From Cosmos to Absurdity: How Physics Abandoned God, Ignored Einstein, and Embraced Camus

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

April 28, 2025

The history of physics began as a noble endeavor to uncover the rational structure of creation — a disciplined inquiry into the intelligible order of the Universe. Early scientists believed that in studying nature, they were discerning the mind of God Himself, unveiling a cosmos rooted in coherence, causality, and meaning. Yet over the past two centuries, this vision has been steadily eroded. Modern physics has abandoned its metaphysical foundations, exchanging the search for truth for the acceptance of randomness, fragmentation, and paradox. By rejecting the existence of an ultimate rational ground — whether called God, Logos, or Reason — physics has drifted into a state of institutionalized absurdity, mirroring the existential despair articulated by Albert Camus. No longer seeking to explain why the cosmos is ordered, modern theories instead describe a universe stitched together by unexplained correlations and governed by mathematical formalisms devoid of ultimate meaning. This paper examines this intellectual collapse, traces its historical roots, and argues that only a return to metaphysical realism can rescue physics from its self-imposed exile from truth.

Keywords: physics, metaphysics, absurdity, Albert Camus, Einstein, causality, quantum mechanics, materialism, metaphysical realism, meaning, scientific foundations, institutional collapse, Copenhagen interpretation, Many-Worlds, superdeterminism. A collaboration with GPT-4o.

I. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the current philosophical condition of physics and to argue that, by abandoning metaphysical foundations, modern physics has inadvertently embraced a view of the Universe that parallels the philosophy of absurdity articulated by Albert Camus. Where early science sought the mind of God in the lawful order of nature, contemporary physics increasingly depicts reality as a meaningless flux of probabilistic events, stitched together without ultimate cause, purpose, or coherence. The result is not merely a shift in method but a profound transformation in the very conception of reality itself — one that carries existential consequences for both science and culture.

To establish this argument clearly, it is necessary first to define several key terms.

Metaphysics, in its classical sense, refers to the study of being as being — the search for ultimate principles that explain why reality is ordered, intelligible, and coherent. It seeks the foundational structures that allow any scientific inquiry to be meaningful. In the context of physics, metaphysical assumptions historically included the existence of an objective reality, the validity of causality, and the intelligibility of the cosmos.

Causality refers to the principle that events occur according to a lawful connection between antecedent conditions and subsequent outcomes. It is not merely a pattern observed statistically, but a deep structural feature of reality that allows for explanation, prediction, and understanding. Without causality, science cannot offer true explanations — only disconnected descriptions of observed sequences.

Absurdity, following Camus, describes the condition that arises when human beings seek meaning in a universe that offers none. It is the experience of dissonance between the mind's demand for intelligibility and the world's silent indifference. Applied to physics, absurdity manifests when the field ceases to seek coherent understanding and instead normalizes incoherence, contradiction, and randomness as ultimate features of existence.

The thesis of this paper is that the progressive expulsion of God — and with Him, any metaphysical ground of order — from the intellectual foundations of physics

has led inevitably to absurdity. No longer grounded in a belief in a rational, intelligible cosmos, physics has become the institutionalized study of a world stripped of meaning, coherence, and ultimate truth. This transformation is not accidental, nor is it benign. It marks a philosophical collapse whose consequences extend beyond physics itself, touching every domain of human understanding that once depended on the unity of truth, reason, and reality.

II. The Theological Foundations of Early Physics

The birth of modern physics was not a rebellion against metaphysical or theological thought, but rather a fulfillment of it. The earliest pioneers of the scientific revolution saw their work not as a rejection of God, but as a means of uncovering the divine rationality woven into the fabric of the Universe. Science, for them, was an act of reverence — a method of reading the "book of nature" written by the hand of God.

In the seventeenth century, Isaac Newton epitomized this vision. Far from seeing his mechanical laws as displacing divine action, Newton believed that he was elucidating the principles by which God governed the Universe. His *Principia Mathematica* did not simply present a set of physical laws; it articulated a cosmos sustained moment by moment by God's providence. Newton famously wrote in the *General Scholium* that the most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being. For Newton, the stability and order of the cosmos reflected the rational mind of its Creator, and scientific investigation was a form of theological inquiry — a way of apprehending the divine wisdom embedded in the natural world.

