

LETTERS TO PROGRESS IN PHYSICS

On Meta-Epistemic Determination of Quality and Reality in Scientific Creation (An Address to Those Against Real Science, Scientific Creation, Intellectual Freedom, and Epistemic Culture)

Indranu Suhendro

The Zelmanov Cosmophysical Group
<http://www.zelmanov.org>

This is an open letter entitled as “On Meta-Epistemic Determination of Quality and Reality in Scientific Creation”. An address to those against real science, scientific creation, intellectual freedom, and epistemic culture. Inspired by the Declaration of Academic Freedom.

Suffice it to say once and for all that you — and so many others like you — are not epistemically qualified to assess and categorize in any way my person, my work, nor any of my highly dignified and most devoted colleagues (as profoundly silent and understanding as they are), nor our scientific-philosophical group as a whole, both positively and negatively, whether in whole or in part. Such an attempt — particularly such a smug, narrow, shallow, pseudo-intellectual vacuity, which has foamed and mushroomed throughout certain loose forums, online and offline — is essentially epistemically superficial, hollow, arbitrary, and inauthentic, no matter how much pompous sophistication it displays (by this, I simply mean sophisticated solipsism, verbal and mental, stemming from the widespread, persistent epistemic problem of solipsistic syllogism and syllogistic solipsism). It has nothing whatsoever to do with the determination of Quality (quality-in-itself) and Reality (reality-in-itself) in the realmost sense.

The real tragedy of this world, at large (including academia), consists in the lack of epistemic character; of insight and creation (especially scientific creation); of independence and freedom; of objectivity and universality; of honesty and integrity; of solitude and originality; of “qualic” ideation, imagination, intellection, and identity; of a true sense of epistemicity and existentialism; of the ontic-epistemic unity of sight and sense — in other words, of Quality and Reality. These profound characteristics, throughout history, have never been, and will never be, embodied in the collective majority, let alone the very imitators (in contrast to real creators) and their stooges. These belong only to the truly solitary, independent, authentic few among intellectuals capable of not just filibustering and pan-handling raw fragments of knowledge, but also of critically and figuratively substantiating all types of knowledge and understanding. Such an individual is very, very rare.

If you have never heard, nor comprehended, notorious affairs in science such as the Erasmus affair, the Abel affair, the Galois affair, the Bolyai affair, the Wagener affair, the Dewey affair, the Alfven affair, the Sidis affair, the Pir-

sig affair, and, most recently, the Arp affair, the Wolfram affair, and the Perelman affair (alongside other such affairs in the annals of art and philosophy); whether you deem yourself a scientist or a lay person, you would better not assert anything potentially misleading in this category, especially publicly. As Michael Crichton once lamented, science is not the same, and should never be equal to, “consensus science” — with consensus (often very falsely, abusively masquerading as “democracy” and “objectivity”) often being the first and last hiding place (refuge) for scoundrels, mere biased opportunists and affiliates, and pseudo-scientists —; science is simply about one person (or a few), one thinker, one scientist, being correct (in the sense of expanding horizons), no matter how much public opposition and alienation (e.g. Faustian and Kierkegaardian epistemic alienation) he faces, thus contributing not only to the discovery of new facts, but also to the discovery of new ways of thinking and new landscapes of ideation.

That is why in this passage, I shall very militantly emphasize upon the sublime adjective “epistemic” repeatedly (though I generally do not repeat myself): a truly revolutionary science not only contains a new methodology and a new phenomenology, but also a new epistemology and epistemicity, a new ontology and onticity — it introduces new, vaster, more profound “paint”, “brush”, “canvas”, and “dimension”, along with a whole new sketch.

Thus, for instance, using the word “fringe” oversimplifyingly and over-homogenizingly when describing a very peculiar scientist or a scientific group, without ever bothering to base it on correct epistemic qualifications, is slanderous, non-scientific, and non-sensical, far removed from real scientific attitude (whether it is perpetrated by academics and politicians first-hand or by lay people). It is a latent trait of characterless pan-academic memesis and mimicry (e.g. as contrasted with the “mnemonist sense” of the Soviet scientist A. Luria) and of pseudo-objectivity, pseudo-science, and pseudo-skepticism (e.g. in the sense of the sociologist of science M. Truzzi).

