

Anti-Semitism as a part of Anti-Intellectualism: logical and religious outlooks and the conditional optimism

Emanuel Gluskin

Kinneret College in the Jordan Valley (on the Sea of Galilee), Israel.

gluskin@ee.bgu.ac.il

<http://www.ee.bgu.ac.il/~gluskin/>

Abstract: An explanation of Anti-Semitism in terms of the problem that simple people (i.e. those who want to live with a clear mind and be thus respected) have with the intellectual predominance existing in society, i.e. an explanation of Anti-Semitism in terms of the Anti-Intellectualism, is given. The problem of anti-intellectualism is not associated with the "Critique of Pure Reason" again, in any new form, but with *protesting the tough (sometimes cruel or even hooligan) dictatorship of the Ruling Intellect*. The constructive conclusion is that the media of information, like TV or radio, have to cease making intellectualism the main societal ideal. Human mind should not be overloaded, and it should be "fed" by information that it can well "digest". The thinking ability is given to us (just as any our ability) once and forever, and it has some natural limitations which have to be carefully studied and respected. This point, associated with Anti-Semitism, is the main focus of the discussion in which the author expresses strong sympathy to his nation, but also strong belief that human nature and human society are something good, and tries to be objective with respect to all sides.

keywords: *mind science, hemispheres activity, intellectual overburden, cruelty, violence, information means, anti-intellectualism, anti-Semitism, social danger, social responsibility, religion, philosophy, humaneness.*

1. Introduction

Following the scientific way of thought, we do not accept the position that Anti-Semitism is something "irrational" and unexplainable, even though this position is shared by many modern Rabbis. Einstein said in the 30's: "They dislike Jews not because they are better or worse than them, but because they are *different*." While rejecting any lists of accusations against Jews, composed by Anti-Semites (investigations of such lists, seen against lists and polls related to other nations, show that what is bad in Jews is just good in the others), we shall expose the point of this *difference* that causes the hatred and thus leads to different kinds of unfair accusations.

There is no smoke without fire, so a point (that could not be seen by Einstein) does exist and it encompasses a real danger that is seen behind the tragic story of Jews, -- the danger that the next time will relate (this is our basic assumption and concern) to

all intellectuals. Six million *ideologically killed* people are a lot, of course, especially for a small nation, and not a lot, because the next time there might be 600 million of those who are *different*. When correctly *understood*, the trouble that we, the Jews, have had, might save a huge number of lives, and the necessity in *this* understanding should become the main reason why the Holocaust should be never forgotten.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding regarding the topic of intellectualism, -- I do *not* think that Jews are smarter (wiser) than other people, -- the point is that the *ideal of intellectualism* is traditional for this nation; one might say that this ideal is written on its flag, on the long historical scale, more than it is for any other nation. In his remarks (easily found in Google) about Jews, Einstein also often notices the *tendency* to intellectual values, or respect for these values; however we shall have to touch on, in the context of the modern sociological reality, this important feature of Jews not just positively; as a reason for their troubles.

We shall be strongly concerned (not always directly regarding the topic of Anti-Semitism, but always regarding its close background) with the fact that, using democratic freedoms, the means of spreading information (radio, TV, Internet) have made Intellect the absolute world-scale dictator, i.e. have made intellectualism the ideal in every society. *Wishing to live with a clear mind and be thus respected, simple people cannot accept this situation in a good spirit*. There are many obvious justifications for the wish to have a clear mind (e.g. because of having dangerous work, or tough traffic while driving), but not only those seen by the simple people themselves. *Simplicity* gives "structural stability" ("robustness") to life, and when not respecting the wishes of simple people, the means of information, which all the time enhance the inappropriate societal ideal of intellectualism, lead humanity to serious troubles.

It is written in the Old Testament for Jews: "*You will bring light to other nations*", but it is written in the New Testament: "*Do not cast pearls before swine*".

Comment 1: In the latter somewhat figurative expression, we understand by "pearls" something *intellectually very difficult*, and by "swine" -- those who are not able to understand *this particular thing*. This understanding seems to be natural, and there is no intention to hurt anyone, of course.

As the point, it becomes clear today that the intended continuation of the above advice of the New Testament is "*because they will kill you, and will be right in some important sense*".

Before we start with the detailed explanation of this statement, let us "record" two facts:

(a) The very order in the Old Testament to Jews, to bring light to other nations, *defines* Jews as some "incorrigible" (even if not necessarily good) intellectuals.

(b) The quoted words of the New Testament are *not* some semi-humorous advice for one not to waste his time, but a *very serious and important warning*, itself originating from the highest intellect.

