

Opinion Article - Special Issue

Open Access

## Social Engineering: The Concepts behind The E.U., U.S., China and Australia

Darryl Penney

Pebbly Beach Anti-ageing Philosophy Centre, Australia

### Article Info

**\*Corresponding author:**

**Darryl Penney**

Pebbly Beach Anti-ageing Philosophy  
Centre

Country Corner, 40 Pebbly Beach Rd.

Batemans Bay, New South Wales

Australia

E-mail: [dwpenny2@bigpond.com](mailto:dwpenny2@bigpond.com)

**Received:** April 30, 2023

**Accepted:** May 15, 2023

**Published:** May 22, 2023

**Citation:** Penney D. Social Engineering: The Concepts behind The E.U., U.S., China and Australia. *Madridge J Behav Soc Sci.* 2023; S1(1): 7-13.  
doi: 10.18689/mjbss-s1-002

**Copyright:** © 2023 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Published by Madridge Publishers

### Abstract

Currently, physics is based on complex energy absolutes [and excludes organisation] whilst social science contains no organisational absolutes and this new model brings everything together harmoniously. The future direction of the super-powers is considered, because the effects of the Second World War are still with us today and will continue to influence the future when we realise the necessity of the relativity of past and future goals [Fibonacci series]. Civilisations come and go throughout history, for a number of reasons, possibly one being that they do not maintain goals, for example the manipulation of a so-called Australian 'democracy' using an outmoded constitution. This paper also suggests that Adolf Hitler's contribution to world affairs was a little heavy handed [present relativity], but prescient and helps present a new theory of organisation that allows social engineering to come into being and be used to mould a modern world, something that we desperately need, but can only be done reliably through the absolutes of this theory.

**Keywords:** Social Engineering; Relativity; Adolf Hitler; the Creation Equation; Racism; Goals

**Disclaimer:** *This paper is an Opinion Piece, not a scientific paper. This paper projects the theory of organisation [7] onto the modern world as a necessary part of the Fibonacci series [that is an organisational absolute of life] and it should be borne in mind that this theory has not been accepted by peer review which is the accepted scientific practice, and understanding it's derivation changes the thinking of the mind [[3], future goal] and may lead to being shunned by peers that use current thinking [present goal]. In other words, Homo sapiens is restricted to concepts [energy] whilst our future goal must use concept and context.*

*Secondly, mistakes [contextual] may occur because I am a generalist, whereas a specialist is a specialist [conceptual] in a subject and would not be expected to make mistakes. This state of affairs is relativity and cannot be eliminated.*

### Preamble

Everyone would agree that the world is in a mess and the reason, I believe, is that there are no social engineers that understand society, and that is because 'information remains bewildering, partly because it crops up in different guises in so many scientific fields. (*Chance*, ed. Michael Brooks, Paul Davies, p 21). If physics does not understand organisation then social science is in trouble because social engineering cannot exist in any meaningful way without organisation [because that is what social science is based on, whereas physics is based on energy], and if this base is not understood [relative to an absolute], how can social science be a science? The answer is that it is not a science at present, and will never be a science unless based on a complete logic and absolutes.

Newtonian physics is based on the physical, but not on the basic physical, and is misleading everyone [including itself] because it presents itself as complete [by retreating into measurement] and ignoring theoretical modern physics. In consequence, our society has grown largely in technology [materials engineering] with little reference to its orthogonal, which is organisation [social engineering], and, as any engineer can tell you, imbalance leads to problems and imbalance can result from physical or organisational misunderstanding [they are in lock-step in the physical], and both, in this case, are not understood, and as the functioning of our mind-brain is based on the creation equation [as is everything], so, by not understanding organisation, our (so-called) 'leaders' can take society into 'dark' places without us realising it.

