

Physics or Reality: Which Prevails?

Dainis Zeps, University of Latvia

31 December 2024

Abstract

Why such opposition? Physics versus Reality. This is the question we address in this article.

Introduction: War

The inspiration for this article, where we tackle an unusual topic with an unconventional approach, comes from the present day. What has happened? Yes, it has happened – a war is underway, and it is taking increasingly inhuman, horrifying, and appalling forms. That is, if we wish to consider where it is leading. Hence the question: is it appropriate to explore a topic outside the war, one with a speculative philosophical nature? But it is precisely the theme of war that will initiate this line of thought. We will attempt to demonstrate this.

In the article [1], we touched upon the topic of propaganda in Russia and argued that propaganda cannot coexist with the rulers conceding to their people. What happens if this unwillingness to concede becomes a fundamental condition of governance? If such an unwillingness occurs often enough, each subsequent step (or policy decision) based on this inability to concede will lead to a new political stage with new conditions. We referred to such a process as escalation, which prompted us to discuss de-escalation. However, such de-escalation would require concessions, but in our constructed political framework, concessions are excluded.

Let us now examine the same issue in the language used in [1]. In Russia, there exists a total burden of propaganda, with everything under its weight. In [1], we discussed the situation involving an Azerbaijani plane that Russia shot down over Grozny. Well, not quite shot down entirely – the plane survived but required an emergency landing to ensure its full safety or minimize casualties. As we know, Russia did not permit the plane to land on its territory but instructed it to fly over the Caspian Sea to Kazakhstan. Thanks to the remarkable skills of the pilots, the plane managed to make this crossing and landed in Kazakhstan, but the landing was not a "soft" one – it was rather "hard." As a result, half the passengers and part of the crew perished. As we know, Azerbaijan's president, Ilham Aliyev, has demanded an apology from Russia and continues to do so – in essence, asking for acknowledgment of wrongdoing, or in our terms, demanding a concession.

Here we must pause to consider this aspect. Russia and its rulers are being asked for forgiveness, but in Russia, under the rule of total propaganda, forgiveness as a concept is unknown. It is simply impossible. Why? It has never happened. Well, who knows, perhaps in ancient times, something akin to asking for forgiveness may have occurred, but it is entirely ruled out in today's Russia. We see this every day. Recently, there were reports of secret negotiations in the U.S. regarding a possible peace plan in the war against Ukraine, but Russia does not concede. Heaven forbid – what would happen if Russia conceded? But let us remember that Russia's propaganda machinery does not allow for anything that could be called a concession.

So why engage in secret negotiations at all? Why initiate such talks? We will discuss this later.

For now, let us focus on the aspect that concessions and asking for forgiveness are fundamentally incompatible with total propaganda. Returning to the Azerbaijani plane incident: Aliyev pleaded desperately, and let's imagine Putin deciding:

"Fine, let us ask for forgiveness."

- "Forgive us, we shot down your plane; it was an accident. Ukrainian drones are attacking, there is war, circumstances – well, things went wrong, we made a mistake. Not me, Kadyrov made the mistake, poor fellow, he shot down your plane. You asked for a landing, forgive us, but we did not allow the plane to land at our airport in Grozny. Worse, we didn't permit it to land at nearby airfields – not civilian, not military, none at all. In fact, we didn't allow it to land at any of Russia's nearest airports. Forgive us. Why didn't we allow it? Well, our wicked advisors recommended this course of action. They suggested sending the plane over the Caspian Sea. If it fell into the sea – as it was quite clear the aircraft had been damaged, based on conversations with the pilots – the plane would have sunk in the Caspian Sea. Oh, forgive us for acting this way. Was it terrible? Did we kill so many passengers and crew? Oh, forgive us. How could we explain this incident to our people? Could we simply tell our people: oh, we made a mistake, we accidentally shot down your plane, dear Aliyev? No, we didn't want that. And what would the people think? Understand us – we had to lie a little. Forgive us. We made a mistake. We will correct ourselves."

Putin allegedly called Aliyev. Was his conversation similar to this description? Absolutely not. It was evasive, filled with equivocations, and so on. What conclusion can we draw? Under the conditions of total propaganda – such as in Russia – no concessions are possible.