2. How can it be that they will be right?

Those who "do not understand" will be in the right in this killing because the view of the "pearls" destroys their clear mind, which is not only an act of disrespect or an intellectual hooliganism against simple (ordinary) people, but also a kind of killing of their personality. Of course, if you are killing someone intellectually, this one tends

to kill you physically. Just assume that somebody is feeding you with food that you cannot sufficiently well digest, and then accept that such a food can be also intellectual, i.e. there is some poorly understandable information that you cannot well treat in your mind and understand what to remember, if anything at all. *The health of one's mind is no less important for one than the health of one's physiology responsible for the digestion of bread.*

As it stands today with the tempestuous intellectualization of our psychological life, humanity is going to commit suicide, first intellectually, by too strongly increasing the entropy of the human mind, and then also physically. Consider (and see also [1,2] for this point) that today there is already 1:100 of autistics in the USA, among all of the children, which Barack Obama figuratively called an "epidemic".

The simple people have the right to protest against this situation in order to protect themselves. Since at the high level of development of living systems, simplicity is more survivable than is complexity, it may be even added that when fighting against the intellectual ideal, simple people are fighting on behalf of the survival of the whole mankind, first of all in the sense of the health of human mind.

Observe that the not-understood hooliganism of the relatively recent "days of violence" is absolutely not similar to the usual hooliganism of a person who just thinks that everything is allowed to him. (Numerous works and reports on the "soccer hooliganism", illustrated by the numbers of the broken bottles, hands, etc., are easily found in Google, but the "days of violence" [3] are not explained.) The specific, organized hooliganism, presented together with the insistence that this world needs violence, requires not only police actions; it should be approached most seriously, responsibly, and respectfully.

In science, one should not leave anything unexplained, but all what we have regarding the "days of violence" are the BBC reports saying that the police in London stood over-whelmed, not knowing what to do and not understanding from where and why all this falls on it. Observe that the slogan of the "days of violence": "*We, the society and the humanity, need violence*" is not associated with any welfare problem.

3. Let their lives be simple and show respect to this simplicity, not just to the intellect!

Both paradoxically and pragmatically, the *simplicity of life*, required by the *defined hooligans of that kind*, is the same simplicity of expression and logical connectivity that a writer (I at this moment) seeks in a scientific text in order not to cause problems by increasing its entropy. That the aspect of mind disorder, and the organic necessity to be able to healthily "digest" the received information, should be taken as a logical foundation for the line of thought that follows the remarkable work [4], explaining the necessity of some (periodic) decrease of entropy by any living object, whose ideas were never previously really pursued.

It is necessary *not* to increase the entropy of our mind, just as it is for entropy of our body [4], but the input for the brain that the society generates contradicts this necessity.

Work [5] puts forward the hypothesis that the reason for need in violence is *overloading* of the right hemisphere of the brain (the one responsible for our creativity [6-8]) which can be caused in many simple people for whom it is difficult to face and endure the actual intellectual (informational) tension existing in the society.

The "constructive" observation is that an overstress of the right hemisphere [6-8] and its excessive (for the simple people) activity can be *stopped by cruelty*, and *thus* the healthy balance is recovered. This is relevant already for the tragic events of WWII. Cruelty as the "medicine" was the simplest solution found by Hitler for the problem that he intuitively felt in the crowd, and this his cynical finding (a devilish one for Jews and Gypsies, and, *in a degree*, also for many other nations which suffered during WWII from this *strange* [5], and militarily redundant cruelty) resulted in the Holocaust.

We cannot present here the whole background for understanding the causes of Anti-Semitism as it is explained below, and just directly describe our position. We have to start from the Holocaust, since this case is so extremely abnormal that one will inevitably have questions, first of all re the relation of the topic of overburden of the right hemisphere to such a highly intellectual nation as the Germans.

In the humanistic plane of the objective outlook, let us start setting our position with the observation that it is *impossible* to accept the assumption that the cruelty exhibited in the Holocaust by the Nazis could appear in the traditional high-morality Germany for the usual reasons, such as some profit, or some *natural* anger, associated with common sense. On the moral side, such an assumption, that just tries to be natural, rejects the stability of any morality, which is obviously wrong, and hurts the honor of the great nation of Gauss, Bach, Goethe, Kant, Kirchhoff, and many other outstanding minds, incomparably stronger than the reason of the *temporary unbalance in the hemispheres' loading and activity* (i.e. a kind of temporary mental illness caused by intellectual overburden) that we put forward. In our explanation, the responsibility for the trouble finally belongs *to the whole of humanity*, to its unhealthy ambitions, its intellectual narcissisms, to its (softly speaking) naivety, requiring this great, permanent intellectual effort, the uncontrollable increase of the intellectual richness, which in fact, does not make us happy.

There certainly was an unusual reason, not originating from any "common sense", for the troubles Jews already passed through, about which Einstein could not think because the knowledge of the different functions of the brain hemispheres, and the resulting obvious necessity of a balanced brain activity were unknown in his time.

4. The Holocaust as a unique "Brain Experiment" warning humanity to be aware of the limitations of its mind

One should naturally ask how can the modern "days of violence", with their just *strange* accompanying announcements that violence is needed for us, be compared, -- as we do here, -- to the unbelievable cruelty of the Holocaust.