For example, one of the most notorious leaders of the last century was Adolf Hitler, and yet, if he had won, he may have been hailed a great leader and it can be considered that he did win, and that the events that he started are still being played-out in line with his vision! He had flaws, like most leaders, but uniquely, his goal was not only to improve the prospects of the country, but also the quality of the people in it. In fact, throughout history [and prehistory in the animal kingdoms] gaining territory is the successful organisational result of living and breeding and countless battles have been fought for living-room, and this can be seen by watching the wildlife in our backyard. Understanding this allows us to circumvent the horrors of war and the damage caused by the limited views of the participants. The organisation behind evolution is everywhere related to the worth of the participants in it, relative to the environment, and this is shown in the saying 'use it or lose it' because the intellect of each participant is no more nor better than that needed to compete successfully in their environment. Leaders are adept at leading [obviously], but are they good at leading where we should go? We need a new way of thinking that leaves survival of the fittest behind and the first step in social engineering is, 'do we go where they lead?', or 'do we let them lead us where we want to go?'. This is an example of the relativity that the universe is built upon and that we must use as goals and guide (so-called) leaders into the direction that we need to go, see [1]. This paper contains the concepts that we can convert to context [2] because we live in an organisational fractal which simplifies understanding.

The two World Wars of the 20th century taught the dangers of massed men fighting [men get killed, maimed and psychologically damaged apart from physical damage, waste of time etc.] and ended involving non-combatants in total warfare, and probably the only lesson that we learned was to distrust government because government [leaders] got us into wars and have the authority to persevere to the extent of disrupting their own country as well as destroying that of the enemy. Now we can do better by using this approach that makes social science into a real science by providing an understanding of organisation and I have selected Adolf Hitler because he and his aims are well-known and provide a reference point 100 years ago. Relativity needs past and future goals to 'anchor' them to our time because we live in a

fractal universe where everything is relative except for the absolutes [6] that allow us to visualise our surroundings and this forms a new way of looking at the organisation that surrounds us because a fractal has definite properties of simplicity and similarity and so, the purpose of this paper is to simplify our organisation [using similarity [7]] and so bring organisation to 'heel'.

## **Preface**

The circumstances of the second World War are well known, but from the relativity of 80 years it would appear that Hitler won the war because Germany 'controls' most of the area that Hitler invaded [at a cost of the loss of 20 million people], and how easily it was accomplished using more sensible [organisational] means. In fact, I have to applaud a nice piece of social engineering on a par with the advent of Christianity 2,000 year ago, but we only recognise (possibly) a lucky guess unless our thinking expands to include general organisation [3]. Notice that our thinking can only expand when we use relativity because an absolute of Life is, 'if you don't need it, you lose it' and this is the trap in which physics finds itself by using Francis Bacon's scientific method and has waited for 100 years for cosmology's contribution [4, 5].

Thus, the previous paper [1] sets out the form of the organisation that we need to describe the future relative to the second World War [the past], the present and the future as described by the Fibonacci series and we can generalise to a stable state of the world in the future as a goal. However, relativity is always with us and a byproduct of the second World War is that the population of Europe [post Hitler] has changed in number [20 million] and in makeup [because of Hitler's efforts] and if we are to influence the future, we need to consider all factors and, I believe that this theory of relativity [sideways] and bottom-up organisation [to complete the top-down sciences] plus restrictions etc. are needed to do a better job [as *Homo completus*]

In other words, if Hitler's aims could be accomplished so easily by using organisation, can we use organisation to show what the (so-called) super-powers [of today] are really doing and how they should align to bring about a stable world-wide civilisation that is truly civilised and could be trusted by extraterrestrials.

## **Talking With the Animals**

*Homo sapiens* evolved from the animals, think the same way [top-down] as the animals and functions the same as the animals and that is why we can use the organisation of the animals to describe workable organisation [1] for us. Unfortunately, by using technology *Homo sapiens* uses new innovations without the organisation that goes with them and that makes them less than successful. For example, the Fibonacci series holds the key to Life, because Life needs relativities, and it is obvious that *Homo sapiens* is not wise and not civilised and that must be the ultimate goal and that requires changing the way we think, and improving the way

we think requires relativity and bottom-up organisation [3]. Homo completus must be that goal that we attain when we are fully civilised and that goal must be that everyone that is born is entitled to a reasonable life and hence the organisation that we can apply, is to convince those that feel inadequate that they should choose not to breed and should be recompensed by society for that foresight.

