

# Is the IQ of Humankind overtaxed for 3 Generations?

Otto E Rossler\*

Faculty of Science, Germany

## Opinion



**\*Corresponding author:** Otto E Rossler, Faculty of Science, University of Tuebingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 8, 72076 Tuebingen, Germany

**Submission:**  March 02, 2020

**Published:**  March 10, 2020

Volume 3 - Issue 3

**How to cite this article:** Otto E Rossler. Is the IQ of Humankind overtaxed for 3 Generations?. *Nov Res Sci.*3(3). NRS.000564.2020.  
DOI: [10.31031/NRS.2020.3.000564](https://doi.org/10.31031/NRS.2020.3.000564)

**Copyright@** Otto E Rossler, This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

It is very unlikely to come into such a situation as the present writer is in at the moment. The explanation is, of course, that all credit belongs to Fritz Zwicky who in the year 1929 discovered that light roaming a cauldron of whirling galaxies is bound to lose energy – as an explanation of the famous cosmological redshift law discovered the same year by his direct colleague Edwin Hubble. The new fundamental science invoked by Zwicky would 8 decades later be described explicitly in a 3-particle special case by Klaus Sonnleitner in Tuebingen, and independently by Ramis Movassagh in the U.S., both published in 2010. I was only able to contribute the name for the new fundamental science found. Being a twin sister to Thermodynamics, the new science was called “Cryodynamics.” Note that *kryós* in Greek means cold just as *thermós* means hot. The name has nothing to do with a cool temperature as such, but only with the fact that the laws involved have the opposite character to the laws of Thermodynamics (which likewise apply at all temperatures). Specifically, a particle passing through a gas of mutually attractive (rather than ultimately repulsive) particles will not as usual get equipartitioned – that is, get heated up if the other particles that it is interacting with are hotter (have a higher kinetic energy), but rather will on the contrary be cooled down. This holds true automatically for light negotiating a cauldron of moving galaxies. The light hereby has a very much lower kinetic energy but nonetheless is being preyed upon energetically – a case of “energetic capitalism” in Sonnleitner’s words. Rather than getting equipartitioned (heated up), as this is the case for all other known gases, these particles get “anti-equipartitioned” – cooled down. Hence the Hubble law follows as a direct implication in the absence of any added assumption like that of cosmic expansion [1].

This fact was first discovered by Zwicky in 1929 who had a knack for challenging his contemporaries. He in this way proved brighter than the rest of humankind for three whole generations. His rehabilitation is based on the existence of a new form of heat theory, Cryodynamics, as mentioned. The latter can now be put to practical use by building interactively controllable fusion reactors which would not otherwise be possible. Zwicky hence acts as a benefactor of humankind by enabling it to do without the thousands of ineffective wind craft rotors already in existence or else in planning.

The planetary economy is therefore indebted to Zwicky in the long run. But that is not all. The new science also has a disquieting aspect to it. The traditional gas theory is currently misleadingly applied also to a second technological sector, that of particle colliders. The hope is that a new kind of particles can be generated in CERN’s LHC collider – miniature black holes – which will then “evaporate” by the Hawking mechanism. This hope is disproved now as far as the second part is concerned. The second part – to experimentally find the predicted “Hawking radiation” – has lost its justification as we saw, even though it originally motivated the construction of the superlative “Large-Hadron-Collider” experiment LHC at CERN in Switzerland. But in the wake of Cryodynamics now [2-4], two colliding particles can now no longer annihilate each other into Hawking radiation as this was believed so far. Rather, the two will either scatter into many secondary particles or else jointly form a heavier slow particle – a micro black hole –, provided the collinear collision energies are high enough at CERN as no one can tell to date.

Owing to Cryodynamics, the hoped-for black holes if produced at CERN can no longer Hawking-evaporate. They will either fly away from earth if fast enough or else – if a rare specimen is slower than the Keplerian escape speed – it will stay inside earth where it is going to grow. This growth will most likely take place in an exponential fashion inside terrestrial matter. Hence after a delay of the order of years, the first gotten-stuck black hole will become manifest on earth through its uninhibited growth, devouring everything around it in an exponential fashion so as to transform the earth ball into a 1 cm black hole in a matter of years which will then continue to be circled by the moon.

No one objects to this dismaying scenario. CERN's only response is loud silence. More specifically, the CERN community decided that it cannot renew its last learned planetary safety report LSAG (for "Large-Hadron-Collider Safety Assessment Group") from early 2008. But instead of saying so openly, CERN chose to leave the LSAG undated so that it looks fresh to every onlooker who shuns a closer analysis. In the absence of a single careful critic having surfaced since early 2008, CERN decided it could afford to continue with its universe-record symmetric particle collisions on a single celestial body in the universe – without safety report.

Maybe the secret decision to keep a lid on the un-disproved danger was a good idea after all, even though I tried my best to end it? I agree that if the risk incurred is minuscule [5,6], it is ethically allowed to keep a lid on the matter. However, even in that case,

letting CERN continue with its billions of on average symmetric collisions getting accumulated over the years, appears counter-advisable in my humble opinion.

But the reality is that no one knows about the actual probability of a giant risk being incurred or not. But fact is that all of these discussions did start out from the assumption that Hawking evaporation is a reliable sign of successful black hole formation. And fact is also that they were all based on not yet knowing about the existence of Cryodynamics. And ignoring the fact that the science of gases that are made up from mutually attractive particles was established by Zwicky in 1929 already.

## References

1. <http://lsag.web.cern.ch/LSAG-Report.pdf>
2. Movassagh M (2010) A time-asymmetric process in central force scatterings. Physics arXiv:1008.0875.
3. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-New-Science-of-Cryodynamics-and-Its-Connection-R%C3%B6ssler/d99faeef1768b1a74598b9c6bc137f67945ada93>
4. Sonnleitner K (2010) StV4: Ein symplektisches zeitreversibles Störmer-Verlet-Verfahren vierter Ordnung für Hamiltonsche Mehrteilchensysteme mit zwei Anwendungsbeispielen.
5. <https://docplayer.org/12694730-Dissertation-vorgelegt-von-dipl-math-klaus-sonnleitner-aus-erftstadt-frauenthal-bei-koeln.html>
6. Zwicky F (1929) On the red shift of spectral lines through interstellar space. Proc Nat Ac Sci 15: 773-779.

For possible submissions Click below:

Submit Article