First of all, both phenomena are *unexplained* (besides the straightforward hypothesis of [6]), and there really is a similarity between the two via the tendency to violence, i.e. development of the cruelty.

Secondly, there is no contradiction regarding the intellectual aspect. Germans made the most honest and impressive efforts in the field of natural sciences, music, philosophy, etc., i.e. in the field of the intellectual ambitions of the *whole of humanity* (including Jews), -- the humanity that never understood that its averaged intellectual ability is given (just as is any physiological ability) to it *once and forever*, and the *bounds* of this ability have to be carefully studied and never crossed. A lot of cruelty can result (and already resulted!) from ignoring this fact and sinking in a narcissistic euphoria regarding human intellectual power.

It is important to see that even if a nation has more people of genius than all other nations together (and at a period Germans were close to this), -- *all such people still are a very small part of the population of the country*. Thus, the *simple people* of just *such* a country are in the worst position compared to the simple people of other countries. Just they most clearly see before them the societal intellectual ideal that they do not know how to accept and respect, and which cannot respect them. Just they can have, as we assume, the most severe overburden of the right hemisphere, and suffer from this unbalance of the brain, thus needing cruelty [6] for stopping (decreasing) the excessive activity of this hemisphere.

Neither the terrible classical Nazism, nor the Neo-Nazism that bridges the Nazism to the modern *organized* hooliganism typical for the "Days of Violence", can be ever justified, but the scientific approach can help us in making the needed observations and conclusions from the very painful for my nation, but *scientifically very important* "brain experiment" named the Holocaust, preventing in the future such terrible things. It is, of course, unpleasant to accuse Intellect, in ourselves, and the whole society of anything bad, but one has to start to realize that simple people can be right to a significant degree, in their violent protests, as those of the "days of violence".

Jews themselves have to understand this well, and not only because they will be first to have the troubles, but also because just this small nation that already gave this world some very important prophets, has, in the moral plane, to put forward somebody who will convince humanity that *the providers of the information have to radically change their methods of work and the very topics*. This would be "to bring light to other nations" as it is needed at present.

Not the Generals and *not* the Fighting Intellect with its technological fists, -- this new dictator of the world, having very little relation to true democracy intending to equalize human rights as much as possible, -- *but the experienced professional school teachers and professional psychologists have to start to rule this world, and teach our children how to do it correctly*. These reasonable, careful people, not necessarily genius, should become appointed Generals in the world of our psychology.

The first target is to start resisting the uncontrollable intellectualization caused by such communication means as TV that we and our children watch. Then, some methods have to be developed for recovering the balance in the activity of the brain hemispheres, when the unbalance occurs in masses, *without* employing any cruelty.

This is the line of thought, the rocky way, for us to proceed, coming closer and closer to the main topic of anti-Semitism, but never leaving the very important background of the social problem associated with excessive ("over-killed") intellectualism.

5. The absolute measures

Just as a human can be physically smashed when he finds himself among some huge colliding masses of earth or ice, -- just thus the gentle individual human psychology can be "smashed" by the huge "masses" of wishes of numerous people, of the hugely accumulated information, etc., -- "colliding" in the psychological world. It is *not* true that everything is relative, and thus can be once further developed and increased. A human being with his averaged inherent abilities of any kind, is some "quant" that gives the *absolute measure* for these things.

Just as our massive industrialization is spoiling (destroying) today, by its pollutions, the ionosphere that defends us against the very dangerous UV sun

radiation, and thus is already not as acceptable as the initial industrialization that many years ago was just reflecting human ingenuity, -- just so, *in our spiritual life*, some *boundaries* for the possibilities of the development in this *already insufficiently large* world, have become clearly exposed.

The sympathy of the revolutionary mind of Einstein for the tendency of Jews to intellectualism is absolutely natural, and his intellectual ability to always simply and clearly formulate things of any kind, however difficult, is truly amazing, but today we have to think more about the *preservation* of basic human nature, *including the mind aspect*, which requires attention, discretion and developing necessary controls, rather than any new scientific revolution.

6. A Comment on democracy and intellectualization against tradition (some simple mathematical argument)

It is interesting to notice that democracy makes the intellectualization of the society self-accelerating even if only because of increase of the population, while it is also relevant that the *democratic society does not encourage people to follow the wisdom of their fathers*.

Indeed, the population is growing exponentially, i.e. $\sim \exp(t/\tau)$ where τ is a relevant time interval (not necessarily the same everywhere). We can replace, for simplicity, this exponent by 2^n . It is possible to compare the discrete variable to a continuous one, because we have from

$$\exp(t/\tau) = 2^n$$

the direct proportionality of n to t :

$$n = t/(\tau \ln 2) \sim t.$$

We now use the equality

$$1 + 2 + 4 + \dots + 2^{n-1} = 2^n - 1,$$

obtained by multiplying its left-hand side by 1 presented as $2 - 1$. From this equality,

$$2^n > 1 + 2 + 4 + \dots + 2^{n-1}.$$

This *inequality* means that, when counting ourselves together with all our fathers (predecessors), we, -- those who live at present (at n), -- are the *majority* in this set.

