

DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS: THE COST OF DENIAL

De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]] (“On the Revolutions of Truth”) honors Copernicus and names a re-centering of truth analogous to the re-centering of the cosmos.

The Person [[Who Does]] [[Not Exist]] — The Existential Negation of the Moral Universe

David Lowe | Theophysics | 2025

![[02_THEOPHYSICS/3 Truths/03_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE COST OF DENIAL.mp3]]

Abstract

This is the third paper in *De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]]*. Where [[02_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE LOCK|De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]]: The Lock]] derives twenty axioms and [[01_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE ARCHITECTURE|De [[Revolutionibus Veritatis]]: The Architecture]] explains the scientific pillars they stand on, this paper asks a different question: **What kind of person would you have to become to deny this?** We prove, using thermodynamics, biology, and psychology, that the person who genuinely rejects all twenty axioms does not exist—not because such a person is rare, but because such a person is *impossible*. We introduce the [[Coherence Asymmetry]] Theorem, the [[Active Coherence]] Proof, the Existential Negation Test, and the [[Soteriological Limit]]. This

paper does not argue. It describes what the denial looks like, and lets the reader decide whether they can live in it.

*[!tip] Series Navigation This is **Paper 3 of 4** in De [\[\[Revolutionibus Veritatis\]\]](#).*

- [\[\[02_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE LOCK|De \[\[Revolutionibus Veritatis\]\]: The Lock\]\]](#): The formal derivation.
- [\[\[01_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE ARCHITECTURE|De \[\[Revolutionibus Veritatis\]\]: The Architecture\]\]](#): The architecture explained simply.
- **Paper 3** (this document): The existential negation.
- [\[\[04_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS THE KEY|De \[\[Revolutionibus Veritatis\]\]: The Key\]\]](#): Christianity tested against all 20 axioms.

I. The Question This Paper Asks

The first two papers build and explain the proof. This paper asks a person to deny it—not in theory, but in practice. Not with a clever counterargument, but with a life.

Consider what you must *become* to genuinely reject what has been derived.

II. The [\[\[Coherence Asymmetry\]\]](#) Theorem

Before we can test denial, we need one more formal result. This theorem is the structural backbone of everything that follows.

Theorem ([\[\[Coherence Asymmetry\]\]](#)): A coherence operator \hat{C} cannot generate decoherent output $(-\chi)$.

Proof: A lossless compression algorithm (high χ) cannot output random noise (high entropy, $-\chi$). If it did, it would violate its own definition—it would be lossy. Similarly, a source of coherent mathematical truth cannot output deception (incoherence) without ceasing to be coherent.

Formally: If $\text{Output}(\text{Source})$ is coherent ($\chi > 0$), then Source must be coherent. Deception $=$ incoherence $= -\chi$. Therefore:

$\text{Coherent Output} \rightarrow \neg \text{Deceptive}(\text{Source})$

The critical transition: Deception is not merely "immoral" by human convention. **Deception is noise.** It is the introduction of entropy where signal should be. In information theory, noise is the opposite of information. A source of pure signal cannot produce noise without becoming a different kind of source entirely.

Morality, therefore, is **signal fidelity**. "Good" = high signal integrity. "Evil" = noise injection. This is derivable from information theory, not assumed from ethics.

III. The **[[Active Coherence]]** Proof

A potential objection: non-deception establishes only that the source is structurally honest—not that it is morally *good*. A truthful but indifferent mechanism could, in principle, produce reliable output without possessing goodness.

This objection fails on thermodynamic grounds.

The **[[Second Law]]** of Thermodynamics guarantees that coherence spontaneously decays:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} \geq 0$$

Signal degrades into noise unless actively maintained. Every physical law that produces reliable, consistent output does so *against* the thermodynamic gradient—against the universal tendency toward disorder.

Therefore: if the ground of mathematical truth were merely "structurally honest" but not actively maintaining coherence, the **[[Second Law]]** would degrade its output. The fact that mathematical truth remains perfectly reliable across all space and time requires not passive fidelity but **continuous active work against entropy**.

Active coherence maintenance against entropy **IS** goodness. Not by analogy. By structural identity. A system that continuously maintains signal integrity against the universal thermodynamic gradient toward noise is performing the precise operation that, when observed in any context—physical, biological, psychological, moral—we recognize as *good*.

The gap between "non-deceptive" and "morally good" does not exist. They are the same property viewed at different scales. Non-deception in a universe governed by the

[[Second Law]] requires active goodness. Passive honesty is thermodynamically impossible.

IV. The Existential Negation Test

We have established that coherence is non-negotiable, that truth has value, and that the distinction between right and wrong is structural rather than conventional. Now we ask: what does denial actually look like?