Besides, basically there are two kinds of “fringes” (referring to both “mere outsiders” and “those who are self-conscious on the boundary”) with respect to the majority (“mob consciousness”) in any given domain of thought: 1) the utterly wrong “crackpot” one, which is just basic, quickly self-dispersing non-sense without any significance, and 2) the subtle, mercurial “vortical” one — frontier science laden with extreme originality, creativity, synthesis, and daringness —, which DOES have true, profound, substantial epistemic qualification, novelty, merit, and life (i.e. space and direction) in the sublime heart and vein of science, philosophy, and art.

Without this in the very life of the sciences, all good human endeavors, speculations, and ideas are as good as being suffocated, dwarfed, and nullified, and thus organically dead, instead of epistemically, creatively breathing, living, and winging. It is this cross-roads, frontier-type, revolutionary, vortical kind of science that matters the most in the penultimate, genuine progress of science, let alone all of humanity, a merit to be most fairly appreciated in its own universal time, not simply in a temporary “age” dominated by some contemporaneous power-structures and political interests.

To paraphrase Schopenhauer, every genuine — truly epistemically original and weighty — truth, along with its markedly lone proponents (included are the geniuses and mavericks concerned not with merely “adding color and ice to a pre-existing drink and cup”, but with opening new frontiers, dimensions, and grounds entirely), is effervescently conscious of three stages pertaining to the reactionary, abusive behavior of the crowd, the majority, whether practically in power or not: first, it is ignored; second, it is ridiculed, rejected, slandered, and violently opposed; third, it is accepted as “self-evident” — and yet this last phase is often only in conjunction with Oppenheimer’s (and Kuhn’s) warning, “they (the proponents of fortress status-quo) do not get convinced ever, they simply die first”.

In this sense, and only in this sense, there is no such a thing as a “single scientific method”. Serious paradigms co-exist at the frontiers not as mere parallels and alternatives with respect to each other, but already as profound alternating paradigms.

Genius, one with genuine academic freedom, is the very faculty responsible for novelty in individual scientific creation and collective scientific production, including, inevitably at a very fundamental level, new scientific theories, syntheses, and results as well as new ways of managing science altogether. This is because the structure of scientific revolution takes place simultaneously at methodological, phenomenological, axiological-ethical, epistemological, and even ontological levels. One cannot separate individual scientific creation and collective scientific production from the underlying philosophy and sociology of science. This way, self-aware epistemology serves as the very gradient on the slope of knowledge all the way to the mountain peak of sci-

entific progress and revolution.

Suppression, abuse, slander, and any other kind of ill-treatment done by the majority towards anything intellectually new and blossoming by a minority in this category can truly be likened to child abuse: for here we are dealing with the infancy and growth — as well as the very ground, seeds, roots — of future scientific clarity, superstructures, and foundations.

Science evolves, revolves, snarls, twists, and surmounts on tensed — indeed epistemically intense and maudlin — edges and ridges, on suave pavements and narrow lanes, on lone fulcrums and horizons, as well as in broad day-light and in long stringent evenings, in the silent wet limits of the world, in poignant cracks and labyrinths; and the spirit of scientific revolution, let alone dialectics, is embodied this way, through critical, paradoxical, synthetic, epistemic, universal free thinking. Any form of dogmatic suppression and stymie in science in any epoch (i.e. in antiquity, modernism, post-modernism, and “post-post-modernism”) is intolerable, a cumbersome instance which usually easily shows itself perfidiously in cases of epistemically hideous overfunding, over-politicization, over-elitism, over-sycophancy, over-patronizing, and over-establishment.

If one is not uniquely, naturally well-versed in these logico-dialectical strands of thinking, one is simply not a real scientist and creator capable of any profound insight and zenith. Such an attitude should also underlie a real, truly enlightened scientific enterprise and editorship: irrespective of the individual views of the editors and reviewers of a scientific guild, one must allow diverse new ideas to flourish and co-exist (as long as they are true new ideas, and not obvious “pieces of crackpottery”, in the minimum epistemic sense). This should naturally, winnowingly manifest spontaneous scientific-epistemic certainty and solidity, far removed from the prevalent type of superficial insecurity, fear, and suppression.