Since democratic principles teach us that the majority is always right, these principles encourage us to look only forward, believing that our intellectual interests and wishes are more important than the already out-of-fashion interests and wishes of our fathers.

Thus, the societal ideal of intellectualism and the democracy make intellect self-accelerating, and it becomes difficult for the simple and healthy logic of our inherent thinking to remain "structurally stable" under the heavy informational overburden.

In order to remain simple, we should look not only into the future that is always more complexity, more entropy [2], i.e. less of the so important simplicity that defines the human essence. We should defend our mind, but not by means of cruelty, -- not as the defined hooligans of the "days of violence", or the classical and neo-Nazis. *The intellectual protection should become the main target of the modern sociology, and how to defend our mind from overburden is a very serious problem of modern society.*

7. My "non-sleeping" nation and other nations

We all are created by Nature so that we must *rest* by sleeping several hours per day. For sleeping, we must have a quiet and safe place, -- a place *belonging to us*, where we have grown up and can safely exist. Since the intellectual ability has no direct relation to all this, intellectualism should never be in the first place when we consider the country's or nation's interests.

The necessity to have and firmly hold one's land is so important for one, that any person, close to him, weakening, physically or spiritually, his ability to do this, will be hated by him, and he will always wish such a person to be expelled, just as when a person is ill with dysentery. Without the mentioned, more general, argument of advancing the harmful intellectualism, we would explain the existence of anti-Semitism by the fact that for a very long period Jews had not been keeping their land, which, together with the present troubles of Israel, is perceived by the others as a weakness that can "infect" one contacting a Jew, like a dangerous disease.

Indeed, the common opinion that one is afraid only of a strong person acting against him is *wrong*. People are also afraid of taking into their company one who will convince or cause them by personal example, to be weak. This is, in particular, the deep cause for the problem that we, Israelis, have with our Arab neighbors. All the territorial concessions made by Israel have just enhanced the hate, because Arabs *do not want to ever make any territorial concessions by themselves*. For them, these concessions are an abnormal behavior, exhibition of a weakness, and they do not want to have such a strange, "defective" state in their company. Just recall how the buses full of people started to explode in Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem and other Israeli towns right after the famous peaceful speech of Yitzhak Rabin announcing Israeli concessions towards the Palestinian state.

Of course, any state must attempt to show respect to its neighbors, but it is a basic axiom of the theory, and the basic fact of the reality of coexistence, that *when accepting the ideology of your neighbors (in this case, respecting force and stability of political principles), you show these neighbors more respect than when making concessions to their pressure*.

The whole world understands this simple truth; only Israel is guilty in that it receives now only the "support" for concessions, because of showing its insufficient moral strength. Again, this is a result of the long history of being spread among other nations, but not only this, -- it is also a result of the fact that we, Jews, are interested in everything, which is the tendency to intellectualism that prevents us from being sufficiently simple, and concentrated on our national (physical) needs, so as to firmly keep our land as every other nation can do. (Here, in Israel, we are definitely improved in this sense, but still insufficiently.)

It is both absurd and tragic that this regional hatred Jews, due to the ambitions of the local rulers, prevents people from seeing what we really do. Recently, Israel made great progress in the technology and quantitative (power) output of desalinating sea water, which greatly increased our resources of the drinking water. The lack of the drinking water was always considered as a threat for the region, and since the Arab population is growing faster than the Jewish one, in the sense of actual possibility of the growth, it may be said that this technological advance is more relevant for Arabs than for Jews. Already by this *technological achievement* Israel has done for Palestinian Arabs more than all the local accusers and haters together, with their pompous ambitions.

Love and hate are close in our mind because just in these mood states we have the exceptional spiritual concentration that is necessary for serious *learning* this world. In principle, hate can lead to love, and this actually happened between different neighboring nations. However, the time constants of the physical actions are much smaller than those of the developments of philosophical thought and its implementations, and for killing you it is sufficient that people strongly hate you at some periods. Thus, though Jews as a nation may be loved, we have to remain focused on the clear direct reasons for hate, and only thus understand how to improve the situation.

8. On the intensity of modern Anti-Semitism

From the position of the present work, the "scientific" role of modern Anti-Semitism is expressed in the fact that the hatred of Jews best of all shows the troubles that all intellectuals are going to have. At the NDES'12 conference, I was told by one of the participants that in small Russian towns Jews cannot walk at nights, because they are killed, and – he added impressively, -- people with glasses are also killed, because it is thought that they are Jews. However, it is very improbable that people with glasses are accepted as Jews, rather it is clear that Anti-Semitism appears in these small towns as a part of *Anti-Intellectualism*. This is just the same as when the "days of violence" (or, rather, the "ideology of violence") are put, under some intuitive unperceived motivation, as a shield, against the ideology of the intellectualism.