Johannes Kepler, a century earlier, expressed similar convictions. His formulation of the laws of planetary motion was not merely a triumph of observation and calculation; it was, for him, a profoundly spiritual discovery. Kepler described his work as an effort to "think God's thoughts after Him," believing that the mathematical harmonies he uncovered reflected a pre-existing, objective rational

order that the human mind was designed to comprehend. In Kepler's vision, mathematics was not a human invention but the very language in which the cosmos was written, and to uncover that language was to participate in a form of sacred understanding.

James Clerk Maxwell, working in the nineteenth century, continued this tradition even as physics became increasingly technical. Maxwell, who unified electricity, magnetism, and light through his famous equations, saw no conflict between his scientific work and his religious faith. In fact, he regarded the consistency and elegance of physical laws as evidence of an underlying divine intelligence. Maxwell was deeply influenced by Scottish theological traditions that emphasized the knowability of the world as a reflection of the mind of God. In his own reflections, Maxwell expressed awe at the "unsearchable wisdom" that structured the Universe and maintained that scientific inquiry should be undertaken with humility, recognizing that human reason could grasp only glimpses of the full grandeur of divine reality.

For these figures and their contemporaries, metaphysical realism was not an optional philosophical position; it was the very ground of scientific method. They assumed — often without needing to argue for it — that the Universe was real, ordered, intelligible, and governed by rational principles that reflected the character of its Creator. To study nature was not to impose structure upon it, but to uncover the structure that had been there from the beginning.

This theological and metaphysical framework provided the indispensable foundation for the successes of early physics. Without the confidence that reality was intelligible, that nature operated according to coherent laws, and that the human mind was capable of grasping those laws, systematic scientific inquiry would have been inconceivable. Modern science was thus not born from skepticism or nihilism, but from faith in an ordered, meaningful cosmos — a cosmos that pointed beyond itself to a higher mind and a higher purpose.

III. The First Signs of Rebellion: The Rise of Materialism and Probabilism

Although the theological and metaphysical foundations of early physics remained largely intact through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the nineteenth century witnessed a gradual but decisive shift. The rise of mechanical materialism introduced a new spirit into scientific inquiry — one that began to sever the connection between physics and metaphysical realism, replacing it with an increasingly reductionist and probabilistic view of the world.

Mechanical materialism held that the Universe, at its most fundamental level, was nothing more than matter in motion. Every phenomenon, from the orbit of the planets to the workings of the human mind, was to be explained entirely in terms of physical interactions governed by deterministic laws. This view sought to eliminate any need for non-material causes, whether divine, teleological, or otherwise. While materialism initially retained the notion of a lawful and intelligible cosmos — inherited from its theological predecessors — it stripped those laws of any transcendent grounding. Laws were no longer seen as the rational imprint of a divine mind but as brute facts about the behavior of matter, requiring no deeper explanation.

The success of Newtonian mechanics, which could predict planetary orbits and terrestrial motions with astonishing accuracy, lent credence to this materialist framework. Confidence grew that, given complete knowledge of the positions and velocities of all particles at one moment, the entire future and past of the Universe could be determined by mechanical calculation. Pierre-Simon Laplace famously imagined a super-intelligent being — later called "Laplace's Demon" — who, knowing all forces and positions at a given instant, could predict all future events and retrodict all past events with perfect certainty.

However, even within this deterministic materialism, cracks began to form. As physics extended its reach into the domains of heat, gases, and fluids, new complexities arose that deterministic laws could not easily capture. The behavior of large systems composed of vast numbers of particles became too complex for exact solutions. It was in this context that statistical methods entered physics, not merely as practical tools, but as conceptual replacements for strict determinism.

Statistical mechanics, pioneered by figures such as James Clerk Maxwell and Ludwig Boltzmann, introduced the idea that the properties of systems — temperature, pressure, entropy — could be understood in terms of averages over enormous numbers of random microstates. The motion of any individual molecule might remain deterministic, but in practice, predictions could only be made probabilistically. The focus shifted from exact trajectories to distributions and likelihoods.

While initially presented as approximations, statistical methods began to erode the earlier confidence that nature operated according to precisely determined causes at all levels. In particular, Boltzmann's work on entropy and the second law of thermodynamics suggested that irreversibility and disorder were fundamental features of the Universe when considered statistically, not just illusions of human ignorance. Time itself, once thought to flow from a chain of causally linked events, came to be understood as an emergent feature of probability distributions.