While a scientist, I am also an acutely epistemic artist, independent philosophical mind, keen observer-participant, and free thinker, and this indelible quality wholly underlies my scientific path. Insight, originality, creativity, and solitude are the things that matter the most to me — not mere conformity, suitability, respectability, and normalcy. If I display my work of art (e.g. painting, sculpture, and musical score), and if it is indeed my very own authentic creation and self-conscious novel expression of profundity and eccentricity, I need not list any so-called “references”: the object — the work — is ALREADY there in its entirety, and it is lone, universal, and transparent as it is, possessing both a verizon and a horizon. True originality shines through effortlessly, especially as regards scientific creation (and not mere “review” or “documentation”). There is no difference in this matter, whether I create scientifically, artistically, or philosophically: when I create something, I create it in a most comprehensive scientific, artistic, and philosophical sense. This ensures

real quality. Reality alone — and the Universe — is the parameter, not fallible and unqualified observers. It goes without saying that my “predecessors” in this drive naturally include Einstein, who did not bother to do the “administrative non-essentials” (listing so-called “references”) in his 1905 and subsequent revolutionary papers, and Wittgenstein, who hardly referred to some other work in his 1918 masterpiece *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*.

Pueril, arbitrary comments such as the ones you and the many often perpetrate in a popular forum, and in certain other forums, are but mere psychological detours, infinitely away from real objectivity, verging on typical character assassination and individual abuse. Given a Rembrandt painting, or at least a Modigliani one, or indeed the work of any pan-Renaissance artist, one should not speak of the “person” of the artist in such a cowardly, biased, envious way or hastily resort to ill-chatter, but, first and foremost, one should behold and withhold, witness and withstand, his very art, ALREADY laid bare and transparent for all its mystery and mastery. If one still does not know what one is trying to comprehend or appreciate here, one should at least possess silent humility before the horizon and verizon of things: the qualitative distance between substantial ideas and mere opinions is infinite and asymmetric. It is ethically, universally very lame to form mere borrowed opinions, to downplay certain contributions, and to resort to ad hominem attack, as is often the case. Opinions are mere opinions, not real ideas, let alone absolute truths. I repeat: “Doxa” is never the same as “Eidos”. One is here speaking of the determination and qualification of Reality and Quality, i.e. of “unicity” and “qualicity”.

Again, certain such popular treatments verging on the immoral and the ethically ill are epistemically very trivial, categorically replete with misleading logical error (non-sequitur), ad hominem attack, individual abuse, hyper-semiotics, hypernarration, oxymoronism, pseudo-science, pseudo-skepticism, pseudo-philosophy, pseudo-objectivity, solipsism, and epistemic shallowness.

You know nothing about us first-hand, absolutely nothing. You have only seen shadows and facades, and have only heard petty rumors, slander, and gossip (while we never seek enemies and pettiness in any case). We protect our individuality and wish to advance common scientific freedom and objectivity so universally much, perhaps “too much”, that we rarely enlist “who we are”, other than simply delivering our objectives. An objective of ours is not mere “inter-subjectivity”, but truly epistemically qualified.

As regards “who we are”, we are simply peculiar general relativists and cosmologists as well as core theoreticians and experimentalists. Also, we have never enlisted all our helpers/supporters one by one as well as our real “address” at length — only a decoy tertiary one for mere administrative and convenience purposes, not scientific purposes — for it

matters not whether we reveal such things or not. What matters is the science. We are a core body of just a few acutely epistemic- progressive science creators throughout the world. That said, our group has more than one headquarters in the world. What essentially matters is the real scope, puissance, renaissance, and dimension of our scientific productivity and guardianship. We, a unique combination of the “very young” and “very old”, epistemically and experientially, are serving science, philosophy, artistry, and humanity with all our strength, in necessary absolute freedom.