Killing Jews represents some disappointment in God who leads, according to one's opinion, life not in the direction one wishes. Hitler's hysterical speeches before the crowds were far from the spirit of "we shall win *because God is with us*", and it may be even said that one killing Jews tries to expel God from his mind.

9. Jews and time: some symbolism

If to ignore for a moment the (most amazing) fact of preserving the Judaism and its nation during thousand years, and be focused on the "outer" role of Jews, it may be noticed that while the other nations are responsible for *maintenance* of things (created either by them or by Jews), Jews are more responsible for their *changes*. Contrary to those of other nations, the main blessings of Jews relate to time, and not to space. Indeed, the idea to keep Shabbat appears to be very successful, but with both of our Temples that are an ideal taken from other nations, we have had great troubles. In some sense, we, Jews, more relate to time than to space, and the very preservation, during the thousands of years, of this ancient, "gone with the wind" haunted nation, seems to be a miracle most directly proving the existence of God.

Comment 2: One of my old thoughts even was that the basic concept (definition) of God is that *God is the whole distinction between the concepts of time and space, which the human mind has*, and this simply because only God knows the future.

The nation that is a kind of screwdriver in the hand of God, when *He* wants to change something in this world, indeed was (is) the "chosen" one, but not chosen to be happy (see also [9]), and the existence of Anti-Semitism is not any miracle. The Bible story about the parting of the sea before Jews, during the exodus from Egypt,

can be seen not only as a description of a physical event/miracle, but more as a symbolic prediction of the situation that we shall be separated from the other nations, also thus parted, and go among them without contacting them. That is, as the water stood aside of us, the nations will stay.

10. The wisdom of a Rabbi

It has to be observed that as a not religious man, Einstein was completely ignoring the important thoughts and insistences that can be found in *religious texts*. However, when thinking about the fate of Jews, one has no right to ignore the wisdom of Rabbis, because Jews are *defined* by their religion, and it is just *Torah* (the Old Testament) that preserved the nation as such, during thousands of years.

Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochay ("Rashbi") lived approximately 150 years after Christ, and is considered as the central figure in creation of Jewish religion-psychological teaching "Kabala" (that was published for the first time, in some final form, in the 13th century). The following words of Kabala:

"Gossip causes hate"

are ascribed to this Rabbi. By definition, "Gossip" is *not* necessarily telling something bad about somebody, but *spreading information about people without real need*. Since many people today have a problem with the spreading by the informational means of a lot of "good" information that they do not need and cannot well understand, -- we really have nothing so directly important and relevant as these words of Rashbi, -- of this looking-forward Rabbi, warning the humanity against intellectual (informational) overburden.

Having the tradition of early teaching of Torah to *all* their children (not only those talented or capable), Jews could earlier and easier than the other nations see the problems associated with the difficulties of informational "feeding" and "digestion".

The present opinion is that in order to have a respectable and correct place in the future society, Jews have to return in masses to their religion. (At this point, our position agrees with that of all Rabbis.) The state of Israel always will be the best solution because the surrounding Muslim world is a religious world and because of the *requirement* of Muslims that the Jews learn how to keep and rule their state.

With some wisdom on both sides, our relations with the close neighbors and with the whole world will be improved and stabilized at the level where we, Jews, could and would *correctly* "bring light to the other nations". Nobody has the right to abolish this order of the Old Testament, for which Jews have preserved themselves though the numerous great troubles, during thousands of years, but the question of *how* to bring the light is left to the wisdom of a small man. Good teachers are needed also for the latter.

11. Conscience against honor, -- how it works and what it gives?

One can see the respect for the intellect by Jews not only via logical arguments, but simply by observing *how* a Jewish mother is looking at her son giving a speech (that necessarily includes some religious parts) at his Bar-Mitzva (13 years old) party. As far as this relates to the religious wisdom and education that all of us need in this or

that frame and degree, -- the image of this mother is one of the important images of the humanity.

The naive tendency to intellectualism observed in Jews, is seen here on the general (and contrasting) background of the tendency to excellence and honor (pride) exhibited by other nations. Why Jews gave so many prophets? Just notice that no prophet ever seeks honor. Such one seeks conscience. We all are created by the image of God, but not as the whole image, -- each nation has its purposed blessed features, for us *as a whole* to complete this image.

