A pragmatic approach towards sociology.

Johan Noldus

March 25, 2013

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to propose guidelines to construct workable and calculable models of society in which essential features are disentangled from gratuite desires emanating from the personal morality of its author. This is not to say that the model at hand should not contain a moral aspect, but that the specific form of the latter is a necessary byproduct bounded in time.

1 Introduction

It is not a shame that contemporary social sciences are not satisfying the same criteria as their exact cousins are; what is problematic however is that the gap is far too wide and in my opinion, as an exact scientist, the problem does not reside in the mathematical camp but in its social counterpart. The question of organization of society is an old one which is at the same time its major problem in the sense that only historical accounts are available and the latter unfortunately are not very trustworthy. Sociology is a field which embraces many different sub-branches such as genealogy, psychology, morality, biology and it uses as tools the exact sciences, engineering, medicine, jurisdiction and military amongst others in order to come to a sustainable form of society, where the main pilars are ideological in nature[1]. One of the few trustworthy lessons we can draw from history is that systemic and therefore ideological failures have always been resolved through a dirty revolution and that the latter usually never brought the desired liberation, but merely a change in outlook as well as a different form of pragmatism. A serious problem of sociology as a science is that psychology nor morality satisfy this criterion due to the practical limitations on properly calibrating the environment as well as cleansing the subject of study from possibly relevant historical experiences; not to mention the justified legal restrictions on doing so[2]. Logically, the approach is therefore very ideological and its practices demagogic giving this author the uncomfortable impression that in this way, one will never break the revolutionary loop. It is unfortunately the case that even psychology, which *is* in principle open to a scientific approach, seriously suffers from, amongst others, these limitations and this paper is a humble attempt to break this feedback circle within a practical framework which might be possible from a legal point of view.

This paper will systematically treat the following issues in the respective order:

---

[1]Such as the ten commandments in the bible as to speak.
[2]Physicists would call this a "backreaction" problem.

(a) the methodology of the field shall be argued from the *global* perspective and against a *local* small scale approach, (b) a pragmatic instead of a principled approach is argued for meaning the number of guiding principles should be kept to a strict mininum (c) a study towards (more or less) objective quantization is introduced. Towards (a), let me emphasize that physicists have understood since decades that foundational experiments need to be performed in large scale projects requiring billions of dollars such as is the case for the Large Hadron Collider under the Alps near Geneva. The kind of "experiments" or better to speak "observations" I will describe later on are in need for much more organizational preparatory work than the physicist's study of elementary particle collisions. Concerning (b), also this is mainly a physicist's or mathematician's approach where we try extract a few basic principles allowing for a multitude of consistent dynamics where the eventual choice on which path to follow may be determined by pure luck or historical data not taken into account in the description. The issue here is that the choice of principles must be flexible enough for many alternative equivalent formulations to exist allowing for continuous transitions between different kinds of dynamics in case some parameters, such as the law, in society ought to change; also, they must be easily quantifiable in order to make a quantitative analysis in contrast to current practices in social sciences. (b) is the most difficult step, since asking for the right questions may lead to a considerably more transparent analysis which is the aim of (c).

2   Methodology.

In contrast to the physics of elementary particles or of planets in a gravitational computation, humans and animals in general are simply far too complicated to give a good effective modelling for if it were not that their behavior would be confined to very simple situations such as traffic jams. For this very reason, statistical analysis of not easy to quantify data has been a major tool in as well sociological as psychological research; obviously, such methods have serious drawbacks and more often than not, lead to the wrong conclusions. A major objective is that such research is behavioristic *and* individual which departs from an a priori vision on society by even the mere choice of the researcher who is supposed to represent a particular important group while it should be a possible conclusion of the study if this group is really important or not. Indeed, the subjective notion of "behaviour" which has been largely objectified in the more broad term of "local culture", imposed by higher power structures in society, is the starting point of every "observation" and it is rather strange to notice that the respective class of observers which has been chosen in such a particular way, is largely unaware of this. Therefore, the ultimate question is how to erase this a priori "cultural" influence and undress sociology of this unnecesary baggage: the answer I will explain here and elaborate upon is that such research has to be done on a global scale in a collective way and that only very basic behavioristic parameters should be included in the analysis since it is reasonable to assume that the others wash out on large space and time scales[3]. Research in that direction on small scales has been performed at the end of the 19'th century by the observation of primitive triabs[4] in central Africa; however,

---

[3]This is literally erasing the cultural factor.
[4]It was therefore not "acultural".

a grand study of the Western Civilization has only become possible after the second world war and such study would neither classify as acultural. Due to cruel nazi practices during the 1930 ties, it has unfortunately become taboo to raise the issue of the correlation between race and behavioral traits where the former is not only defined by means of physionomy, colour of skin, geographical and genealogical descent but possibly also, more recently, by innate differences in tissue and brain structures[5]. That is to say, I believe the primary component of any sociological research to be the biological one and it appears to me that not too much attention has been spent to this issue. It would be interesting to have an idea about biological, political and in general "cultural" stability of different races and hows it intertwines with cultural and structural[6] issues in the respective societies as seen from an culturally unbiased point of view. In this way, it might be possible to reduce the sociological interaction between different races to a biological one on timescales of a hundred years or a few hours while on timescales of a few decades some historical variables, such as important conflicts or wars, certainly dominate and leave serious traces.