Indeed, some of us have had core scientific experiences as far back as the two world wars and the cold war along the contours of history, scientific creation, existential alienation, political turbulence, and cultural-scientific administration. A lot of us have synthesized first-hand the landscapes of both core Soviet and American science, East and West, and beyond. We are neither “big” nor “small”; we are infinite and infinitesimal. We know the world within and without, within-the-within and without-the-without. We alone know who we are. We know history and the human tendencies very well. We truly know where we have come from and where we are heading. We are quintessentially scientific and humanistic.

We do not populate typical non-scientific forums (especially countless on the internet), where mere bipolar, biased opinions are inevitably found in abundance: we are scientists in the most extreme sense of epistemic integrity and predisposition. We do not have time for trinkets, no matter how popular or trendy. We cherish creative solitude, universality, objectivity, independence, and democracy, so uniquely, so intensely, in a single, most variegated meta-epistemic framework, in order to be able to fully, impartially contribute to the betterment of our world in the way we know the most.

Do not bother to respond to this letter: you and so many others are not qualified to do so properly. Doing so shall only reveal, again and again, the very epistemic limitations you have at your core, and hence the very lack of substance lingering therein. Besides, this address is not a mere intellectual rambling or raving, it is simply meant to be a celestial sonnet akin to an ocean symphony and a contrapuntal melody, with “all the secret knowledge of harmony and counterpoint”. Now, we shall withdraw into infinite silence, as usual, ever-pugnaciously dwelling in the realm of pure scientific creation.

Thus I hereby declare, once again, all-time individual and collective academic freedom in science, from science, to science, for science.

* * *

Dedicated in the name of truth, beauty, science, creativity, freedom, and genius to Grisha Perelman. And to a much better world rid of the rigid and frigid excess of characterless politics, solipsism, suppression, tyranny, and conformity; a most tranquil, vivid, living world-organism genuinely fond of self-growth and of ideation, individuation, character, liberty, and honesty.

Appendix: Overture on Character and Independence*

Talent warms-up the given (as they say in cookery) and makes it apparent; genius brings something new. But our time lets talent pass for genius. They want to abolish the genius, deify the genius, and let talent forge ahead.

Kierkegaard

Philosophy becomes poetry and science imagination, in the enthusiasm of genius.

Disraeli

In every work of genius, we recognize our own rejected thoughts; they come back to us with a certain alienated majesty.

R. W. Emerson

Genius is the ability to act rightly without precedent — the power to do the right thing the first time.

Elbert Hubbard

Society expresses its sympathy for the geniuses of the past to distract attention from the fact that it has no intention of being sympathetic to the geniuses of the present.

Celia Green

There is in every [such] madman a misunderstood genius whose idea, shining in his head, frightened people, and for whom delirium was the only solution to the strangulation that life had prepared for him.

Antonin Artaud, of Van Gogh

The case with most men is that they go out into life with one or another accidental characteristic of personality of which they say: "Well, this is the way I am. I cannot do otherwise". Then the world gets to work on them and thus the majority of men are ground into conformity. In each generation a small part cling to their "I cannot do otherwise" and lose their minds. Finally there are a very few in each generation who in spite of all life's terrors cling with more and more inwardness to this "I cannot do otherwise". They are the geniuses. Their "I cannot do otherwise" is an infinite thought, for if one were to cling firmly to a finite thought, he would lose his mind.

Kierkegaard

It is easy to live after the world's opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after your own; but the great man is he who, in the midst of the crowd, keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude.

R. W. Emerson

I call that mind free which protects itself against the usurpations of society, which does not cower to human opinion, which feels itself accountable to a higher tribunal than man's, which respects itself too much to be the slave of the many or the few.

Channing

The genius differs from us men in being able to endure isolation, his rank as a genius is proportionate to his strength for enduring isolation, whereas we men are constantly in need of "the others", the herd; we die, or despair, if we are not reassured by being in the herd, of the same opinion as the herd.

Kierkegaard

Talent is hereditary; it may be the common possession of a whole family (e.g. the Bach family); genius is not transmitted; it is never diffused, but is strictly individual.