Homo sapiens crossed into distant lands and created civilisations from the food plants that they found and evolved to the extent that the general area in which they evolved can be seen in posture, skin colour and facial variability. This variability allows castes to be easily recognisable and fosters slavery whereas animals are only concerned with their efficiency at extracting nutrients from the environment and not that less efficient animals suffer starvation. I am assuming that birds and animals are not concerned with out-competing others, but Homo sapiens is different because firstly, Christianity supports helping your neighbour, secondly, according to the creation equation, organisation [beauty, music, helping the sick etc.] translates as emotion in the brain of the observer [affordances, [3, 6]] and presumably contributes to the ['bleeding heart'] tendency to help others. Thirdly, politicians possibly gain votes and favour [in our current voting system] by fostering the selfish division of multiculturalism over the good that can come from a homogeneous population.

That our population should be similar is shown by the birds and animals that create species with different coloration etc. for just that reason. Whenever people from different areas across the world come together for some reason, there is 'automatic prejudice' 'meaning the degree to which they associate certain ethnic groups with negative stereotypes at the level of the unconscious'. (*Caste*, Isabel Wilkerson, p 304) 'People who face discrimination . . . often build up a layer of unhealthy fat, known as visceral fat, surrounding vital organs, as opposed to subcutaneous fat, just under the skin. It is this visceral fat that raises the risk of diabetes and cardiovascular disease and leads to premature death.' (p 306) Thus, if the barriers that caused speciation were removed by improved transport, we would [theoretically] become one people, but relativity suggests that that is not stable and that a number of species would occur. Given that the future relativities [Fibonacci series] are unknowable and can only be determined by competition, the ideal is to create artificial barriers and allow races to show their potential [by competing].

The idea that different areas of the Earth's surface should be left to develop at their own pace was normal until 500 years ago and civilisations came and went around the world, but always broke down and disappeared leaving ruined buildings. This theory aims to provide a blueprint for a stable world community to prevent the return of 'dark ages' that has followed the fall of every empire. That this requires a number of improved races to oversee the retention of knowledge is obviously necessary and the animals indicate that artificial barriers need to be set up to do this and we can use the existing racial distinctions to set up a caste system. A caste

system has bad connotations because 'a caste system uses rigid, often arbitrary boundaries to keep the ranked groupings apart, distinct from one another and in their assigned places' (p 17), but there is nothing wrong with castes that are built on racial discrimination if the races do not intermingle.

Over the last 500 years, trade has burgeoned under Homo sapiens initially using the 'laissez faire' [allow to do] system of trade, which is fair, but then greed and religion stepped in and empire building started that enriched European countries and impoverished the rest of the world. The British Empire, for all its problems has much to recommend it and does duty as a foil to the European Common Market and other super-power wannabes in that it respects other countries more than some of its competitors in the past. So, what should a member of a group do? The animals show that there are dominant groups and niche dwellers that are the remnants of failed species and we see it in the indigenous peoples around the world that cannot compete with the invaders.

For example, the Australian Aborigines had been isolated for about 50,000 years and were successful as hunter-gatherers, but now, 250 years later, after being invaded, enlightened etc., have interbred and are defending their culture, but does their culture have relevance today? The improved [by outcrossing] have the opportunity to prosper, but do they have the determination to excel in a modern world? They can prove this by creating a civilisation somewhere and not just existing on welfare etc. Australia cannot 'carry' anyone because everyone must be part of the country that is fighting to exist in a modern world. This is the key to understanding the animals, that every moment they are in danger of being eaten and this applies to us as a member of a species. This rule applies to everyone, *if you do not have the determination to compete, your genes should not exist and the country should pay you not to burden the gene pool.*

Currently, people seem to believe that if you exist, you have the right to contribute to the gene-pool, and so you do, in survival of the fittest, because something will eat your offspring if they cannot compete in saving themselves, but we inhabit a world of technology and should allow every child the same opportunity to show their worth. For example, 'the U.S. is losing its former competitive advantage that rested on an educated workforce, and on science and technology. At least three trends are contributing to this decline: the decreasing amount of money that we devote to education, the declining results that we get for the money that we do spend on education, and the large variation among Americans in the quality of education that they receive.' (*Upheaval*, Jared Diamond, p 372) Their worth can only be established if they compete on equal terms and clearly, it is the determination of the parents that provides the opportunity and this can be seen in the school results where the immigrant children are over-represented [due presumably to their determination to succeed].

