

The Past Physics and a Future Sociology Revolutions

(An "Opinion" Paper)

Emanuel Gluskin

Kinneret College in the Jordan Valley (on the Sea of Galilee), 15132 Israel.
gluskin@ee.bgu.ac.il

Abstract – It is explained that sociology has to be drastically changed, in order to face the important problem of the growing *dictatorship of intellect* which will inevitable lead to intense societal stresses. It becomes more and more difficult for simple people, -- i.e. those who have the noble vocation to preserve, just by their simplicity, the healthy nature of the human, -- to live with a clear mind and be thus respected. The concepts of sociological research should be properly extended, becoming more "outdoor" and more "fighting". The sociology as a whole will (should) become a very important field of modern human thought.

As is well known from the history of physics, the common opinion of the end of the 19th century, was that there are no more interesting targets in the almost completed physics, and just several unexplained details remain. These details were:

1. The results of the Michelson Morley experiment showing that the movement of Earth does not influence the measurement of the velocity of light;
2. The high-frequency part of the spectrum of radiation of black-body radiation, which contradicts the classical theory of thermodynamic equilibrium.
3. The fact that even very intensive light of a low frequency cannot cause an electron to leave a metal, but even a very low-intensity light of a high frequency can do this.

The first item led Einstein (after some pioneering works of Lorenz and Poincare) to special relativity, and then to general relativity which is the modern theory of gravitation (used today even in the GPS systems known to every driver). The second item led Plank to introduction of the quantum constant of "action". The third item led Einstein to introduction of the concept of the photon. Then, Bohr, De Broglie, Pauli, Heisenberg, Shrodinger, Dirac and some others, created Quantum Mechanics as a great field of human knowledge. The resulted progress in electronic technology changed our life. The transistor, whose theory is based on quantum solid state physics, is the basis of micro-electronics, and thus the *whole* electronics around us is "quantum electronics".

The technological advance lead, furthermore, to great advances in communication that, figuratively speaking, became the "third apple", after that of the paradise, and that which fell on Newton's head, and it can be compared with the invention of the wheel. Does one like it, or not, the advance in communication that overflows us with

often redundant information (and thus recalls to me the words of Rashbi, a Jewish philosopher of ancient times, the founder of "Kabbalah": "*Gossip causes hate*"), -- all these discoveries and changes just very clearly show, -- to our point, -- that ***considering in science something unexplained as unimportant, is a great mistake.*** Real scientists are not ready to leave something not understood. A missing link in a logical scheme of physics was intolerable for the great physicists mentioned, and the old opinion regarding the "almost completed physics" sounds today like a joke. Famous Russian crystallographer E.S. Fyodorov (Fedorov), (1853-1919) said: "*Give us one new theorem, and we shall prove 40 others*". In the most basic foundations of any science, scientific logic, not tolerating any "holes", is most important.

With this observation regarding the necessity of scientific explanation of any individual, "strange" fact, let us turn to modern sociology.

As the matter of fact, academic sociology understands "almost everything", besides one "small" fact, namely the "Days of Violence" that shocked London several years ago. According to BBC reports of that time, the police stood over whelmed, not knowing why and from where all this fell up on it. The cause for the slogan of the defined hooligans "*We, the society and this world need violence!*" was absolutely not understood. It was just clear from this slogan that the well-organized hooligan actions had no relation to the usual protest against poor (social) welfare.

"Google", which is full of works devoted to "soccer hooliganism" (with the "academically necessary" experimental material in terms of the numbers of broken bottles and bones reported by police), does not even try to explain the Days of Violence that a real sociologist should, I think, perceive as something most interesting!

In our opinion, the works in [1] have closed the "hole" in the academic knowledge associated with the "Days of Violence", i.e. with some *need for violence (cruelty)*. The point put forward is that the intellectual overstress is continuing and increasing in the modern world. The defined hooligans of the "Days of Violence" are seen in [1] not so much as hooligans; more as simple people who are frightened by the more and more enhanced intellectual burden. *These people want to live with a simple mind and be thus respected.* They (as any of us) have no democratic means to fight against the dictatorship of Intellect, and instinctively try to reduce their internal worry by the cruelty, thus both resting from the intellectual overburden and restoring the balance between the activities of different parts of the brain. (Roughly, between the activities of the right and the left hemispheres, having in large very different functions, but such strong macroscopic separation of the relevant parts of the brain is not absolutely necessary for the existence of the problem.)

Does one wish it, or not, -- he will come to the necessity to close the "hole" in his sociological knowledge, just as the physicists had to do this in their physics knowledge, i.e. the era of a serious, fighting sociology will come. Without understanding the hidden sociological reality and the growing problem, humanity will come to great trouble [1].

As physics has passed through the mentioned revolutionary period, sociology will have to pass over its own, and, eventually, real young talents will come to this field having a huge potential, in order to make the revolution. They will have to consider the advances in biological studies of the brain, creating a bridge (presumably via such a *system approach* as we tried to develop in [2]) between the very complicated results of the biological researches and the "macroscopic" ("system") human behavior, relevant for sociology.

The time has come for more of human and societal attentions, and scientific efforts, to be directed to the field of sociology (understood not as some pet-cat that is all the times combed in order to remove from it all that just makes it vivid, but as the one who is not afraid to appear at the streets).

I ask the respectable staff of Academic Sociology to forgive me this "intervention" into the pastoral field of: their inherent rights, correct decisions of the type "*Look at the last issue of journal in order to see our editorial needs*", and nicely polished publications treating some easily understandable "experimental evidences". The point is that one, related to engineering/physics, is more adjusted to solving real and urgent problems, and, in general, it is just logical and often happens in science, that a possible contribution to a field is better observed from outside.

References

- [1] The viXra Manuscripts found at http://vixra.org/author/emanuel_gluskin (especially works 2, 6, and 8, and the final part of work 1).
- [2] E. Gluskin, " Some system comments on the work of the brain hemispheres: the role of the 'Inputs' ", American Journal of System Science, 2013, 2(1): 1-7. DOI: 10.5923/j.ajss.20130201.01.