



American Journal of Materials & Applied Science

Letter to Editor

Evidence-Based Physics -

Stanislav Ordin*

Ioffe Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

***Address for Correspondence:** Stanislav Ordin, Ioffe Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia,
E-mail: stas_ordin@mail.ru

Submitted: 15 February 2021; **Approved:** 19 February 2021; **Published:** 22 February 2021

Cite this article: Ordin S. Evidence-Based Physics. American J Mater Appl Sci. 2021 Feb 22;3(1): 001-002.

Copyright: © 2021 Ordin S. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



ABSTRACT

In his numerous, since 1970, precision studies of optical, kinetic and X-ray structural studies of the properties of a wide class of materials, from dielectrics to metals, from crystals, including incommensurate ones, to nano-particles and artificial nano-structures (many of which I, As an Honored Inventor of the USSR, he carried out on the devices I created), I always accompanied my measurements with the analysis of the models, with the help of which the results of experiments were “read” (interpreted). My last articles and books are just devoted to the analysis of the theoretical Basic Physical Models and this work will be continued in a new generalizing book, the introduction of which I have prepared in the form of an article.

Keywords: Basic physical models; Optics; Kinetics; Thermoelectricity; Crystal structures and superstructures

INTRODUCTION

True Science, as a kind of striving for the Achievement of Truth, is really moved, naturally, by Truly Smart people, in the very concept of MIND of which REASON is necessarily included. But what should those who do not strive to achieve the Truth do, since this requires almost unbearable, hard mental labor and for a deep understanding of the Ideas of the forerunners, and for finding errors in their reasoning-theories, and, in the end, strictly- mathematical substantiation of the fact that the correction-expansion of Ideas gives a more strict, more correct Description of the World.

And what is left to do, simply put, fools who, nevertheless, found themselves in the scientific field. And they only have what is inherent in any ordinary tradesman in a consumer society - intrigue and career struggle for the sake of the bourgeois well-being. Some of them succeed in this within the framework of the established official-bureaucratic scientific structure. And for some, the external polish was not enough for this, but rather energetic, they manage to form something similar, but with the use of bureaucrats of state structures, which are very far from science.

But between these two categories of “scientists” there is something in common, which opposes them to True Scientists, and objectively interferes with Science in general. And those who have built in the scientific and bureaucratic structure, and those who have built in the simple bureaucratic structure, have no UNDERSTANDING of the Fundamentals of the same Physics. It’s just that the first ones hide this INCORRECTION behind ROSK - how can they, usually the heirs of eminent dads and mothers, who know mostly only about scientific intrigues, represent official science, And the latter hide this same INSISTENCY behind a DENIAL (of what they feed on to).

The first who DO NOT UNDERSTAND, all my life, I have to confront as a Scientist who has worked for about 50 years at the Academy of Sciences. Oppose in terms of the Ideas of Science itself. And in terms of a demonstrative rejection of a scientific career, as an element associated with the sacrifice of Truth, in conditions when the entire scientific career of “opponents” is built on officially approved dogmas, the very reasoning about which was considered a challenge to the entire system.

I also had to deal with the second UNDERSTANDING. But in

terms of insufficient substantiation of the contradictions asserted by them in the Ideas of predecessor scientists, and in terms of the fact that they did not give a strict PROOF of alternative concepts and theories.

In my articles and books, I just concentrate on the PROOF, sometimes seemingly elementary Truths, but my initial mathematical education pushed me to this. And it turned out not in vain, the “proofs” included in many textbooks of physics are either hopelessly outdated, or generally led physics to the wrong steppe - to metaphysics and BUTAFORIA - <http://rusnor.org/network/social/user/10216/blog/3853/#comment>

Earlier I published two books in which I clarify, correct the basic models:

Stanislav Ordin, Book: “**Refinement of basic physical models**”, Lambert, 2017, ISBN: 978-3-659-86149-9, 82 pp.

AND Stanislav Ordin, Book: “**Modern Physics**”, Lambert, 2019 (in eight languages), ISBN: 978-620-0-48094-1, 196 pp

Having completed my second book, I published at the beginning of the year and the third: 2nd (revised and supplemented by the second part) edition of my book “Modern Physics”, in which I continued the work begun on verification and rigorous analysis of Basic Physical Models.

Stanislav Ordin, Book: “**MODERN PHYSICS**”, Second Edition (Revised and Expanded), Lambert, 2021, ISBN 978-620-3-30509-8, 317 pp.

But the number of Fundamental Problems solved at the modern level is growing. And I figured it would make sense to write another book with a fuller amount of PROOF, which I think I would do with the title in the title.

And although the basis of any PROOF is (pre) PROVISIONS and AXIOMS, the very rethinking of them at the modern level makes it possible to decide to move forward and PRESENTATIONS. But this is the topic of another book “Scientifically Advanced Basic Concepts”, on which I am also working, and for which the chapter **Scientifically Advanced Basic Concepts-Representations** (Awareness Recovery), was actually made. But given its purely scientific nature, I decided to single it out in a separate book.