What the Outcome? One of the most absurd scenarios occurred: the refusal to allow the plane to land in Russia, combined with the pilots' extraordinary skills in saving the aircraft. An absurd case for Russia's political fate, yet nothing absurd about the reality itself. Reality, in this instance, materialized one of the many possible scenarios under the circumstances. Russia chose one of the most horrific options: it effectively sentenced the aircraft to destruction, even though everyone on board could have been saved. Russia revealed to the world its plan for such an eventual catastrophe – the plane crashing into the Caspian Sea – and failed miserably in this "anti-operation" against rationality and civilized understanding, exposing its inhuman and criminal nature to the world.

Let us draw some conclusions from this episode with the Azerbaijani plane. The situation demanded that Russia acknowledge its guilt, that Russia ask for forgiveness. However, propaganda ruled out this path, opting instead for another: the path of refusal, the path of lies, the path of fabricating a scheme in which the plane and everyone on board were expected to sink into the Caspian Sea, just so Russia's rulers could comfortably explain a propaganda-friendly narrative to their people about the incident. But at the same time, by excluding the path of concession, they activated another path – the path of destruction. Yes, this path chosen by Putin and Russia is the path of Russia's self-destruction.

To clarify, this does not mean that Russia will collapse immediately after this incident. No, it can continue in the same manner, day after day, moment by moment, waging war and committing countless criminal acts, each of which would require concession, an apology, or a request for forgiveness. But such actions are impossible because the "almighty" Russian propaganda dominates everything. Will this constant march in one direction – the direction of refusal and the inability to receive forgiveness – not lead to destruction?

Soon it will be three years of repeated refusal in countless steps. Even the invasion in February 2022 demonstrated a catastrophic mistake that required immediate retreat, concession, or, dare we say, a request for forgiveness – as absurd as it might sound. Of course, nothing like that happened or could happen. The trajectory remains singular: refusal and the inability to seek forgiveness. It leads inevitably to one outcome. Such a system cannot exist indefinitely; it must collapse.

Why do I repeat the terms "refusal" and "failure to seek forgiveness" so frequently? The reason is simple: I want to transform this framework into a theological one. After a concession and a request for forgiveness, forgiveness can follow. But after refusal and the inability to seek forgiveness, destruction can follow. And here, we arrive at what I wanted to establish: forgiveness and salvation, refusal and destruction. We thus arrive at a theological conclusion in our analysis of today's situation.

Propaganda That Excludes Concessions

Propaganda that excludes concessions. Yes, that is precisely the situation in Russia, with its total propaganda that permeates everything. In truth, what is forming there is even more terrifying: a total anti-society, akin to a global serfdom system. But more on that later.

How does propaganda conflict with concession? The example from the introduction clearly illustrates this. Propaganda begins its transition into a machine for constructing anti-society precisely at the point when this threshold is crossed – when no concessions are allowed. This can also be described as the infallibility of the rulers. In Russia, it goes even deeper. The transition was already predictable when the situation arose where even speaking about the war was prohibited – when simply holding a sign saying *"Нет войне"* (No to War) could land you in prison.

It was clear even then that a transition had occurred. Transition to what, you might ask? That is what we are now witnessing in Russia, and it progresses daily. Anti-society is devouring poor Russia.

Yes, under the conditions of Russian propaganda, no concessions are possible. Refusal to concede to anyone – not to Ukraine, not to European countries, not to NATO, not to the United States, to no one. How could they concede, a naive person might ask? How could they explain to the Russian people the tales that are told daily? These tales are, in fact, absurd and contradictory, changing from day to day. Yet the Russian people understand these shifts. *"Если Путин врёт, то так надо"* (If Putin lies, it's necessary). The people understand this and even applaud it.

Perhaps some mock it on the sidelines, perhaps some criticize it or debate it, as figures like Strelkov do, but there are boundaries. If you attempt to touch on the pillars of propaganda, you will face consequences. What are these pillars? Most likely, even the Russians themselves do not fully know, but they sense them, grumble, and simultaneously praise the Ruler. The safest approach is to praise Stalin first. That is even safer than praising Putin.

In Russia, praising Stalin essentially means praising Putin. Does anyone understand the syntax and grammar of this ideology of lies? Yet people feel it, and it functions, allowing this society to continue existing, to persist for now. But it simultaneously forces this society to evolve toward its end, toward its inevitable demise.

Why? Because built into this system are simple mechanisms: there must be no concessions to the West, NATO, or anyone else – not even to Ukraine. And within propaganda, forgiveness is ruled out because concessions are excluded.

What Must Ultimately Follow: An Inevitable End. A theological, eschatological forewarning – providence's pre-providence.

Theological Consequence or Interpretative Trick? Or Something More?