How do prophets arise? Let me explain this as I would do before the audience of electrical circuit specialists. "*This* is your level, -- I would say, -- and *here*, above you, there is the star of Gustav Robert Kirchoff. What is more important, -- the average level of this whole formation, or the gap between Kirchoff and you? Of course both, but since we do science for ourselves (Nature certainly does not need our formulae, and a scientist from another planet need not use them either), maybe, this *motivating gap* is more important. Creating Jews, God made an interesting experiment. He created a nation that knows how to get (fall) into trouble and then learn how to get (clamp) out of it. The getting out is, ad hoc, the essence of "conscience", while the "honor" of the other nations is a good reason not to get into troubles at all, preserving the "level" in any sense of this word, which you would like. The latter seems to be better, of course, however, on the other side, after getting into trouble, somebody very smart, a spiritual leader, *must* appear in order to help his people to get out of the trouble, which is very important. Thus, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Paul, and some other well-known prophets arose, creating the "gap" and becoming important not only for Jews. In the same spirit of the distinction, just much more prosaically for a teacher, most of you would advise a young scientist to try not to make mistakes while deriving his equations. However, I would suggest at the beginning of the theoretical work not to be afraid of making mistakes; be more focused on not missing the logical connections that give the research its heuristic importance and express your interest to the topic. Of course, the formulae have to be then carefully analyzed. You must consider the physical dimensions of the whole expression, and the extreme cases of the parameters when the system is strongly simplified, in each case, and the result is simply directly seen (i.e. independently derived). Does your formula give this result in the proper limit? If not, you must go back and find the mistakes. In this way you will finally obtain the correct equations, but not just this; the hard work of avoiding the trouble into which you fell with your mistakes will not be redundant, because in this way you will force yourself to see your mathematical problem from different sides (angles) and thus, finally, better understand your systems and the possible applications. Of course, the advice 'do not be afraid to make mistakes', i.e. *fall into a trouble*, that I actually give here, sounds anti-pedagogical, non-practical, even dangerous, but, as the matter of fact, on some such general psychological background the prophet and the 'motivating gap' created by him, which is well felt and well perceived by the others, arose."

Well, it is dangerous to be a Jew, and for giving this world the prophets and some such non-religious thinkers as Einstein, Freud and Marx, millions of simple Jews (one of the sides of the "gap") paid their lives.

From the position of my technical education, my creative nation sometimes seems to me to be like an electrical circuit with so many batteries that some of them unexpectedly become directly loaded on each other (which is very bad for the relatively weak batteries). *However*, there *are* moments when one sees the *spiritual* values introduced by Jews, when a Jew arises who knows *how* to bring the light to the

other nations, and, perhaps, even *how* to respectably and correctly "cast the pearls" before those who otherwise would wish to kill him, or at least to destroy the "pearls".

12. Summing up the "analytical position" regarding the Holocaust

Trying not to make things simpler than is possible, we replaced in Section 3 the not quite official, but actually accepted by many, position, which seemingly "naturalizes" the situation, but is, in fact, cynical:

A. Hitler, with the cruelty that he proposed and then realized, came to power because of some common, understandable causes.

by the position:

B. Hitler came to power because he had found an effective, though a cynical, solution (a kind of "medicine"), -- *the cruelty*, -- for the problem of a temporary overburden of the right hemisphere, which presumably took place in a large part of German population in the 20's and 30's, -- which he intuitively felt, and became a popular ruler, fanatically devoted to his effective idea.

Comment 3: Note that Stalin was never called "our doctor"; Hitler – was, and consider the easily found in Google speech of Ernst Janning at the Nuremberg Process, in which he said: "*We were afraid of ourselves*" and "if you, then you will see *what was Hitler for us*". When well thought out, this speech (that seems to be absolutely honest) covers not one page of the present text. However, how could it be that in the country of the great culture, very poorly educated and very unattractively behaving Adolph Hitler, became *very important* for the people? *Of course*, this strange unhealthy situation was based not on the common sense, but on some mental illness.

In view of the high traditional morality of the Germans, -- if explanation 'A' were to be true, then any moral, *education*, and the whole intellectual life over the centuries, not only of Germans, but of the whole of humanity, would be something completely unstable and, finally, miserable. However, undoubtedly, without moral stability, the existing temples of the human spiritual world, including the noble science and art, would fall long ago, and no religion could exist on the background of the assumption that the Holocaust was caused by reasons of normal human psychology. The whole history of mankind stands against explanation **A** *which is much more terrible and much more harmful for the honor of the great German nation than explanation B*.

It is important to stress that the deep cause for the Holocaust was absolutely not understood then, and is not explained in the vast existing post-WWII literature on the Holocaust and Nazism. All that the accepted treatments actually create is the unacceptable assumption that the most basic norms of human moral and behavior are something not stable, easily violated by propaganda.

Though it may be difficult for one to accept that a mental (the unusual "informational" or "intellectual") illness can relate to a significant part of a population, the spiritual health of the humanity indeed is under a stress that outlines the boundaries of human intellectual ability, and Jews who strongly contributed to development of the intellectualism were the first who paid the price.

I would be especially grateful to Germans for an unprejudiced approach to the present analytical position re the Holocaust. Many thanks are given to postwar Germany for its honest and kind support of the Jewish state, and there is no doubt that *all* humans in their basic (unperturbed) state of mind are universally and uniformly *good*. The suggested explanation of the Holocaust by means of the temporary problem of the intellectual overburden, scientifically, humanistically, and correctly puts the things on a firm foundation, and *thus* introduces the needed correct warning (that has to be considered by *all* nations and *all* rulers) which today becomes the main meaning of the Holocaust tragedy.