Such an approach would be of an extremely practical benifit since it is open for importation to the individual case[7] and could be used in conflict avoidance by governemental agencies. The main question to be answered prior to engaging in specific proposals is whether the required means justify the potential benefits of the acquired knowledge. Alas, we only dispose of historical sources here[8] and those reveal racial wars, gender surpression, imperial slaughters between competing races and many other unpretty events having cost the life of millions of people. At this moment in history, we are appearantly living in a democracy and older power structures have become somewhat more hidden albeit they are still dominant. The effect of this is that hard killing has been replaced by a somewhat softer form: a necessary thing since politicians did not succeed yet in explaining systematic birth control from a natural point of view to its citizens. Indeed, the absence of a system almost eliminating physical violence and paying at the same time due respect to Darwin, something we must all aspire, causes an unbridled confusion about whom has to pay the bill; the current concensus being that the weakest ones are "softly" eliminated and certain strongest ones being weakened, and if that is still not sufficient "removed". Such a mess which orginates from a deep rooted mistrust between different races (of distinct intelligence) not only justifies but necessitates a fundamentally biological and psychological global research of how to structure society so that the above two principles (a) elimination of physical violence and (b) letting Darwin do what he does best are respected. Another reason, apart from the racial one, why such research has to be global is because one can better estimate the importance of systemic choices in this way; so how to perform such research ? The easiest way would be to deliver an implant in the neighborhood of the knot (around the ears) of the trigeminal nerve of any human a few years after birth; in this way all visual and auditive information can be gathered and even steered if you

---

[5] Although I am not aware of systematic differences having been published.

[6] For example concerning hyriarchical, legislatory and spiritual institutions.

[7] Just as it happened for quantum mechanics of elementary particles.

[8] And most likely unpublished medical data too.

equip the miniscule device with a transmitter and receiver[9] possibly without the subject of study even knowing that it is there. However, in case a receiver is present, the reader can imagine what such device could do, it could influence your heartrate (and actually even stop it), close your eyelids so that you fall asleep, project ghostly images on the signal coming from your eyes, distort your sensations about virtually all parts of your body and so on.... Actually, overzeleous popes or cardinales could be of the opinion that it could very well serve to unnecessarily prolong the belief in a universal God, ghosts and all kinds of supernatural beings or to promote the Christian thought that pain and suffering are worthwhile living for. Even if only a transmitter were present, it would still pose a serious infliction on your privacy if those people governing the coded information coming from your device are not too careful in dealing with it. Moreover, I feel it would be hard to make such practice publicly acceptable; nevertheless, visual and auditive information is needed and alternatives would consist in putting camera's at social meeting places such as your job, shopping center, traffic roads, bars and so on governed by central instancies such as the state security or secret services. However, this concerns only passive information gathering; in order to steer the process, you need to build whole social structures, including cities and specific public transport lines to study how people of certain different races and or gender interact with one and another. The succes of your model is measured by the lesser amount of police work, psychiatric facilities, licenced psychologists and hospitals you have to allow for; Belgium is not doing too well in that respect, the northern part of the country with around 5 million inhabitants having more psychiatric facilities than the whole of England.

3 Principles.

Governing principles should only include human rights, elimination to the greatest extend of physical violence and maximal Darwinistic evolution; by the former I mean maximal freedom of choice[10] without damaging the very fabric of society. That is, society must be stable, simple, "free", protective and biologically progressive[11]. The difficult part is how to realize this goal and as mentioned previously, I tend to think that biological, including genetic, research concerning the racial question may offer a valuable perspective on the issue of mild geographical segregation of too diverse races within a single state unit. Indeed, segregation is mandatory since the distinctions within humanity are too large for all of them to live together in a mixed bag; however, it cannot be too large either in the average sense if the geographical separation is not wide enough since that would result in tensions between cities and city wars certainly have existed in the past. On the other hand, some mild tensions could have a mutually productive and benificial outcome in the long run as innovation and progress de facto originate from distinction. It should be noted that the largest cities equipped with a good segragation plan could carry the biologically most advanced people as can the smallest villages; mid sized towns or cities are not capable for this since nor

---

[9]If the device would span some part of the temporal lob, it could even mess with your short term memory.