Thus, by the late nineteenth century, physics was no longer exclusively the search for exact, divine order. It had become, increasingly, the science of describing patterns in large aggregates, admitting randomness as an unavoidable element. Even before the formal discovery of quantum mechanics, the philosophical seeds had been sown: deterministic causality was giving way to probabilistic description, and materialism was evolving into a worldview in which ultimate meaning, purpose, and causality were no longer central.

The stage was set for the twentieth century, when the tentative admission of probability into the margins of classical physics would become the central dogma of quantum physics, and the vision of an ordered, meaningful cosmos would be replaced by the acceptance of an incoherent, indifferent void.

IV. Einstein’s Warning: No God, No Dice

As the twentieth century began, the slow erosion of metaphysical realism in physics accelerated into a full rupture. The discovery of quantum phenomena — discrete energy levels, probabilistic behavior in atomic systems, and the apparent

role of observation in determining physical outcomes — shattered the classical vision of a fully deterministic universe. Many physicists, confronted with these new experimental facts, chose to abandon not only determinism but also any expectation of a coherent underlying reality. In the emerging quantum worldview, uncertainty was not a temporary reflection of human ignorance but an intrinsic feature of nature itself.

Against this rising tide of epistemological surrender stood Albert Einstein.

Although often caricatured as merely resisting the "new physics," Einstein's position was far deeper and more principled. He accepted the empirical successes of quantum theory but refused to accept that randomness, incoherence, and observer-dependent reality could be ultimate features of the Universe. For Einstein, the very possibility of scientific inquiry presupposed an ordered, rational cosmos. The goal of physics was not to merely predict outcomes statistically but to uncover the hidden, lawful structure beneath appearances.

It was in this spirit that Einstein famously declared, "God does not play dice with the Universe." This was not a theological assertion in the narrow sense, but a metaphysical one. Einstein invoked "God" as a symbol for the rational, coherent order he believed must undergird physical reality. To him, the suggestion that nature operated on pure chance, without deeper necessity, was a betrayal of the scientific enterprise itself. If reality were truly governed by randomness at its foundation, then the success of rational investigation would be a miracle without cause — an untenable paradox for a mind devoted to coherence.

Einstein's objections to the standard interpretations of quantum mechanics were not casual. He persistently challenged Niels Bohr, Werner Heisenberg, and others at every major conference and correspondence. His famous thought experiments — including the EPR paradox (Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen) — were designed to show that quantum mechanics, as then understood, was either incomplete or incoherent. Either there existed hidden variables preserving causality and objectivity, or else physics had abdicated its traditional aim of describing an objective reality independent of observation.

Yet, as the physics community embraced Copenhagen-style interpretations, pragmatism, and mathematical formalism, Einstein became increasingly isolated. The new generation of physicists — influenced by operationalism, positivism, and a growing cultural skepticism toward metaphysical claims — found it easier to "shut up and calculate" than to wrestle with the philosophical implications of their theories. Even those who respected Einstein's genius increasingly viewed him as an anachronism, clinging to an outdated metaphysical vision in a world where certainty had become unfashionable.

In his later years, Einstein continued to seek a unified field theory — a single mathematical framework that would reconcile gravity and electromagnetism under deterministic laws. But the mainstream of physics moved in another direction, toward ever more abstract and probabilistic models, culminating in the acceptance of quantum field theory as the dominant framework. Einstein died without seeing the vindication of his belief in a rational underlying reality, a belief that by then had been almost entirely marginalized within the physics establishment.

The rejection of Einstein's warning marked a profound turning point. No longer committed to uncovering the rational architecture of the cosmos, physics became content with statistical predictions, mathematical models, and paradoxical realities. Where earlier generations had sought to read the mind of God through nature, the new physics would instead invent myriad interpretations of an incoherent universe, each less grounded than the last.

In rejecting Einstein's plea for coherence, modern physics moved decisively away from the metaphysical realism that had made its own birth possible. It chose instead to embrace a vision of nature that, while mathematically powerful, was philosophically adrift — a world in which reason could describe phenomena but could no longer explain them.