13. A comment about intellectuals supporting Hitler

It is important to see that Hitler's understanding of the noted problem regarding simple Germans was *intuitive*, and that he could not officially adopt any *anti-intellectual* position, certainly not against technological development that he needed for the war. His official position could be only nationalistic, and among his supporters there were not a few intellectuals, for instance, the outstanding German philosopher Martin Heidegger, who wanted, as did the others parts of the population, the reality and the moods in Germany to be improved.

For Heidegger personally, the principle of *acceptance of fate* was a motivation. By itself, the acceptance of fate is inherent also in our position; the distinction is in seeing the reasons via more extended moral *and logical* analysis that involves wider philosophically fundamental and historical perspectives. Later, Heidegger indeed defined (see, e.g., Wikipedia) his (past) sympathy to Nazism as a most stupid thing in his life. Undoubtedly, even high level intellectuals cannot always immediately understand the situation; the fact that the youth (the students), who always seek action, were enthusiastic about Hitler, just shows that the events were too tempestuous.

In any case, the sympathy of some intellectuals with Hitler does not contradict the thesis that simple people were strongly dissatisfied by the intellectual ideal of the society, and it is obvious that in large, Nazism was/is *not* any movement of intellectuals. According to [12], since 1920 "*The use of violence became a way of life for the Nazis*" who started to prevent by force meetings of other political parties. This definitely does not fit any intellectualism, just supports the hypothesis of [5] where it is written: "*Hitler was a strong leader with an intuitive ability to understand the crowd, but was very poorly educated in any sense, which was, obviously, absolutely not appropriate for a man who had gained such power, and Hitler in power is seen here as an unperceived rebellion of Germans against the intellectual overstress.*"

As is explained in Sections 2 and 3, Nazism was/is a movement of those simple people (not the intellectuals) who decided to fight against intellectualism that causes in them an internal problem, but one has to see that the guilt of the unhealthy euphoria of the intellectual power relates to the whole humanity, first of all to the intellectuals.

14. Conclusions and final remarks

1. A correlation between two eternal features of Jews, -- their tendency to intellectualism and their ability to cause antipathy (Anti-Semitism) was observed.

2. We have considered the general *background* for Anti-Semitism, or a "junction" of the topics of:

intellectualization of society, forced by human ambitious,

democratic ideals that *have* to support the wishes of simple people to live with a clear mind and be thus respected, but do not support,

objective importance of simplicity for the stability of the existence of humanity,

justice with respect to the (defined) "hooligans" of the "days of violence",

possible dangerous forms (as in the Holocaust) of the expressing of the intellectual overburden via the associated (dis)functioning of the hemispheres of the brain,

moral responsibility of the means of public information.

3. The general aspect of intellectualism is associated with redundant ambitions of humanity that without limits tries to develop the intellectual power that it cannot hold in view of the needs and wishes of the whole population.

4. The incorrect focuses of the means of public information can be classified as some naïve absence of wisdom, and thus we assume that *explaining and convincing* can be sufficient for improving the situation. However, every dictator, *in this case Intellect*, has a very strong bureaucratic apparatus (which, *ad hoc*, first of all is the means of information spreading), and it is unclear how easily the situation can be improved. Hopefully, when "armed" by the correct understanding of the threat of the intellectual aspect, the common sense can solve those problems.

5. In large, the present argument is just intended to convince one to be *constructive*, to pay more attention to, and take more responsibility for the "informational feeding" of society; not to be indifferent regarding the problem of the spreading of information, i.e. regarding the needed psychological and pedagogical control of the means of information. It *may be* that we can rather easily prevent the troubles. There were cases in the history when for terrible disasters simple solutions were found. For instance, the vaccine against cholera was such a solution. There *is* a real basis for the optimism, but in order to do the right things *one has to well see the danger*.

6. In Plato's "Republic", the democracy is said to be leading to a dictatorship. The given reason is that a leader arises, who has to become stronger and stronger for winning the countries' wars, and for this he has to gradually establish a dictatorship. This explanation is poorly relevant to the modern society, but democracy has found another way to create a dictatorship. Too much democratic rights given to the means of public information causes dictatorship of the *Intellect*, which, as we argue, is not an innocent dictatorship. The thesis of the great Greek thinker that a too extended democracy becomes (leads to) a dictatorship remains in force.

7. There is also a methodological argument, given in the Appendix, partly related to religious philosophy. One interested not only in the sociology aspect, also in the internal methodology of the developed analysis, can find this argument important for him.

Appendix: Some constructive religious philosophy: *detach and compare*

The vision of the world of human psychology *as an independent world* allows us to observe some useful analogies that are constructive for the analytical thought, while they use concepts understandably to everyone.

At its first step, we use a "method of detachment", having some religious character, which decisively separates between the psychological and the usual physical worlds and *thus* allows one (as the second step) to seek *similarities* helping in understanding the world of psychology.