Otto Weininger

The age does not create the genius it requires. The genius is not the product of his age, is not to be explained by it, and we do him no honour if we attempt to account for him by it . . . And as the causes of its appearance do not lie in any one age, so also the consequences are not limited by time. The achievements of genius live for ever, and time cannot change them. By his works a man of genius is granted immortality on the earth, and thus in a threefold manner he has transcended time. His universal comprehension and memory forbid the annihilation of his experiences with the passing of the moment in which each occurred; his birth is independent of his age, and his work never dies.

Otto Weininger

It is the genius in reality and not the other who is the creator of history, for it is only the genius who is outside and unconditioned by history. The great man has a history, the emperor is only a part of history. The great man transcends time; time creates and time destroys the emperor.

Otto Weininger

Genius is the ability to escape the human condition; Humanity is the need to escape.

Q. Uim

Some superior minds are unrecognized because there is no standard by which to weigh them.

Joseph Joubert

Thousands of geniuses live and die undiscovered — either by themselves or by others.

Mark Twain

Geniuses are like thunderstorms. They go against the wind, terrify people, cleanse the air.

Kierkegaard

A genius is one who can do anything except make a living.

Joey Adams

Could we teach taste or genius by rules, they would be no longer taste and genius.

Joshua Reynolds

*Courtesy: Kevin Solway's extensive philosophical library.

Genius is the highest morality, and, therefore, it is every one's duty. Genius is to be attained by a supreme act of the will, in which the whole universe is affirmed in the individual. Genius is something which "men of genius" take upon themselves; it is the greatest exertion and the greatest pride, the greatest misery and the greatest ecstasy to a man. A man may become a genius if he wishes to. But at once it will certainly be said: "Very many men would like very much to be *original geniuses*", and their wish has no effect. But if these men who "would like very much" had a livelier sense of what is signified by their wish, if they were aware that genius is identical with universal responsibility — and until that is grasped it will only be a wish and not a determination — it is highly probable that a very large number of these men would cease to wish to become geniuses.

Otto Weininger

Universality is the distinguishing mark of genius. There is no such thing as a special genius, a genius for mathematics, or for music, or even for chess, but only a universal genius. The genius is a man who knows everything without having learned it.

Otto Weininger

Genius is the capacity for productive reaction against one's training.

Bernard Berenson

It is frequently the tragedy of the great artist, as it is of the great scientist, that he frightens the ordinary man. If he is more than a popular story-teller it may take humanity a generation to absorb and grow accustomed to the new geography with which the scientist or artist presents us. Even then, perhaps only the more imaginative and literate may accept him. Subconsciously the genius is feared as an image breaker; frequently he does not accept the opinions of the mass, or man's opinion of himself.

Loren Eiseley, in "The Mind as Nature"

I swear to you, sirs, that excessive consciousness is a disease — a genuine, absolute disease. For everyday human existence it would more than suffice to have the ordinary share of human consciousness; that is to say, one half, one quarter that that which falls to the lot of a cultivated man in our wretched nineteenth century [...] It would, for instance, be quite enough to have the amount of consciousness by which all the so-called simple, direct people and men of action live.

Fyodor Dostoevsky

Great geniuses have the shortest biographies. Their cousins can tell you nothing about them.

R. W. Emerson

The genius is not a critic of language, but its creator, as he is the creator of all the mental achievements which are the material of culture and which make up the objective mind, the spirit of the peoples. The "timeless" men are those who make history, for history can be made only by those who are

not floating with the stream. It is only those who are unconditioned by time who have real value, and whose productions have an enduring force. And the events that become forces of culture become so only because they have an enduring value.

Otto Weininger

Talent, lying in the understanding, is often inherited; genius, being the action of reason or imagination, rarely or never.

Samuel T. Coleridge

When a true genius appears in this world, you may know him by this sign, that the dunces are all in confederacy against him.

Jonathan Swift

Precisely because the tyranny of opinion is such as to make eccentricity a reproach, it is desirable, in order to break through that tyranny, that people should be eccentric. Eccentricity has always abounded when and where strength of character has abounded; and the amount of eccentricity in a society has generally been proportional to the amount of genius, mental vigor, and moral courage it contained. That so few dare to be eccentric marks the chief danger of the time.