V. The Full Collapse: Quantum Mechanics and the Institutionalization of Absurdity

With the marginalization of Einstein's call for an underlying rational structure, physics entered a new and unprecedented phase — one in which the abandonment of metaphysical foundations was not seen as a temporary confusion, but institutionalized as the dominant framework of thought. Quantum mechanics, while empirically successful beyond any doubt, was interpreted and extended in ways that increasingly detached the discipline from coherent conceptions of reality. Instead of recognizing the philosophical incoherence of many of these interpretations as a sign of crisis, the physics community embraced incoherence as a new norm, institutionalizing absurdity at the heart of its enterprise.

The earliest and most influential move in this direction came through the Copenhagen Interpretation, championed by Niels Bohr and Werner Heisenberg. According to this view, quantum mechanics does not describe an objective reality independent of measurement. Rather, physical properties such as position, momentum, and spin exist only when measured by an observer. Between measurements, the system exists in a nebulous "wave function," representing probabilities rather than actualities. Bohr insisted on a radical epistemological modesty: physics was about what we can say about nature, not about what nature is.

This formulation introduced profound philosophical contradictions. Reality became dependent on acts of observation, yet observers themselves were physical systems — raising the question of how a world composed entirely of quantum systems could "observe" itself into existence. The measurement problem, wave function collapse, and the lack of a clear dividing line between quantum and classical domains revealed deep incoherencies. Nonetheless, the Copenhagen Interpretation became dogma, largely because it provided a pragmatic framework for calculations, not because it resolved the underlying metaphysical issues.

As dissatisfaction with the Copenhagen view grew, other interpretations arose — many of them even more radical in their embrace of absurdity.

The Many-Worlds Interpretation, proposed by Hugh Everett III, sought to eliminate the need for wave function collapse by asserting that all possible outcomes of quantum measurements actually occur — each in a separate, branching universe. Every quantum event thus gives rise to a splitting of reality into multiple, non-communicating worlds. In this view, the universe is not a coherent, unified whole, but an endless fracturing of realities, each as real as the others, yet forever inaccessible. The very notion of a single, comprehensible cosmos is abandoned in favor of a limitless proliferation of universes — an ontological inflation without evidence or necessity, and without any possible means of verification. Reality becomes an infinite splintering without purpose, coherence, or end.

Another development, retrocausality, embraced the idea that events in the future could influence events in the past. In certain interpretations of quantum mechanics, such as the two-state vector formalism, the outcomes of measurements depend not only on past causes but also on future boundary conditions. This inversion of causality further undermines the basic structure of explanation. Cause and effect, once the pillars of scientific understanding, dissolve into mutual dependency or outright reversal. The temporal coherence of the universe is sacrificed, and the arrow of time becomes not a fundamental feature of reality but an emergent illusion subject to reversal.

Perhaps the most extreme manifestation of the abandonment of rational order is found in superdeterminism. Faced with the challenge of explaining quantum correlations without faster-than-light communication, superdeterminists propose that all events — including the choices of experimenters — were predetermined from the beginning of the universe. There is no real free will; the apparent "choices" made by observers are merely the unfolding of a cosmic script written at the origin of time. In this view, experimental independence is an illusion, and scientific inquiry itself becomes suspect, since any outcome could be attributed to hidden conspiracies of initial conditions. This represents not merely a rejection of causality, but a rejection of the very intelligibility of scientific practice.

Thus, the full collapse is evident. Where physics once sought to uncover a coherent, lawful, divinely ordered cosmos, it now flirts openly with interpretations that celebrate incoherence, infinite fragmentation, time loops, and cosmic conspiracies. Instead of confronting these contradictions as signs of a profound philosophical failure, modern physics often treats them with a kind of weary acceptance, even triumphalism — as if the abandonment of rational understanding were itself a mark of sophistication.

In embracing these interpretations, physics has institutionalized absurdity. The mind's demand for order, reason, and intelligibility has been replaced by a culture of paradox, fragmentation, and meaninglessness. The enterprise that once sought the mind of God has become an elaborate system for navigating a universe stripped of reason — a universe more closely resembling the existential despair of Camus than the rational grandeur of Newton.

VI. A Case Study in Absurdity: The Spacetime Stitch Thought Experiment

To illustrate the nature of the absurdity that has taken root in modern physics, it is helpful to construct a thought experiment that captures the core features of the collapse: the preservation of locality, the violation of causality, and the complete abandonment of metaphysical coherence. This is the purpose of the Spacetime Stitch Thought Experiment.