Notice that immigration is often thought to improve the population, for the reason above, but the same effect can be had by allowing the less determined [the major absolute of life is to invest in children] to be paid not to breed [1] and this does

away with the problems of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism benefits the individual, but not the nation because the immigrant enters an economically richer environment and the individuals become a caste that is prepared to do the valuable, but dirty work of harvesting food etc. The politicians gain because these people naturally vote Labor/Democrat and eventually skew the voting system [to some extent] that possibly may not be in the interests of the country.

## The Macro Economy through the Fibonacci Series

It is also no surprise that 'ever since the rise of the first government 5,400 years ago, they have served two main functions: to maintain internal peace by monopolizing force . . . and to redistribute individual wealth for the purpose of investing in larger aims – in the worst case, enriching the elite; in the best cases, promoting the good of society as a whole.' (p 372) Compare that with the reverse direction which is the simplicity and similarity of a fractal [Adam Smith] where the individual's action helps the nation and we are in a position to describe how a true leader should function so as to initiate positive feedback. Homo sapiens has allowed a number of governments [kings and queens, dictators, religious leaders, versions of (so-called) democracy etc.] to form because no one knows which is the best. Leaders [with questions of their sanity, knowledge, judgement, personality etc.] do what they will, but, from animal behaviour the less efficient tend to become the prey of the more efficient and countries are no different. Thus we can expect to see, in the future [if we have one], a smallish number of groups, each of which contains one religion, one predominate racial type that is agreed to be the norm, no ownership outside of the group and no migration between the groups except [product] exports and imports. One would hope that each group is fully self-contained, fully employed and left to their own devices just would happen in the animal kingdom.

If a group feels that it is falling behind it can dissolve and join other groups, taking on their religion and racial characteristics [1] or just realising that they are not good enough and giving in. This goal is not a difficult choice and the success of each group is dependent on themselves and is easily monitored by themselves. The ultimate goal is Homo completus, which cannot be defined, but only found by actors playing out the parts. Indeed, that could be considered to be our universe's function, to answer Socrates' questions [7] because an organisation must be completely entangled [otherwise it is not an organisation]. Homo sapiens has changed the organisation [by using technology] and is working through the options [as described in this paper] and putting civilisation at risk in the process, whereas introducing bottom-up organisation could improve the situation.

## The Australian Constitution

Consider relativity in the setting up of federation in Australia, 'the cause failed when it was in the hands of the

politicians because they always have their own agenda and a great capacity for obfuscation. They are also stupid and arrogant enough to think they could create a nation without involving the people. But politicians are very thick-skinned. Among the growing chorus criticising the parliamentary approach to nationhood and invoking the people were politicians themselves. Whatever happened, they would not be left out.' (*The Sentimental Nation*, John Hirst, p 124) These are strong words and one would hope that the quality of politicians has improved over the last 120 years and that the Constitution has grown in relevance over the years as society grew and modernised, but I fear that nothing has changed and there is a desperate call for a new Constitution that is based on a new way of thinking through social engineering.

'The Constitution created a single Australian people and turned a continent (and its islands) into a nation. It is amongst the oldest of the world's functioning constitutions and this is much to its credit. But, being over one hundred years old, it is now out of date (as might be expected), in at least a number of ways.' (*Five Things to Know about the Australian Constitution*, Helen Irving, p 5) This quotation begs the question of 'How does the country operate?', and the answer is with the help of constitutional lawyers and the High Court and 'up-dating through interpretation is permitted and is effectively all that is needed' (p 6). This might provide a good income for lawyers, but are their interpretations adequate, being specialists? It would seem more efficient to update the constitution through social engineering to make governance more efficient because governance is a concept [application by lawyers] and a context [the organisation of governing]. This is a serious problem because the Constitution forces 'government by lawyers' who (often) know little about practical organisation and practical subjects, and seem to delight in courtroom arguments.

