

## **You Are Smarter Than You Think II**

Marvin E. Kirsh

[Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com](mailto:Kirsh2152000@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

This essay is intended to raise to awareness the self, educational values as they emerge from modernly taught concepts, especially in the sciences and technologies with respect to concepts of a relative world, of ratios. The theory of relativity is employed in an analogy that demonstrates the over-employment of difficult to conceive quantitative methods. Introduced are concepts that in definition are intended to underline an indispensable place for the ordinary qualitative and comparative aspects of life, motion, relative motion, as an example of change, for the comprehension of concepts that have lost accessible definition and meaning as a result.

In a vast over populated world, problem solving with respect to man and nature has an emphasis on scholarship, excellence in scholarship, as a positive measure, moral standard enroute towards a goal of the applications of nature to serve a more humanely experienced existence, a buck is involuntarily passed to the highest recognized achievers for the responsibility of understanding the world, nature, and an associated planning of society. A comprehension of the factors that modulate the forces that have influence on these goals of a good life, comfort with respect to the elements, appears so complex, even from a perspective of those at the middle or highly educated level, at or beyond the college level, that a feeling of indecision, overwhelming, occurs in light of the paradoxes that are ubiquitously confronted at the outset of study. At the advanced level where it is felt confident that progress has been accomplished, it is not impossible that, in retrospect, initial definitions, first impressions, have become clouded and vague, result in confusion, doubt, denial in the form of self denigrations that lead to a compulsive dependence on logic, sophisticated theorizations dependant on an advanced comprehension of mathematics and profundities that are the product of intellectual integrations by others.

With respect to this situations are two associated topics:

- 1) Reliance on the opinion of experts?

## 2) Are recognized experts more able intellectually than myself?

With respect to 1) I have already pointed out the great complexities involved in the interpretation of nature. I wish to focus on topic 2) with the notion that nature is still not understood well regardless of the claimed level of accomplishment, not as well as claimed such that the paradoxes that you first perceived have only lost some acclaim to some new creatively created perspectives by which not only one new division is lent with which to view nature but a second one which divides the mind and common perceptions of the ordinary man from that of the creators of the new tools of perspective. The phenomenon of deception based on falsely construed divides by the human species, seeming to occur by opinion and vote, and the divide itself as topic is either passed by or reiterated invisibly in texts in efforts towards an understanding of it. There is thus 'a divide' that is not understood for which definition and delineation can be delegated to others, but despite high intellectual accomplishments, have no more an accomplished idea of it than yourself and have accomplished alternately the creation of additional divides and an alienation from the self entailed in the acceptance of a mistaken, pseudo, divide that is accompanied by a self fed self denigration that is fueled by the personal comforts afforded from the technologies generated from endeavors.

In simple words an understanding of change is not accomplished and replaced with ideas associated with at least one fixed perspective. A concept of motion, as if quantified from the fixed perspective of a pillar in a field of moving objects, has emerged into a world of non-comprehended intellectual pillars. This difficulty becomes obvious, in analogy, as a lacking with respect to the understanding of intellectual products in order to promote intellectual change (excuse the puns).

In simple words again, as one could proceed with a discussion of the theory of relativity (1,2), a theory that at its conception, seeking to say something about man, nature and perspective, contains the same divide discussed and failed resolution-it speaks of the transparent of which Einstein was an expert, but similarly says nothing about transparencies themselves; the transparency, changing transparency, physically, conceptually, instead of the stationery 'pillar' as a common denominator of man and nature together. Thus, if space in general has the (relative rather than mathematically relative containing a constant) properties given by Einstein, as must all of the internal processes that bring about the intellect as well as what is external to the self, cannot one replace the stationery pillar in the above example with himself; does it not move with the self to be stationery?;to define the transparency to be a ratio of self to

what is moving with respect to it-i.e. everything in the universe moves with a differential to the self and with respect to everything else to different unique extents such that the difference is expressed as the motions of perception, of the mind and cognition, in sensory experiences, of the (moving) images of vision, seeing etc.

If one comprehends this notion, a matter of contrasts, he is now an expert in physics and the theory of relativity. Might he ask to better himself, better educate himself with related ideas. How did Einstein result, as well as one himself seeks, to consolidate the world mathematically?; in an unaware manner to experience and fail to define a transparent oppression? What kinds of trouble, civilization trouble, can cause one, whether of the most probing intellects or of a whole civilization to sublimate, project that way, attribute a stationery aspect, conceive a constant, to nature in his highest conceptual interpretations of the world that are devoid of a real, however transparent, facet of change and relationship.

Once you have answered for yourself, you are at or way beyond the PhD level, though I do not know the subject. With respect to the theory of relativity I believe it refers to an invisible mass bearing on the environment of the earth-physics, geophysics? With respect to Sigmund Freud I believe it refers to self feeding, a self feeding fear of the self and change, psychology? With respect to Charles Darwin I believe it refers to paradox of mind and matter, design, creation and evolution- biology? With respect to Karl Marx I believe it refers directly to the trouble to conceive the self clearly in relation to nature/others, society, the economic and political problems associated with men, social classes, population- economics, political science, social science? With respect to ethics, man and nature, a natural ethic, the permissible free hand of men as members of the set of nature, the meaning of enlightenment with respect to choice and free will-philosophy?

Have I proved that you are oppressed and innately are smarter than you think?

## References

- 1) Einstein, Albert Physics and Reality Journal of the Franklin Institute 221:3 359-382  
March 1986
- 2) Einstein, Albert The Meaning of Relativity 5thed. Princeton University Press  
Princeton