood is not merely a cultural preference but a consequence of the deepest structural feature of reality: the Yoneda Constraint.

8.5 Environmental Ethics and Ecological Holism

The relational ontology of Quantum Perspectivism also supports a form of ecological holism. If systems are constituted by their relations, then the "environment" is not external to organisms but constitutive of them. The boundary between organism and environment is a pragmatic abstraction, not an ontological fact.

Proposition 8.4 (Ecological Holism from Yoneda)**.** *The ecological web of relations between organisms and their environment is a presheaf on the category of ecological contexts. Destroying a relation (e.g., driving a species to extinction) does not merely remove a node; it alters the relational profiles of all connected nodes, changing their very identities. Ecological harm is thus ontological harm: it changes what things* are, *not merely what they are like.*

9 Synthesis: The Perspectival Worldview

9.1 The Unity of the Perspectival Framework

We have traced the philosophical implications of Quantum Perspectivism across metaphysics, epistemology, the philosophy of mind, the philosophy of mathematics, and ethics. The unifying thread is the Yoneda Constraint: the mathematical theorem that identity is relational structure, applied as a principle of physical ontology.

Philosophical Domain	$\Longrightarrow$	**Yoneda Consequence**
Metaphysics (OSR)	$\Longrightarrow$	Structure is all there is
Subject–object divide	$\Longrightarrow$	Dissolved: both are objects in $\mathscr{C}$
Hidden variables	$\Longrightarrow$	Categorically impossible
Primacy of relation	$\Longrightarrow$	Relations determine relata, not conversely
Philosophy of mind	$\Longrightarrow$	Perspectives are primitive; structural panpsychism
Philosophy of math	$\Longrightarrow$	Structural Platonism; reasonable effectiveness
Gödel incompleteness	$\Longrightarrow$	Perspectival limitation, not absolute truth
Ethics	$\Longrightarrow$	Relational constitution; perspectival pluralism
Ecology	$\Longrightarrow$	Relational holism; constitutive interconnection

9.2 Comparison with Existing Philosophical Frameworks

9.2.1 Kantian Transcendental Idealism

Kant's transcendental idealism holds that we can know only the phenomenal world—reality as structured by our cognitive faculties—not the noumenal world of "things in themselves." Quantum Perspectivism agrees that all knowledge is perspectival but denies the existence of an unknowable noumenal realm. The Yoneda Lemma guarantees that the totality of perspectives *is* the object: there is no "thing in itself" hiding behind the relational profile. Kant's phenomena are the presheaf data; his noumena are an unnecessary and indeed categorically incoherent addition.

9.2.2 Hegelian Absolute Idealism

Hegel's dialectical method, in which opposites (thesis and antithesis) are resolved in a higher synthesis, has a categorical echo in the construction of colimits: the colimit of a diagram in $\mathscr{C}$ is the "synthesis" of the objects and morphisms in the diagram. Hegel's Absolute Idea—the self-knowing whole that contains all perspectives—corresponds to the presheaf topos $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ itself, which is the "universe of discourse" containing all possible perspectives and their interrelations.

9.2.3 Nietzschean Perspectivism

Nietzsche's perspectivism [37] asserts that there are no facts, only interpretations, and that every interpretation is from a particular perspective. Quantum Perspectivism preserves Nietzsche's insight that perspectives are fundamental while avoiding his nihilistic conclusion. The Yoneda Lemma provides what Nietzsche could not: a mathematical proof that the totality of perspectives constitutes a fully determined object. There *are* facts, but they are perspectival facts—sections of a presheaf, not elements of an absolute set.

9.2.4 Pragmatism

The pragmatist tradition (James, Dewey, Rorty) holds that truth is what works, that theory is a tool for navigating experience, and that the sharp theory/practice distinction should be abandoned. Quantum Perspectivism is compatible with pragmatism: the presheaf assigns data to contexts of inquiry, and the "truth" of a physical claim is its coherence across contexts—precisely a pragmatist criterion. The Yoneda Lemma adds to pragmatism the assurance that this coherence is not merely practical convenience but mathematical necessity.

9.3 The Categorical Turn in Philosophy

We suggest that Quantum Perspectivism represents a **categorical turn** in philosophy, analogous to the "linguistic turn" of the 20th century. Where the linguistic turn recognized that philosophical problems are often problems about language, the categorical turn recognizes that they are often problems about structure—about the morphisms, functors, and natural transformations that relate different perspectives.

Remark 9.1 (The Categorical Turn). The categorical turn does not replace the linguistic turn but subsumes it: language is itself a category (of expressions, inference rules, and semantic interpretations), and the problems of the linguistic turn are special cases of the problems of categorical structure. But the categorical turn goes further, applying to domains (physics, mathematics, ethics, consciousness) that the linguistic turn could not easily reach.