As an example of governing by lawyers, "'the Australian Government has authorised the forward positioning of elements of the Australian Defence Force to the Persian Gulf" . . . parliamentary debate followed the Prime Minister's announcement, with non-government members questioning the decision and challenging the Government. Indeed, on 5 February, a censure motion was moved against it in both Houses of Parliament. It succeeded in the Senate (where the Government lacks a majority), along with a vote of no confidence in the Prime Minister. This was an unprecedented event in the Commonwealth Parliament's history. . . . On 20 March, the Senate passed a vote condemning the war and calling for the troops to come home. It was high and newsworthy drama. But it went nowhere. There was never a need for a "mandate". The matter was not in the Parliament's hands.' (p 11)

Clearly, the politicians, and others, thought that the parliament should have been involved in such a momentous decision, but the Prime Minister [John Howard] knew his Law [and had been a lawyer, I believe] and 'if the meaning of section 68 in the Constitution were really to reflect current practice, it would need to say something like this:\* The command in chief of the defence forces of the Commonwealth

is vested in the Minister for Defence.' (p 17). I am flabbergasted that something with the ramifications of sending troops into another country to fight the inhabitants is the preserve of a politician in a country that is supposed to be based on democratic process. Surely the Constitution needs updating using the organisation outlined in this paper.

'A Constitution needs to be stable. It should not be altered too frequently, and probably not too easily.' (p 108) What is not being said is that it should be up-to-date and that is the relativity that this paper is suggesting and periodically putting forward a number of proposals could allow a truly democratic vote [perhaps using mobile phone voting] that could upgrade the existing Constitution. 'The Constitution "is not immutable. It was consciously designed with a mechanism for change, the referendum process." The mechanism is described in section 128'. (p 108) If it has the capacity for change, why not change it? Notice that referenda and polling-station voting is out-of-date with the universal use of personal phones. Why are we letting these limelight-loving idiots lead us, or perhaps it is we that are to blame and a truly democratic social engineering system is necessary?

In other words, the Constitution is designed to change, but from what? The writers did the best that they could using top-down thinking [that which the animals use] in creating it, but this new model uses relativity and bottom-up organisation [fractal from a creation equation] that challenges the base of the original Constitution by exploring social engineering [simplicity and similarity]. So, 'if we re-wrote it, we could have the Constitution we *really* have' (p 116) and one based on social engineering. A governance fit for a modern nation, and sorely needed.

## The U.S.A.

'To many Americans, it seems only a matter of time before China overtakes us economically and militarily. We increasingly hear claims that the 21<sup>st</sup> century will become an Asian century – specifically, a Chinese century.' (*Upheaval*, Jared Diamond, p 326) This statement can only be considered as a relativity in a totally entangled worldwide organisation, so, where do I start to consider this defeatist statement? I should start with the Fibonacci series, which is the fundamental statement of Life, and in particular, the restriction that the parent must invest energy in the offspring and that is, that there must be a future goal based on the past and present [Fibonacci series]. The US. seems to revere its Founding Fathers, but as shown by the previous section, they were using top-down thinking that was faulty [compared to bottom-up etc.] and Constitutions must change as circumstances change and thus, the real reason behind the defeatist statement, and that it will probably come about, is that no one is forward planning to change that perceived outcome.

The present day answer is:

'QUESTION: When will the U.S. Take its problems seriously?