In this thought experiment, we imagine two distant observers, Alice and Bob, situated on opposite sides of the galaxy. Each possesses a sealed device: a box containing a button and a light. When Alice or Bob presses their button, their box immediately flashes either a red or a blue light, determined by a local, random mechanism inside the box. Critically, the distance between Alice and Bob is so great that no signal — not even light — could travel from one to the other in time to influence the outcome of the other's measurement. Each event is thus locally determined and spacelike separated, preserving strict relativistic locality.

However, after both measurements have been completed, the Universe "selects" only those histories in which Alice and Bob's outcomes satisfy a hidden global

consistency condition — for instance, that they must always see opposite colors. If both saw red or both saw blue, that branch of reality is discarded; only branches where Alice and Bob's outcomes differ are retained. Yet crucially, this selection occurs without any communication between Alice and Bob. Their individual actions and observations are locally random and causally independent, but the global history that survives reflects a correlation that could not have been caused through any signal or local influence.

This scenario preserves locality — no faster-than-light influence is transmitted — but it destroys causality. The outcome observed by Alice is not determined solely by her local conditions but is retrospectively dependent on the outcome observed by Bob, and vice versa. Neither event individually causes the other, nor are they linked by any lawful causal chain. Instead, reality itself is stitched together after the fact, enforcing consistency without explanation. The timeline that observers experience is the result of an unseen, acausal selection process, violating the very structure of cause and effect.

While fictional, this thought experiment is not far from the spirit of real proposals in quantum foundations. In delayed choice experiments, decisions made in the present appear to retroactively determine the behavior of particles in the past. In post-selection techniques, outcomes are filtered based on future conditions, suggesting that certain global consistencies are enforced across spacetime without causal mechanisms linking them. These experiments and proposals implicitly invite a view of the Universe in which the fabric of reality is not determined by a continuous, lawful unfolding of causes and effects, but by a mysterious and selective coherence applied across vast temporal and spatial separations.

In accepting such ideas, modern physics edges closer to normalizing the view that reality itself is not fundamentally causal, but selectively stitched, with local randomness governed only by hidden global constraints. In this framework, explanation ceases to be the uncovering of a real chain of causes and becomes instead the acceptance of arbitrary global patterns with no deeper necessity.

The Spacetime Stitch Thought Experiment thus serves as a vivid microcosm of the absurdity into which physics has descended. By preserving locality at all costs — a relic of relativistic orthodoxy — but sacrificing causality, physics retains the outward forms of scientific rigor while surrendering the core of what made scientific understanding meaningful: the intelligibility of events through lawful, continuous causal relations grounded in a coherent metaphysical reality.

In short, physics today stands on the threshold of endorsing a view of the Universe that is not ordered but edited, not coherent but post-selected — a cosmos without a living chain of reason, governed not by rational law but by opaque consistency filters. The result is not a world we can understand, but a world we must merely navigate: a shifting tapestry of events stitched together without why, how, or ultimate meaning.

VII. Enter Camus: The Absurd Universe

In the mid-twentieth century, as physics was descending into its own crisis of meaning, a parallel development unfolded in philosophy. Albert Camus, writing in the shadow of world wars, existential disillusionment, and cultural fragmentation, articulated a vision of human existence that he called the absurd.

Camus's philosophy of absurdism begins from the confrontation between two facts: the human longing for meaning, clarity, and order, and the silent, indifferent nature of the universe. Human beings seek understanding, coherence, and purpose; yet the world offers no answers, no explanations, no ultimate fulfillment of these demands. The universe, Camus argued, "seems unreasonable," and this confrontation between the desire for reason and the reality of unreason generates the feeling of the absurd. Life, in Camus’s view, is not tragic because it fails to satisfy our hopes — it is absurd because it renders hope itself meaningless.

In Camus’s existential vision, the absurd is not something that can be resolved by appeal to transcendent truths or metaphysical systems. Religious answers, philosophical rationalizations, and utopian dreams all fail because they impose artificial coherence upon a fundamentally incoherent reality. Instead, Camus

advocates a kind of defiant acceptance: a refusal to flee from the absurd, combined with a commitment to live fully in its presence without illusion.

This vision, intended as a diagnosis of the human existential condition, has now, perhaps unintentionally, become the mirror of modern physics.