John Stuart Mill

Genius is its own reward; for the best that one is, one must necessarily be for oneself... Further, genius consists in the working of the free intellect., and as a consequence the productions of genius serve no useful purpose. The work of genius may be music, philosophy, painting, or poetry; it is nothing for use or profit. To be useless and unprofitable is one of the characteristics of genius; it is their patent of nobility.

Schopenhauer

Great passions are for the great of souls. Great events can only be seen by people who are on a level with them. We think we can have our visions for nothing. We cannot. Even the finest and most self-sacrificing visions have to be paid for. Strangely enough, that is what makes them fine.

Oscar Wilde

Fortunately for us, there have been traitors and there have been heretics, blasphemers, thinkers, investigators, lovers of liberty, men of genius who have given their lives to better the condition of their fellow-men. It may be well enough here to ask the question: What is greatness? A great man adds to the sum of knowledge, extends the horizon of thought, releases souls from the Bastille of fear, crosses unknown and mysterious seas, gives new islands and new continents to the domain of thought, new constellations to the firmament of mind. A great man does not seek applause or place; he seeks for truth; he seeks the road to happiness, and what he ascertains he gives to others. A great man throws pearls before swine, and the swine are sometimes changed to men. If the great had always kept their pearls, vast multitudes would be barbarians now. A great man is a torch in the darkness, a beacon: in

superstition's night, an inspiration and a prophecy. Greatness is not the gift of majorities; it cannot be thrust upon any man; men cannot give it to another; they can give place and power, but not greatness. The place does not make the man, nor the scepter the king. Greatness is from within.

Robert Ingersoll

No one suffers so much as he [the genius] with the people, and, therefore, for the people, with whom he lives. For, in a certain sense, it is certainly only "by suffering" that a man knows. If compassion is not itself clear, abstractly conceivable or visibly symbolic knowledge, it is, at any rate, the strongest impulse for the acquisition of knowledge. It is only by suffering that the genius understands men. And the genius suffers most because he suffers with and in each and all; but he suffers most through his understanding...

Otto Weininger

He is a man of *capacity* who possesses considerable intellectual riches: while he is a man of *genius* who finds out a vein of new ore. Originality is the seeing nature differently from others, and yet as it is in itself. It is not singularity or affectation, but the discovery of new and valuable truth. All the world do not see the whole meaning of any object they have been looking at. Habit blinds them to some things: short-sightedness to others. Every mind is not a gauge and measure of truth. Nature has her surface and her dark recesses. She is deep, obscure, and infinite. It is only minds on whom she makes her fullest impressions that can penetrate her shrine or unveil her Holy of Holies. It is only those whom she has filled with her spirit that have the boldness or the power to reveal her mysteries to others.

William Hazlitt

Genius is present in every age, but the men carrying it within them remain benumbed unless extraordinary events occur to heat up and melt the mass so that it flows forth.

Denis Diderot

The ego of the genius accordingly is simply itself universal comprehension, the center of infinite space; the great man contains the whole universe within himself; genius is the living microcosm. He is not an intricate mosaic, a chemical combination of an infinite number of elements; [...] as to his relation to other men and things must not be taken in that sense; he is everything. In him and through him all psychical manifestations cohere and are real experiences, not an elaborate piece-work, a whole put together from parts in the fashion of science. For the genius the ego is the all, lives as the all; the genius sees nature and all existences as whole; the relations of things flash on him intuitively; he has not to build bridges of stones between them.

Otto Weininger

I made art a philosophy, and philosophy an art: I altered the minds of men and the colour of things: there was nothing I said or did that did not make people wonder... I treated Art

as the supreme reality, and life as a mere mode of fiction: I awoke the imagination of my century so that it created myth and legend around me: I summed up all systems in a phrase, and all existence in an epigram.

Oscar Wilde, in *De Profundis*

Submitted on: May 16, 2013 / Accepted on: July 21, 2013