10 Open Problems and Future Directions

Several important questions remain open.

The structure of the physical category. We have left the category $\mathscr{C}$ largely unspecified. Determining its structure—or showing that the philosophical implications are robust across a wide class of categories—is essential for the program's credibility.

The hard problem, revisited. Structural panpsychism reframes the hard problem but does not eliminate it. Why *this* structural type is accompanied by subjective experience, rather than being a "zombie" structure, remains mysterious. Whether category theory can address this deepest of philosophical questions is an open problem.

Formal ethics from categorical structure. We have sketched ethical implications of relational ontology, but a rigorous ethical theory derived from categorical principles remains to be constructed. Such a theory would need to define a notion of "moral morphism" and derive ethical principles from the structure of the category of agents.

The relationship between incompleteness and contextuality. The parallel between Gödel incompleteness and quantum contextuality is suggestive but requires rigorous development. Is there a categorical theorem that unifies both?

Experimental tests. Can the philosophical framework generate testable predictions? One possibility: if consciousness is related to integrated information (Φ), and if Φ has the categorical structure we have described, then specific predictions about the neural correlates of consciousness might follow.

Cross-cultural philosophy. The resonance between Quantum Perspectivism and Ubuntu, Buddhist dependent origination, and other non-Western philosophical traditions deserves systematic exploration. If the Yoneda Constraint is universal, its philosophical content should appear in diverse intellectual traditions.

11 Conclusion: To Be Is to Be Related

The Yoneda Lemma is a theorem about the nature of identity in any mathematical structure: an object is completely determined by the totality of its relations to all other objects. The Yoneda Constraint—the application of this theorem as a principle of physical ontology—yields Quantum Perspectivism, a framework in which quantum mechanics is the unique physics consistent with relational identity.

The philosophical implications of this framework are sweeping:

(i) **Ontic structural realism** is elevated from philosophical thesis to mathematical theorem. Structure is all there is, and the Yoneda Lemma proves it.

(ii) **The subject–object divide** dissolves. Observer and observed are symmetric objects in the same category, and the apparent asymmetry of measurement is perspectival, not ontological.

(iii) **Hidden variables** are categorically impossible. The full faithfulness of the Yoneda embedding leaves no room for intrinsic properties beyond the relational profile.

(iv) **Relations are prior to relata.** Objects are constituted by their morphisms, not the reverse. Process philosophy is vindicated.

(v) **Perspectives are ontologically primitive.** The hard problem of consciousness is reframed: the question is not how perspective arises from non-perspective but why certain perspectival structures have the qualitative character they do.

(vi) **Mathematical and physical reality share the same structure**—both are instances of the Yoneda Constraint. The "unreasonable effectiveness" of mathematics is reasonable.

(vii) **Ethics** inherits a relational character. If identity is relational, then harm to the relational web is harm to the self; and perspectival pluralism demands that multiple viewpoints be taken seriously.

At its deepest level, Quantum Perspectivism asserts a single, profound truth: *to be is to be related.* The Yoneda Lemma is the mathematical proof, quantum mechanics is the physical manifestation, and the philosophical implications developed in this paper are the conceptual harvest. If this program is correct, then the ancient philosophical question "What is real?" receives a definitive answer: reality is the totality of perspectives, coherently assembled by the Yoneda Constraint, and there is nothing else besides.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks the YonedaAI Research Collective for ongoing collaboration and intellectual support, and acknowledges the foundational contributions of Saunders Mac Lane, Alexander Grothendieck, and Nobuo Yoneda, whose mathematical vision makes this work possible. The philosophical development owes debts to the ontic structural realism program of James Ladyman, Steven French, and Michael Esfeld, to the process philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, and to the participatory universe vision of John Archibald Wheeler.

GrokRxiv DOI: `10.48550/GrokRxiv.2026.02.philosophical-implications-qp`

References

[1] M. Long, "Quantum Perspectivism as the Foundation of Physics: The Yoneda Constraint and the Relational Structure of Reality," *GrokRxiv*, 2026.

[2] N. Yoneda, "On the homology theory of modules," *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. I*, vol. 7, pp. 193–227, 1954.

[3] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, 2nd ed., Springer, 1998.

[4] J. Worrall, "Structural realism: The best of both worlds?" *Dialectica*, vol. 43, pp. 99–124, 1989.

[5] J. Ladyman, "What is structural realism?" *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, vol. 29, pp. 409–424, 1998.