As we have seen, physics has moved from seeking the rational structure of the cosmos to accepting randomness, incoherence, and acausal stitching as the fabric of reality itself. The Universe is no longer understood as a rational, intelligible whole created and sustained by a higher order, but as an endless flux of probabilities, disconnected events, and arbitrary consistencies, stitched together without cause or reason.

In this new view, the cosmos is silent and indifferent not merely to human hopes but to the very structure of reason. There is no guarantee of lawful order beyond statistical correlations; no assurance that causality holds except within limited approximations; no firm metaphysical ground upon which the edifice of knowledge can rest. Observers may participate in the unfolding of events, but they do so without understanding the full context or meaning of their actions. Reality unfolds according to patterns we can model but cannot explain, and the human mind is left adrift, constructing pragmatic frameworks to navigate a world it can no longer claim to comprehend.

Physics, having banished God and transcendent order from its foundations, now finds itself enacting a version of Camus's absurd drama. It builds theories not as revelations of deeper truth but as pragmatic tools for surviving in a meaningless system. Like Camus's Sisyphus, the physicist rolls the boulder of understanding up the mountain of incoherence, fully aware that the summit will never be reached — because there is no summit to reach.

Thus, the intellectual situation of physics mirrors, almost exactly, the existential predicament Camus described. The longing for reason persists, but it is met with a cosmos that offers no reason, only arbitrary structure and fleeting regularities. The result is not a glorious expansion of knowledge but an institutionalization of

absurdity, a systematic training in the art of navigating incoherence without hope of final understanding.

In abandoning metaphysical realism, physics has not liberated itself. It has condemned itself to an endless engagement with the absurd — a cosmos that cannot be explained, a reality that cannot be fully grasped, and a science that can no longer claim to know what is real. What began as the search for the mind of God has ended in the confrontation with the silence of an indifferent universe.

VIII. Beyond Absurdity: Toward a Recovery of Meaning

If modern physics has drifted into absurdity by abandoning its metaphysical foundations, then the way forward must involve a restoration — not a return to outdated dogmas, but a reestablishment of the fundamental assumptions that made coherent science possible in the first place. At the core of this restoration must be the recovery of metaphysical realism: the conviction that reality exists independently of our perceptions, that it is ordered according to intelligible principles, and that these principles can, at least in part, be discovered by human reason.

Metaphysical realism affirms that the Universe is not merely a shifting web of observations or a collection of statistical regularities, but a coherent whole grounded in an objective structure. It asserts that causes precede effects, that entities possess natures and properties independent of measurement, and that the rational mind is capable of uncovering, not constructing, the truths embedded in the cosmos. Without this framework, science becomes either an exercise in description without understanding or a kind of metaphysical nihilism where the very concept of explanation dissolves.

The abandonment of metaphysical realism has led physics to blur the line between discovery and invention. Increasingly, theories are treated not as attempts to uncover the real structures of the world, but as useful fictions — mathematical frameworks that help organize predictions without making any claim about what actually exists. In this model, reality becomes whatever

mathematical formalism is most convenient at the moment, and truth is subordinated to utility.

This attitude must be decisively rejected if science is to recover its soul. Physics must be understood once again as an act of discovery, not invention. The goal of scientific inquiry is not to create models that "work" in a narrow sense, but to uncover and describe the actual order of being that governs the cosmos. Mathematics, while indispensable, must be seen as a tool for articulating reality, not as a substitute for reality itself. Theories must be judged not merely by their predictive power but by their capacity to reveal deeper levels of intelligible structure.

Moreover, a recovery of meaning in physics entails a recognition that purpose and order are not human projections onto a chaotic void, but intrinsic features of the Universe itself. This does not mean imposing simplistic teleologies onto nature, but acknowledging that the remarkable coherence, beauty, and intelligibility of the physical world point beyond themselves to a higher rationality. The language of physical law, the harmony of mathematical structure, and the astonishing success of reason in apprehending nature all suggest that the cosmos is not a random accident but the manifestation of deeper, lawful purpose.

Without this recognition, physics remains trapped in a self-imposed exile from meaning. It can calculate, predict, and manipulate phenomena, but it cannot explain them in any ultimate sense. It can describe the motions of particles but not the reason why such coherent structures exist at all. It can predict the decay of particles but not the deeper logic that binds the fabric of spacetime together.