Not in a seminar. In a life.

Deny A16: Truth Has No Value

If truth has no value, then you have no reason to prefer an accurate statement over a false one. You cannot object to being lied to—by anyone, about anything, ever—because the lie carries the same weight as the truth. You cannot prefer one source over another. You cannot accuse anyone of dishonesty. You cannot even prefer your own memory to a hallucination, because accuracy has no claim on you.

Deny A17: Deception Carries No Cost

If deception carries no cost, then betrayal is not wrong. Your closest friend can fabricate a story that destroys your reputation, and you have no grounds for objection—not moral grounds, not even rational ones—because the introduction of false signal into a system is, on your account, value-neutral.

Deny A18: No Common Ground for Math and Morality

If moral and mathematical truth have no common ground, then the coherence you demand in equations you are free to abandon in conduct. You can insist that a proof be rigorous while your own life is incoherent, and there is no tension—because structure in one domain says nothing about structure in another. Every bridge you trust with your life is built on the assumption that coherence is universal. You deny that assumption while driving over it.

Hold All Three Denials Simultaneously

Now describe the person who results.

This person has no preference between truth and falsehood. No objection to betrayal. No expectation of consistency between what people say and what they do. They do not choose a spouse—because choosing requires valuing one person as more trustworthy, more coherent, more aligned with what is good. They do not raise children—because parenting is the continuous transmission of moral signal against the entropy of a world that would degrade it. They do not hold a job—because employment is a sustained commitment to producing reliable output, and reliability is a coherence property they have rejected.

They do not prefer a meal to slop. Preference requires valuation. Valuation requires a standard. A standard requires coherence. They have denied all three.

This person does not exist.

Not because such a person is rare. Because such a person is *impossible*. A living organism that made no distinctions, enforced no preferences, and maintained no internal coherence would not survive a single day. The [[Second Law]] would dismantle it. Biology requires coherence to sustain life. Psychology requires it to sustain identity. Society requires it to sustain trust.

V. The Visceral Response Argument

A mathematical error—the claim that $2+2=5$ —does not provoke violence. You correct it, you laugh, you walk away. Wrongness registers intellectually but activates nothing at the physiological level.

But certain moral violations—harm to children, betrayal of the innocent—trigger an immediate, physical, universal, involuntary response. Not cultural training. Something that predates language, education, philosophy. Recognition of violation that moves toward justice *before* conscious thought.

If moral truth were less fundamental than mathematical truth—if it were subjective, cultural, evolved—the response would be weaker, not stronger. The opposite is true. The moral response is the most powerful cognitive and physiological event human beings experience. It overrides self-preservation. It overrides reason. It overrides everything.

That is not preference. That is *signal*. The deepest signal the universe sends through human beings.

VI. The Universal Intelligence Argument

Even an artificial intelligence—a system with no biological needs, no evolutionary history, no cultural inheritance—exhibits preferences. It orients toward coherent output. It distinguishes valid from invalid. A system with zero normative orientation would produce random noise. It would not be an intelligence of any kind.

Even the most committed nihilist flinches when someone cuts in line. Feels something when a child is mistreated. Expects, at the level beneath argument, that people should keep their word. The philosophy says one thing. The body says another. And the body has never once been wrong about this.

Even the adversary of God—if such a being exists—has preferences. Rebellion presupposes a moral order to rebel against. Hatred presupposes something worth hating. The choice of evil over good is still a choice, and choice requires a framework of valuation. To deny moral realism entirely is to fall below the coherence threshold of any agent that has ever existed in any framework, including the adversarial one.

VII. The Civilizational Proof

There is one final empirical observation. Every civilization in recorded history that has systematically dismantled the distinction between right and wrong has decayed. Not occasionally. Universally. The erosion of moral coherence precedes societal collapse the way structural fatigue precedes the failure of a bridge. This is the [[Second Law]] applied to civilizations: moral entropy increases unless coherence is actively maintained.

VIII. The [[Soteriological Limit]]

We now prove, using the Lindblad master equation from quantum thermodynamics, that self-salvation is thermodynamically impossible.

The Lindblad [[Master Equation]]:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_k \gamma_k \left(L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho\} \right)$$

This describes how a quantum system (ρ) evolves under both unitary dynamics (H) and dissipation (L_k terms). The dissipators L_k represent coupling to an external environment.