ANSWER: When powerful rich Americans begin to feel physically unsafe.' (p 379)

'With increasing inequality, persisting racial discrimination, and decreasing socio-economic mobility, poorer Americans will perceive correctly that the vast majority of their children have low chances of achieving a good income or even just of modestly improving their economic status.' (p 369) Looking at the role of government above, the U.S. is clearly deficient in it's governing, has limited future goals and is operated by and for Homo sapiens and has little hope of retaining it's leadership in the future. Even worse, the U.S. treats the rest of the world in the same way because of it's business model that is principally, that the capitalist system is laissez fair [allow to happen] with the aim of extracting the maximum profit from each business ultimately for the stockholders [principally in the U.S.]. Of course the 'powerful rich Americans' twiddle their thumbs as the money rolls in, but for how much longer and they are dragging-down most of the world with them.

'In a 2006 survey of American economists (83 responders), "87.5% agree that the U.S. should eliminate remaining tariffs and other barriers to trade "and "90.1% disagree with the suggestion that the U.S. should restrict employers from outsourcing work to foreign countries"' (Wikipedia, Free trade, Economist opinions) This is what economists say, but it is top-down thinking without relativity, and as such is meaningless and dangerous. Economists behave as specialists [concepts] and have no interest in the context of their selfish conclusions on the rest of the world. Compare the relativity of this quotation with the quotation at the start of this section and of course the Chinese will move into first place because the U.S. is doing what the second quotation is saying and buying cheap products from China at the expense of their own industry and to the benefit of China's industry [and U.S. business owners]. Who makes these decisions? It is public servants and politicians, who are, arguably, the least fit to make these decisions and especially without the relativity and organisation of this paper and the [truly democratic] will of the people, who want jobs.

In the U.S. and other first world economies, approximately 60% of adults are overweight or obese which shows that they are not suited to living in a modern marketing society where companies are allowed to present (so-called) foods to people that do not have the education, money or sense to make choices that suit their health and this state of affairs is affecting longevity, chronic illnesses, depression etc. and is part of anti-ageing and micro social engineering of society that feeds through to the state of the nation [fractal] and is the responsibility of government [macro social engineering] to educate people [who's level of health feeds into the state, positive feedback]. That this state of affairs should happen when many in the world are hungry is a sad indictment of the (so-called) Free World, but then again, if no effort is made to curb populations, what can be done? [1] Where is the forward planning?

I feel that I have not adequately accentuated the problems that the U.S. has inflicted on itself and the rest of the [(so called) 'Free'] world and a more in-depth study is suggested by the quotation, 'the so-called Free World has problems with

the U.S. that considers itself to be the leader and yet it is riven by so many problems within itself and it is no surprise that the five internal problems are all organisational that surface when physics ignores organisation and that lack is carried into the social sciences that are the foundation of society, and now, haunts our very existence.' [1]

## China

'In late 2012, Xi Jinping announced that achieving the China Dream of "the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation" would be his great ambition. China would no longer hide and bide but assert the nation's newfound power for all to see.' (*Silent Invasion*, Clive Hamilton, p 18) I can imagine that this course of action was precipitated by the (so-called) Free World's decision to send production to the offshore low-cost producers, such as China, as above. 'His China Dream singles out a "strong army dream". The influence of the hawks is seriously underestimated in the West.' (p 18) The problem with 'nationalist "super-hawks" in the Chinese military' is that they are specialists that see invasion as their forte, in the same way that WW2 threw up Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese military, and China uses 'sabre-rattling' to a large degree firstly, over Taiwan, the South China Sea, the 'islands in the East China Sea claimed by Japan' (p 84), secondly, the long-term goals of a larger area including Australia. 'It all began in the middle of August 2004 when China brought together its envoys from around the world for a conclave in Beijing. Communist Party Secretary Hu Jintao told the gathering that the party's all-powerful Central Committee had decided that henceforth Australia should be included in China's "overall periphery". . . . China has always devoted special attention to the countries that have a land border with it – its "overall periphery" - in order to neutralise them.' (p 1)