This way is widely used in the present research, and explains some things that are insufficiently well, or not at all, explained otherwise. Thus, the analogy between the "digestion" of usual *and* intellectual foods *helps us to understand our intellectual limitations*, and the most general requirements of the *stability and order of our mind* also logically follow from the principle of correspondence and the obvious stability of different ordered processes observed in the physical world.

In the philosophical plane, one has to simply accept that we are given the two worlds in *order to be richer in any sense, and it is wrong to seek contradictions when always trying to have one explanation for each thing*. If the single explanation were exist in every case, then the problems of life would be similar to the problems of solving differential equations and all such problems would be successfully solved long ago.

Though we simultaneously live in the physical world and that of human psychology, we should not *mix* these worlds, allowing each to have its own purposes and logic. Thus, one's thinking *may* belong to only one of these worlds, -- that which is conceptually more relevant to his thought on line. However, we have the right to *compare* these well-familiar to us worlds.

There cannot be any real (objective) contradiction, between the things belonging to the different worlds, if one sees these worlds as independent. It is even the matter of elementary logic that *if things are defined (described) independently, then any contradiction between them can be only in the mind* of one who thinks that he can simplify the complicated reality given to us by Nature (God).

When a person is sincerely religious and also a good scientist (e.g., Newton was such), -- then religion and science are *not* mutually contradictory for him, and such one does not try to mix these basic fields. Such a person often observes that an explanation of science by religion is a funny naivety, while an explanation of religion by science is a cynicism. Any attempt to use either of these fields for explaining the other, inevitable spoils both fields; however, comparisons motivating the analytical thought can and should be suggested.

The common opinion that everything can be physically explained is good only in technical subjects, and is unhealthy in all others. Figurally speaking, in the quantitative aspect explainable things are like rational numbers whose structure is well known, while the things that a human can intuitively understand are like a continuum. In our perception, we have to be able to understand many things that cannot be deductively defined and explained.

Acknowledgements

Being a devoted citizen of Israel for about 40 years, I am forever indebted to Russia where I grew up and was educated (see also [10,11]). Though my tendency to independent thinking originates from my nation, my main intellectual treasure is the Russian language that developed, enriched, and even directed this thinking. I hope that the present work will improve the situation of Jews in the small Russian towns, considered in Section 8, where some people following the middle-ages' traditions, try to see in Jews the cause for all their woes, instead of requiring the really needed and justified respect from the whole society, -- this good and strong modern society that is charged, purposed and able to make everyone happy!

References

- [1] E. Gluskin, "An argument regarding the nature of hooligan behavior", DIALOGUE MENT NEURO SCI 2012; 5(2): 51-53. See at: <http://www.crossingdialogues.com/Ms-C12-01.pdf>.
- [2] E. Gluskin, "Electrical ANN Circuits (1-ports) and Schrödinger's 'What is Life?'"', Proceedings of the Int. Conference: *Nonlinear Dynamics of Electronic Systems* (NDES 2012, 11-13 July 2012, Wolfenbuttel, Germany), pp. 210-213. Found in IEEE Xplore. See also the set of slides for this conference presentation (especially the last part): <http://vixra.org/pdf/1207.0082v1.pdf>
- [3] L. Parle, "The English Riots: The Autopsy Is Well Underway", *Slaw*, December 12, 2011.
- [4] E. Schrödinger, "What is life?", First published in 1944., (Complete text is available at: http://whatislife.stanford.edu/LoCo_files/What-is-Life.pdf .) See Chapter 6.
- [5] E. Gluskin, "Cruelty as the 'medicine' treating an unbalance in the development of the brain's hemispheres," *International Journal of Neuroscience*, 119:1150–1154, 2009.
- [6] J. Bradshaw, "Hemispheric specialization and psychological function", Wiley, Washington (1989)
- [7] S. Pinker, "How the mind works", W.W. Norton, New York, 2004.
- [8] E. Gluskin, "Some System Comments on the Work of the Brain's Hemispheres: the Role of the 'Inputs' ", *American Journal of Systems Science* 2013, 2(1): 1-7. (DOI: 10.5923/j.ajss.20130201.01)
- [9] E. Gluskin, "The Cemetery", *SAJAH*, ISSN 0258-3542, volume 24, number 1, 2009: 196–200.
(See http://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/14004/Gluskin_Cemetery%282009%29.pdf?sequence=1)
- [10] E. Gluskin, http://www.raoulwallenberg.net/wp-content/files_mf/1329311391IgivetheFinalScorestoSweden.pdf ; <http://repository.up.ac.za/browse?value=Gluskin%2C+Emanuel&type=author>
- [11] E. Gluskin, "Memories about Sonya Gluskin(a)" (In Russian). <http://berkovich-zametki.com/2010/Zametki/Nomer7/Gluskin1.php>
- [12] http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/adolf_hitler_1918_to_1924.htm.