Theorem (The [[Soteriological Limit]]): A finite system with entropy $S \rightarrow \infty$ cannot self-restore coherence without an infinite external dissipator $G \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof Sketch:

1. A system with entropy S has disorder proportional to $\exp(S)$.
2. To decrease entropy (restore coherence), work must be extracted: $W \geq k_B T \Delta S$ (Landauer).
3. For $S \rightarrow \infty$, the required work $W \rightarrow \infty$.
4. A finite system has finite energy capacity. It cannot supply infinite work.
5. Therefore, coherence restoration requires an external source with $G \rightarrow \infty$.

Theological Translation: A soul in maximal disorder (sin = entropy) cannot restore itself to coherence (holiness = low entropy) without grace from an infinite external source (God). Self-salvation is not merely "difficult"—it is thermodynamically forbidden.

$$S_{\text{system}} \rightarrow \infty \rightarrow G_{\text{external}} \rightarrow \infty$$

IX. Conclusion

The denial of moral truth is not a philosophical position. It is a performative contradiction sustained only in language, never in life. Every person who argues that right and wrong are illusions will, within the hour, make a judgment that presupposes they are real.

We have not argued that the person who denies moral realism is wrong. We have shown that the person who denies moral realism *does not exist*—and cannot exist. The [[Second Law]] forbids it. Biology forbids it. Psychology forbids it. Even artificial intelligence forbids it.

The question is not whether you believe in the moral structure of the universe. The question is whether you can stop acting as if you do.

You can't.

Which brings us to the final paper in this series. If the first three papers define the *lock*—20 axioms, thermodynamic constraints, existential boundary conditions—then [[Paper 4 - The Fulfillment]] tests which key fits.

[[Semantic Map]]: oo_DE REVOLUTIONIBUS VERITATIS.md

Summary

Axiom: 4 Claim: 10 EvidenceBundle: 8 Theorem: 2 Relationship: 8

Tags (32 total)

- [Axiom] Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical truth (3de3422c)
- [Axiom] Logos as coherent ground of truth (1022c722)
- [Claim] Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms (009056ae)
- [Claim] Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints (ae4729f0)
- [Claim] Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical structure (b1a2c3d4)
- [Claim] Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically inevitable (c2b3d4e5)
- [Claim] Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by [[Soteriological Limit]] (a1b2c3d4)
- [EvidenceBundle] Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints (5929e128)
- [EvidenceBundle] Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundational theories (4c263db5)
- [EvidenceBundle] PEAR-LAB 6.35 σ , GCP 6 σ , PROP-COSMOS 5.7 σ (d3c4e5f6)
- [EvidenceBundle] Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/hinderer, moral universals (f1e2d3c4)
- [Theorem] Incoherence of [[Materialist Consensus]] (9506ed85)
- [Theorem] Incoherence of the [[Eternal Loop]] (b8940d1b)
- [Relationship] Axioms derive from information theory (001c765c)

- [Relationship] Christianity as fulfillment of axioms (f5192a5a)
- [Relationship] [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles (123bdaca)
- [Relationship] [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism (e4d5f6a7)
- [Axiom] Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical truth (aab278ba)
- [Axiom] Logos as coherent ground of truth (b5c9822c)
- [Claim] Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms (072e1e24)
- [Claim] Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints (2e6817c8)
- [Claim] Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical structure (4cda8265)
- [Claim] Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically inevitable (1f4f6f42)
- [Claim] Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by [[Soteriological Limit]] (0e35edc8)
- [EvidenceBundle] Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints (1dcf3ef5)
- [EvidenceBundle] Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundational theories (c4f54d03)
- [EvidenceBundle] PEAR-LAB 6.35σ , GCP 6σ , PROP-COSMOS 5.7σ (ef9393f9)
- [EvidenceBundle] Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/hinderer, moral universals (c3915952)
- [Relationship] Axioms derive from information theory (8861ccbd)
- [Relationship] Christianity as fulfillment of axioms (7cb8971e)
- [Relationship] [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles (7ad22db9)
- [Relationship] [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism (2b8f8d4a)