Thirdly, a very real problem is raised by allowing a caste 'of over one million people of Chinese heritage in Australia' (p 280) and on the other hand, why does Australia allow them to settle here? "Overseas Chinese Affairs" [OC] 'can be described as "a massive operation involving incorporation and cooptation of the OC at every level of society, and managing their behaviour and perceptions through incentives or disincentives to suit the situation and structural circumstances that the CCP [Chinese Communist Party] desires" . . . . to use the diaspora to transform Australian society in a way that makes us all sympathetic to China and easy for Beijing to control. . . . the influence of wealthy Chinese businessmen in our political system through donations and networking . . . . Involves mobilising ethnic Chinese as voting blocs and placing Chinese candidates loyal to the PRC [People's Republic of China] in parliaments and senior public positions' (p 26)

Fourthly, using politicians that seem extraordinarily friendly to China in their speeches. 'Through this program of flattery and royal treatment, involving all-expense trips to China and meetings with top leaders, some of our former prime ministers, foreign ministers and state premiers have been turned into "friends of China". In addition to Bob Hawke and Paul Keating, Kevin Rudd, Bob Carr and John Brumby are

frequent flyers to Beijing. Julia Gillard has resisted the Chinese sirens, probably because she is a more modest individual not driven by money or ego.' (p 258) Clearly this supports my contention that firstly, politicians are drawn to the limelight by "money or ego", and secondly, not from scholarship, knowledge and desire to help the country and thirdly, that they make up a contextual group with disturbing 'cultural legacies' [see below and especially [8]] that appear to run counter to Australia's best interests.

Fifthly, 'Bob Hawke's gift . . . . When Prime Minister Bob Hawke, deeply shaken by the images of brutality, tearfully told Chinese students in Australia that they would not be sent home, his decision led to 42,000 Chinese obtaining permanent residence rights and, with close members following, some 100,000 Chinese immigrants. . . . The reality was not as it appeared. Hawke's unilateral decision, taken against strong advice from officials, continues to reverberate through the nation.' (p 27)

Sixth, a friend emailed me saying 'the Australian Constitution, how dry, dusty and boring, I would rather watch paint dry', but that attitude might be responsible for the loss of Australia to China after only 250 years, but that is, unfortunately, what we deserve unless we increase our intellect and interest along the lines of this paper. 'So we must ask the question: What is Australian sovereignty worth? What price do we put on our independence as a nation? In practice, it's a question we are answering every day, and the answer is "not much"' (p 3) This is unfortunately a trend of incompleteness that is a factor of Homo sapiens and needs the completeness of the goal of Homo completus to upgrade our thinking to overcome our multitude of problems.

## The E.U.

The European Common Market [ECM] has brought Europe into a modern marketing setting not unlike Hitler's dream of a Third Reich where Germany is preeminent in production and this is obvious by comparing the number, size and sophistication of the products of their motor industry. Consider 'cultural legacies are powerful forces. They have deep roots and long lives. They persist, generation after generation, virtually intact, even as the economic and social and demographic conditions that spawned them have vanished, and they play such a role in directing attitudes and behavior that we cannot make sense of our world without them.' (*Outliers*, Malcolm Gladwell, p 175) Notice that this quotation is using previous goals to understand the future, as I am, and as an example of this effect on the success of areas of the ECM and future strengths that can be brought to bear by understanding this social engineering, consider a study that 'compared German and French manufacturing plants that were in the same industry and were roughly the same size. The French plants had, on average, 26 percent of their employees in management and specialist positions; the Germans, 16 percent. The French, furthermore, paid their top management substantially more than the Germans did. (p 205) Clearly, a Pax Germanica?

We have to ask ourselves whether a citizen should be interested in the State [as currently], or be content with being a member of the fractal [Adam Smith] as survival of the fittest, or, be part of a democracy that controls and is the State. This is the enhanced goal oriented democracy that I am suggesting, much like Hitler's Germany, where this paper is suggesting a new version of survival of the fittest that has goals. This is the basic difference between Homo sapiens and striving towards Homo completus and, as Homo sapiens has proven to have made a mess of society, we must turn to Homo completus before it is too late. The E.U. seems to have taken the amalgamation on trust, a realisation of Hitler's dream or an inkling of this theory. How much of Hitler's dream was worthwhile? Does he warrant the seemingly universal condemnation that he seems to have gained, or is the version being manipulated by the 'bleeding hearts', the Church, the Jews or others? This is why this theory is so important to understand where we are going and we should not rely on luck in the future. The E.U. affects millions that deserve the best advice that can be found.