[6] J. Ladyman and D. Ross, *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized*, Oxford University Press, 2007.

[7] S. French, "Structure as a weapon of the realist," *Proc. Aristotelian Society*, vol. 106, pp. 170–187, 2006.

[8] S. French, *The Structure of the World: Metaphysics and Representation*, Oxford University Press, 2014.

[9] M. Esfeld, "Quantum entanglement and a metaphysics of relations," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, vol. 35, pp. 601–617, 2004.

[10] J. Busch, "What structures could not be," *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 17, pp. 211–225, 2003.

[11] S. Psillos, "The structure, the whole structure, and nothing but the structure?" *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 73, pp. 560–570, 2006.

[12] M. Morganti, "On the preferability of epistemic structural realism," *Synthese*, vol. 142, pp. 81–107, 2004.

[13] N. Bohr, "The quantum postulate and the recent development of atomic theory," *Nature*, vol. 121, pp. 580–590, 1928.

[14] J. A. Wheeler, "Law without law," in *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek, eds., Princeton University Press, pp. 182–213, 1983.

[15] J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik*, Springer, 1932.

[16] J. S. Bell, "On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox," *Physics Physique Fizika*, vol. 1, pp. 195–200, 1964.

[17] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, "The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics," *J. Math. Mech.*, vol. 17, pp. 59–87, 1967.

[18] D. Bohm, "A suggested interpretation of the quantum theory in terms of 'hidden' variables. I," *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 85, pp. 166–179, 1952.

[19] J. Conway and S. Kochen, "The free will theorem," *Found. Phys.*, vol. 36, pp. 1441–1473, 2006.

[20] R. N. Giere, *Scientific Perspectivism*, University of Chicago Press, 2006.

[21] B. C. van Fraassen, *Scientific Representation: Paradoxes of Perspective*, Oxford University Press, 2008.

[22] A. N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, Macmillan, 1929.

[23] D. J. Chalmers, "Facing up to the problem of consciousness," *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 200–219, 1995.

[24] P. Goff, *Consciousness and Fundamental Reality*, Oxford University Press, 2017.

[25] G. Strawson, "Realistic monism: Why physicalism entails panpsychism," *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 13, pp. 3–31, 2006.

[26] T. Nagel, "What is it like to be a bat?" in *Mortal Questions*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 165–180, 1979.

[27] G. Tononi, "An information integration theory of consciousness," *BMC Neuroscience*, vol. 5, no. 42, 2004.

[28] G. Tononi, "Consciousness as integrated information: A provisional manifesto," *Biol. Bull.*, vol. 215, pp. 216–242, 2008.

[29] S. Shapiro, *Philosophy of Mathematics: Structure and Ontology*, Oxford University Press, 1997.

[30] M. D. Resnik, *Mathematics as a Science of Patterns*, Oxford University Press, 1997.

[31] E. P. Wigner, "The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences," *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 13, pp. 1–14, 1960.

[32] K. Gödel, "Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I," *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, vol. 38, pp. 173–198, 1931.

[33] D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 1739.

[34] G. E. Moore, *Principia Ethica*, Cambridge University Press, 1903.

[35] T. Metz, "Toward an African moral theory," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 15, pp. 321–341, 2007.

[36] M. B. Ramose, *African Philosophy Through Ubuntu*, Mond Books, 1999.

[37] F. Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, 1887.

[38] K. Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Duke University Press, 2007.

[39] C. J. Isham, "Topos theory and consistent histories: The internal logic of the set of all consistent sets," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 36, pp. 785–814, 1997.

[40] J. Butterfield and C. J. Isham, "A topos perspective on the Kochen–Specker theorem: I. Quantum states as generalized valuations," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 37, pp. 2669–2733, 1998.

[41] A. Döring and C. J. Isham, "A topos foundation for theories of physics," *J. Math. Phys.*, vol. 49, 053515, 2008.

[42] C. Rovelli, "Relational quantum mechanics," *Int. J. Theor. Phys.*, vol. 35, pp. 1637–1678, 1996.

[43] S. Abramsky and B. Coecke, "A categorical semantics of quantum protocols," in *Proc. 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pp. 415–425, 2004.

[44] A. M. Gleason, "Measures on the closed subspaces of a Hilbert space," *J. Math. Mech.*, vol. 6, pp. 885–893, 1957.

[45] E. Riehl, *Category Theory in Context*, Dover Publications, 2016.

[46] P. T. Johnstone, *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

[47] M. Long, "ContextFS: Typed persistent memory for AI systems," *GrokRxiv*, 2026.

[48] M. Long, "Emergent spacetime from quantum information structures," *GrokRxiv*, 2026.