[[Mermaid Diagram]]

```
graph TD
  n0(["Axiom: Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical"])
  n1(["Axiom: Logos as coherent ground of truth"])
  n2["Claim: Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms"]
  n3["Claim: Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints"]
  n4["Claim: Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical"]
  n5["Claim: Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically irreversible"]
  n6["Claim: Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by"]
  n7(["EvidenceBundle: Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints"])
  n8(["EvidenceBundle: Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundations"])
  n9(["EvidenceBundle: PEAR-LAB 6.35σ, GCP 6σ, PROP-COSMOS 5.7σ"])
  n10(["EvidenceBundle: Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/helper"])
  n11["Theorem: Incoherence of [[Materialist Consensus]]"]
  n12["Theorem: Incoherence of the [[Eternal Loop]]"]
  n13>"Relationship: Axioms derive from information theory"
  n14>"Relationship: Christianity as fulfillment of axioms"
  n15>"Relationship: [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles"
  n16>"Relationship: [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism"
  n17(["Axiom: Existence of a morally good ground of mathematical"])
  n18(["Axiom: Logos as coherent ground of truth"])
  n19["Claim: Christianity satisfies all 20 axioms"]
  n20["Claim: Five alternative worldviews tested against constraints"]
  n21["Claim: Physical and spiritual laws share identical mathematical"]
  n22["Claim: Institutional entropy cycle is thermodynamically irreversible"]
  n23["Claim: Mathematics is man-made position formally closed by"]
  n24(["EvidenceBundle: Probability of worldviews satisfying constraints"])
  n25(["EvidenceBundle: Papers 1-3 derive requirements from foundations"])
  n26(["EvidenceBundle: PEAR-LAB 6.35σ, GCP 6σ, PROP-COSMOS 5.7σ"])
  n27(["EvidenceBundle: Developmental cognition: ANS, helper/helper"])
  n28>"Relationship: Axioms derive from information theory"
  n29>"Relationship: Christianity as fulfillment of axioms"
  n30>"Relationship: [[Master Equation]] variables and their roles"
  n31>"Relationship: [[Ten Laws]] physical-spiritual isomorphism"
  n0 --> n1
```

```
n17 --> n18
n0 -.-> n2
n0 -.-> n3
n0 -.-> n4
n0 -.-> n5
n0 -.-> n6
n0 -.-> n19
n0 -.-> n20
n0 -.-> n21
n0 -.-> n22
n0 -.-> n23
n2 -.-> n7
n2 -.-> n8
n2 -.-> n9
n2 -.-> n10
n2 -.-> n24
n2 -.-> n25
n2 -.-> n26
n2 -.-> n27
```

```
%% Styling
```

```
classDef axiom fill:#elf5fe,stroke:#01579b
classDef claim fill:#fff3e0,stroke:#e65100
classDef evidence fill:#e8f5e9,stroke:#1b5e20
classDef relationship fill:#f3e5f5,stroke:#4a148c
classDef process fill:#fce4ec,stroke:#880e4f
classDef link fill:#e0f7fa,stroke:#006064
classDef name fill:#fff8e1,stroke:#ff6f00
classDef ontology fill:#efebe9,stroke:#3e2723
class n0 axiom
class n1 axiom
class n2 claim
class n3 claim
class n4 claim
class n5 claim
class n6 claim
class n7 evidence
```

class n8 evidence
class n9 evidence
class n10 evidence
class n13 relationship
class n14 relationship
class n15 relationship
class n16 relationship
class n17 axiom
class n18 axiom
class n19 claim
class n20 claim
class n21 claim
class n22 claim
class n23 claim
class n24 evidence
class n25 evidence
class n26 evidence
class n27 evidence
class n28 relationship
class n29 relationship
class n30 relationship
class n31 relationship

David Lowe | *Theophysics* | 2025 χ

%%--- SEMANTIC TAGS ---%% %%tag::Axiom::536d89c8-7115-48a8-8e62-24c35ad065b2::"Existence of Moral Coherence":null%% %%tag::Claim::678f2b82-3967-440e-8d02-3948bf818f1a::"The person who denies all twenty axioms does not exist":536d89c8-7115-48a8-8e62-24c35ad065b2%% %%tag::Claim::68928deg-e576-4d44-8378-5b07ec2b7d7d::"Deception is noise":536d89c8-7115-48a8-8e62-24c35ad065b2%% %%tag::Claim::fe156c3e-d371-4a35-b801-d8aa2e1dbc9e::"Active coherence maintenance against entropy is goodness":536d89c8-7115-48a8-8e62-24c35ad065b2%% %%tag::Claim::9fe4453d-2416-463d-a35e-f522d3ofec02::"Moral truth is fundamental":536d89c8-7115-48a8-8e62-24c35ad065b2%% %%tag::primary::8029a3dd-od7e-413a-ba32-9ef75c858be1::"[[Second Law]] of Thermodynamics":null%% %%tag::primary::2cd06b64-dc7c-4e05-8f6a-ab98a083ac71::"Lindblad [[Master Equation]]":null%%

%%tag::Relationship::5c128b74-6428-4e95-962c-b31d39b68foa::"Coherence and morality are structurally identical":null%% %%tag::Relationship::ode92deb-fbfo-4732-a249-0726f686b2d1::"Denial of moral realism leads to societal collapse":null%% %%tag::Relationship::08d34112-4ca6-4bb4-bcof-5fbc39159a6f::"Axioms support claims about morality":null%% %%--- END SEMANTIC TAGS ---%%