[10]The word choice must be interpreted here as a potentiality and not as being necessarily desirable. However, the idea is that a desirable choice must exist.

[11]Which will automatically imply technical evolution.

mass, nor the lack of distinction can make such people socially acceptable. The least advanced however profit from a mid sized community for as well social[12] as logistic reasons. Another remark one could make is that within the choice of a suitable metric system, the diversity can become larger with increasing population number N of a community, but the spread[13] should have an absolute upper bound in racial diversity since otherwise internal tensions would arise in the population. In order to keep such system stable, one needs to educate people about the model and make it largely public so that conscious choices about labour, vacation destinations and city trips can be made; also, for the top layer of Darwinian evolution, it might be necessary to impose procreation rules in the sense that temporary limitions on *breeding* partners might be imposed so that the gap with "average" society does not become too wide. Likewise, limitations on the number of siblings for the average part of population might be imposed in accordance with the Chinese model so that there is a guided growth pattern causing a sustainable evolution. The largest obstacle, in my view, at this point in time for evolution towards such a society constitutes the acceptance of a moral diversity which requires the elimination of religious extremism as well as some non-dissaproved stories about supernatural beings historically emanating from clerical sources. Indeed, the key word here is respect which constitutes the core of the British society, but has unfortunately, in spite of the endeavour of the multicultural society, found insufficient resonance on the European continent. All this requires the acceptance that morality is emergent, instead of fundamental and, although it does not necessitate the following, an emergent God[14] would enhance the stability of society. Given the current situation of the church, it would actually be benificial for her to *tolerate* such point of view since it would enhance her appeal in modern society.

This is not to say that I think a moral institution such as the church is not necessary, on the contrary even, but I do know that the gap between society and exact sciences in particular on one hand and the somewhat more moralistic and therefore more gratuite religious teachings of the church on the other cannot become too wide. Otherwise, unbearable tensions do arise which could cause a worldwide religiously inspired third world war, something only extremists are interested in. In this regard, big cities require a special schooling system for highly gifted students which is preferably religiously unbiased and particular small villages might dismiss a parochy on their territory all together. Paradoxically, this probably would improve the position of the church since by being less dogmatic, it is possible to genuinely open to a larger group of people. Another extremal solution would consist in isolating some potential neurological causes for jealousy and agression and to pharmaceutically surpress those, if possible, in target groups having those conflict erupting traits in abundance; one could also opt for mixed strategies between the pharmaceutical and systemic model I have just sketched.

---

[12]The presence of caretaking facilities, the possibility for social contact.

[13]That is, the $n(N)$ sigma level should at most incoorporate and $m(n, N)$ racial diversity.

[14]God as a collective mode instead of the individual as a projection of a perpetual God.

4   A metric for Quantification.

A principle in exact sciences is that if something does not emerge naturally from asking a question then either this concept is bogus or in case nothing comes out of a presumed intelligent being, then most likely this person is asking the wrong question. Natural metrics for biological sciences include (a) distances between genetic codes (b) rates of genome mutations possibly even just depending on historical, social factors and not extrinsic chemical stimulants (if such thing would exist) (c) metrics associated to craniological factors (d) the amount of endorfines or other chemical substances in your body as a measure for "hapiness" and so on. The success of a political system is measured by (a) the number of justified and unjustified police arrests (b) the number of correct and wrong arrests by justice possibly following a prior arrest by police (c) the extend of the need for psychiatric facilities (d) the extend of your healthcare system[15] (e) other welfare factors. Indeed, the succes and philosophy of the bulk of society is reflected by the events occuring in its extremal points; if a society requires a lot of psychiatry then this could reflect that either it is wasteful with its most talented members and will soon stagnate or that the average level is too high for the modal citizen who is therefore more in need for a mental break or a convex combination of both. In any case, it points at a lack of differentiation within the system and is the most wasteful, albeit easiest, way a taxpayer could image to deal with such problem; on the other hand, a society without "mental relaxation centers" is unthinkable[16] and it is forseeable that psychiatry could undergo such transformation in the upcoming decade.

Models for human behavior could be tested given any sociological model since they ought to deliver relations between the first class of metrics and the second class. When an adequate behavioristic model would be found, one could concentrate on the task of constructing sociological models optimizing the succes metrics in a quantitative way.

---

[15]With an emphasis on the fact that it should not be unnaturally overextended, in the sense that one has to avoid manufacturing deseases.

[16]Since it would indicate a too low stress level.