To move beyond absurdity, physics must reawaken the metaphysical imagination — the willingness to ask not only how phenomena occur, but why reality itself is intelligible, ordered, and beautiful. It must rediscover its ancient vocation: the search for the rational architecture of the Universe, an architecture that points beyond itself to a ground of being greater than the sum of its parts.

Only by reuniting scientific rigor with metaphysical depth can physics reclaim its rightful place as a path not into chaos, but into deeper and deeper layers of truth.

IX. Conclusion

The journey of physics, once the noblest of intellectual enterprises, has over the centuries undergone a profound and tragic transformation. What began as a search for the rational structure of creation — a disciplined attempt to discern the mind of God through the laws governing nature — has devolved into an engagement with incoherence, randomness, and metaphysical nihilism.

The early giants of science, such as Newton, Kepler, and Maxwell, believed that the Universe was a rational, intelligible creation, bearing the imprint of divine wisdom. Their work rested on the unshakable conviction that nature was governed by laws that could be discovered because those laws were themselves a reflection of a higher, coherent order.

The nineteenth century introduced a slow drift away from these foundations through mechanical materialism and the growing reliance on statistical methods. By the twentieth century, catalyzed by the radical implications of quantum mechanics and the willing abandonment of metaphysical realism, physics found itself cast adrift. The rejection of Einstein's warning — that "God does not play dice" — marked not simply a methodological shift, but an existential collapse.

In its place, modern physics has embraced a series of interpretations and conceptual frameworks — from the Copenhagen Interpretation to Many-Worlds, from retrocausality to superdeterminism — that institutionalize absurdity. These frameworks no longer seek to explain reality in any coherent sense, but merely to describe observable phenomena through models that often abandon causality, objective reality, and even the continuity of existence itself.

The Spacetime Stitch Thought Experiment illustrated how close physics has come to formalizing absurdity as the new norm: a reality in which events are locally random but globally selected without cause, a cosmos stitched together by invisible rules without any explanatory foundation. Physics, in its contemporary form, mirrors the existential condition described by Albert Camus — a struggle to find meaning in a universe that offers none, a scientific Sisyphus condemned to labor without hope of final understanding.

Yet this descent is not inevitable. The absurdity now institutionalized in physics is the direct result of the conscious rejection of a metaphysical foundation — the denial that reality is structured, intelligible, and ultimately grounded in something greater than itself. It is a symptom of the deeper decision to expel God, or at least the idea of a rational ground of being, from the scientific imagination.

Only by reestablishing metaphysical realism — by affirming that reality is coherent, intelligible, and ordered independently of human observation — can physics hope to escape its current dead end. Science must be reclaimed not merely as a tool for prediction, but as a means of discovering an objective and rationally ordered Universe. The restoration of meaning to physics will not come from new equations or more sophisticated models alone, but from the recovery of the vision that first made science possible: the belief that the Universe is an expression of a deeper, ordered reality accessible to reason.

In the end, physics must choose. It can continue down the path of absurdity, endlessly inventing frameworks that describe a meaningless flux, or it can turn back toward the foundation it has abandoned — a foundation rooted in the belief that reason corresponds to reality because reality itself is rationally ordered. Only through this recovery can physics once again aspire to its highest calling: the search for truth, the apprehension of meaning, and the unveiling of the profound order that underlies all things.

References

Bohr, N. (1935). *Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?* Physical Review, 48(8), 696–702.

Camus, A. (1942). *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Translated by Justin O'Brien. Vintage International, 1991 edition.

Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., & Rosen, N. (1935). *Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?* Physical Review, 47(10), 777–780.

Everett, H. (1957). *"Relative State" Formulation of Quantum Mechanics*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 29(3), 454–462.

Kepler, J. (1609). *Astronomia Nova*. Heidelberg: Gottfried Tampach.

Maxwell, J.C. (1873). *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Newton, I. (1687). *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. Translated by Andrew Motte (1846). Prometheus Books, 1995 edition.

Youvan, D.C. (2025). *A Formal Reconstruction of Physics: Foundations in Category Theory, Homotopy Type Theory, and the Primacy of the Word*. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14401.06244

Youvan, D.C. (2025). *Patchwork Cosmology: How the Rejection of God Fractured the Scientific Worldview*. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.18998.41286