Is it just an interpretative trick to shift a totalitarian propaganda conflict, like the one in Russia, into a simplified scheme: forgiveness as a possibility for salvation versus the exclusion of forgiveness, leading to inevitable destruction? Or is it something more? What exactly?

The reader may notice the author's inclination to leap into theological discourse, as if war has become tiresome and attention is now turning to this sphere. But war is fundamentally antagonistic to theology. However, when reading ancient myths, Homer, for example, don't we see gods at war, resolving their relationships in less-than-peaceful ways? And isn't that our original theology, part of our nature, and, as it turns out, part of the nature of gods as well? But this is only my digression as a mathematician stepping out of my subject. Nonetheless, I want to touch upon theology, as I have had some connection to it.

So, is it merely an interpretative trick to analyze Russia's totalitarian propaganda by simplifying it into this framework: forgiveness as a means to salvation versus the absence of forgiveness leading to inevitable destruction? In fact, this is the exact framework I used in my article [1] to substantiate my interpretation of the thesis *Russia delenda est*. A paraphrase from the history of ancient Rome and Carthage (*Carthago delenda est*), it expresses how we see the resolution of the Russia-Ukraine war. We see the only result encapsulated in the phrase *Russia delenda est* as a necessary outcome. Otherwise, what alternative outcomes could there be? Any alternatives would create unimaginable chaos in the world, dominated by a dysfunctional Russia that does nothing but push itself into ruin.

Imagine this absurd construct that is dismantling its society as a civilized entity and turning it into an anti-society. What happens if such a system starts ruling the world? It would overrun Europe. That is why we do not even want to consider this possibility and declare: *Russia delenda est*.

Well. Let's agree to accept the thesis *Russia delenda est*, but what are we to do upon reading these words? I offer the following explanation for this phrase.

First and foremost, it implies **demilitarization**. Yes, that is the essence of these words, and Ukraine is already working on this, though for now, it stands alone. What else? How should this issue be addressed further?

My suggestion is to replace a single "de-agent" with three "de-agents." What does that mean? Action must be taken against Russia's military resources, its propaganda, and a third element – Russia's inability to concede.

Does that sound odd? When I first began working on this concept, it seemed so to me. But now I've grown accustomed to this third de-element, this de-agent. If the first two are called **demilitarization** and **depropagandization**, I attempt to name the third **de-escalation**.

De-escalation opposes escalation, meaning any step in Russia's policy of refusal to concede, which inevitably triggers another fatal step in its domestic and foreign policies.

How Does *Russia delenda est* Function?

The thesis operates as follows:

1. Every day, Russia loses part of its military resources.
2. Every day, Russia sinks deeper into the circle of total propaganda.
3. Every day, Russia commits fatal acts of refusal to concede, which (theologically) provoke a lack of forgiveness.

Russia is self-destructing, inventing ever-new schemes. What do these schemes achieve? Russia attempts to save itself – yes, seeking salvation – but not through the path of concession and forgiveness, instead sinking deeper into its fabrications.

For instance, one of the most recent steps involves total surveillance of citizens: monitoring what they say on their phones, how they communicate on social networks, and how they interact with each other. This means that Russia is preparing to transform itself into a total concentration camp or something akin to a total serfdom system, where nothing functions anymore.

There are no independent civil rights. Passports no longer grant any privileges; they are irrelevant. Everything is controlled. A total informant system is in place. If you do not participate in it, you can be excluded from society.

I hesitate to continue, but this final step could provoke total societal protest, as people are being deprived of everything. People can be forcibly conscripted into the army at any moment, in any manner. There are no laws – only total terror. If Russian citizens fail to understand that this is the end, that they must take up their axes and go out into the streets, then we can only wait for the next move from Russia's totalitarian regime.

How Does the Formula *Russia delenda est* Work?

1. Point 1 (demilitarization) is being driven by Ukraine.
2. Points 2 and 3 are being carried out by Russia itself:
 - Refusing to concede,
 - Preventing forgiveness,
 - Leading ultimately to annihilation.

But the polarity – “salvation through forgiveness versus destruction through refusal to forgive” – is universal. Could this be called a theological formula of existence or essence (with the contingency of Reality)?

Technological Progress and the Abyss of Moral-Ethical Deficiency

We are living in an extraordinarily interesting time. This is evident when we look at the progress around us—progress in the sciences, technologies, and the field of artificial intelligence. Yet, at the same time, this era is filled with horrors, as the bloodiest war since World War II unfolds, threatening to escalate into something even greater.

It seems we are witnessing two realities. One is the realm of science and technology—the triumph of the human mind. The other is the realm of human action, overtaken by war and danger. War seeks to expand, while the danger lies in the fact that the forces capable of stopping this war are unwilling to do so. Instead, they plan something else. What are they planning? Let us not delve into that in the context of this discussion. Here, we are interested in theological consequences.

We seem to be in a moral-ethical abyss—or perhaps rolling ever deeper into one. Is this roughly an accurate metaphor for the present? Let us leave this question to those who specialize more deeply in these fields. As the author, I am interested in a broader framework that attempts to grasp what we can infer from today’s events.

Here, I have primarily focused on Russia and what is happening there. But similar issues can be observed elsewhere—for example, in China. However, China must be viewed through a very different lens than Russia, as China has not attacked any other country, unlike Russia. Still, China has its own domain of totalitarian terror—namely, the Uyghurs. Let me not delve further into this topic here, merely naming the problem in China.

The Universe of Existence Versus the Physical Universe

Let me attempt to reach some conclusion in addressing this theme. We observe progress in science and regression—perhaps a return (to the Middle Ages? To a primitive state?)—in the moral-ethical realm. How can we characterize our moral-ethical plane? Where does it reside?

Here, I will try to contrast it with the universe in which we seemingly dwell as materially thinking beings. This is the universe governed by the laws of physics, the laws of nature, as

understood in the exact sciences. And where is our moral-ethical world? I will call it the world of Existence, or the Universe of Ontology.

Yet, our reality also resides here, as it follows the logic of events we observe in the world. How will we continue? Does providence rule over us? Is providence what allows us to be drawn into an even deeper cycle of existence, where we know nothing about what lies ahead?

Politicians and experts speak of the transformation, reconstruction, and redistribution of the world. We are first struck by the horror that, in these declared "existences," Russia is present—a Russia that should have already been dismantled. Will this happen? Will the civilized world be subjected to the threat of total annihilation simply by allowing Russia to persist in its existence—merely because Western nations are mired in an unimaginably deep slumber, incapacity, and cowardice?

In the ontological Universe, the opposition between forgiveness and unforgiveness operates. Reality decides which path each entity takes.

Conclusions

So, what does the opposition between Physics and Reality mean? The question is simple. Do we understand what reality is when we look at what is happening in the world and find ourselves uncertain about whether to rely on our reason or on Providence? Yes, this is a question we occasionally ask, especially when a new discovery in physics prompts us to wonder: do we truly know what Reality is? But now, let us ask instead: what is Reality, as we face a similar uncertainty?

On the theological plane, the polarity between salvation and destruction operates (with the contingency of Reality). Meanwhile, our intellect operates (triumphantly) in the physical Universe. Which one prevails? Or, conversely, which is the other's reflection?

References

1. **D. Zeps**, *Russia delenda est: how we understand this*, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387538894>
2. **Dainis Zeps**, *Russia delenda est, or Demilitarisation, Depropagandisation, Deescalisation: how we see this?* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387527944>
3. **Dainis Zeps**, *Russia delenda est, або демілітаризація, депропаганда, деескалація: як ми це розуміємо?* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387526782>
4. **Dainis Zeps**, *Russia delenda est, vai Demilitarizācija, Depropagandizācija, Deeskalizācija: kā mēs to saprotam?* <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387521785>
5. **Dainis Zeps**, *Multilingual conversation about war in Ukraine*, <https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.16.pdf>
6. **Dainis Zeps**, *Otrā saruna ar ChatGPT par karu Ukrainā (Second conversation with ChatGPT about the war in Ukraine)*, <https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.17.pdf>
7. **D. Zeps**, *Muitnieks un turpnieki (The Customs Officer and the Continuers)*, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351286393> *Muitnieks un turpnieki*

8. **D. Zeps**, *Russia's aggressive war against Ukraine: a conversation with GPT-4o and its analysis*, Seminar of the Science and Religion Dialogue Group, November 27, 2024, <https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.15.pdf>
9. **D. Zeps**, *Vai būt blēdim ir izdevīgi? Ko saka Mākslīgais internets, AI? (Is it advantageous to be a rogue? What does Artificial Intelligence say?)*, <https://hal.science/hal-04856585>
10. **D. Zeps**, *Что на Руси творится: Проект Россия (What is happening in Russia: Project Russia)*, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318038370>
11. **D. Zeps**, *The New World, or The world after Ukraine's victory*, <https://hal.science/hal-04839439>