## Conclusion and Prediction

We can understand China's actions by considering the herd example [1] because China's thinking is aligned with the animals in survival of the fittest and firstly, it works because the organisation is proven and secondly, can be appraised by the organisation in this paper. [This is relative to the organisation used by the U.S. that is firstly, complex, secondly, from top-down thinking and thirdly, does not work well for the majority of the world.] Given that the herd system works, but does not work perfectly and like the logic of the half truth, there are other possibilities that can work [in the literature], such as other males seeking sex at opportune [for them] times and even males that are similar to females and go unrecognised. There is nothing wrong with China's approach and should be considered as alternatives, but relative to myself, I am being tested and my survival [and my family's future] is at risk and it is my duty to sound the alarm. So, is this an invasion [of the diaspora] by stealth, are the Chinese superior [to us], are the emigrants putting themselves at risk as the Jews do etc.? These are questions that should be considered in the light of the above.

This paper is a call to arms that specialists cannot be specialists [only] and ignore the world because that is incompleteness [the trademark of Homo sapiens] and we need context [8] for completeness. In other words, trying to mix concept and context together leads to the problems of Homo sapiens, so, the context is in the next paper and the prediction is that one [worldwide] people is a goal too far at the moment and, to keep it as simple as possible, I suggest a solution that requires only three changes, and that is that firstly, borders must be closed to people and secondly, only one type of religion, culture etc. be permitted [over time] within each [complete] area and thirdly, the maximum amount of processing of product is done in each country. This is the proven solution of the animals and the benefits are seen in the health of all of society, not profit for a few. We cannot afford to allow castes that do not subscribe to the agreed ethnicity and religion to be

part of the voting public because our very existence depends on our performance relative to other countries.

Unfortunately, China is following one man's dream, just as Germany did a hundred years ago, that might unite the country behind him and even strengthen the country, but it is too easy to take military action. This result has parallels in a history that we don't want to see repeated, and it will repeat itself, as must be expected in a fractal unless we circumvent it. We need to learn from history, because history is simple and similar and we need to plan ahead to counteract (so-called) leaders that try to take us into places that we don't want to go, because we must understand where we need to go to reach a goal of Homo completus, not empire building.

The concepts above are (somewhat) meaningless without the context [to come later] because that balance is the working of the brain [to provide context to the measurement of the concepts in order to make a decision [6]], but we can make a limited finding and that is that we are losing control of our society because our governance allows users [people that crave the limelight for their own sake] without the organisation that makes them useful, to lead us. We need leaders [figureheads that we can rally behind] that are guided by a number of experts to allow us to make decisions for ourselves, not leaders that crave attention, enjoy baby-kissing, dressing-up and generally acting like royalty for the news reporters. As it stands at the moment, we are letting these fools [and they are fools unless they know what they are doing] indiscriminately bring immigrants into the country that tend to create problems [as reported on the nightly news] instead of increasing the existing population and they are like children playing [without understanding] with the economy to get elected. For example, this new premier promised to lift the wage-rise ceiling on public servants if elected and I was told by a family member that this influenced their voting. One has to despair of Homo sapiens and we must create and install a sensible society.

## References:

1. Penney D. Social Engineering: Using Social Science To Improve Ourselves And Society. *Madridge J Behav Soc Sci.* 2023; S1(1): 1-6. doi:10.18689/mjbss-s1-001
2. Penney D. Exploring Numberland. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys.* 2022; S1(1): 13-18. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-013
3. Penney D. A Penny for your Thoughts. *Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys.* 2022; S1(1):19-25. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-014
4. Penney D. Understanding Everything Means Understanding Nothing. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys.* 2022; S1(1): 7-12. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-012
5. Penney D. Why Solving Cosmic Inflation Could Change Your Mind. *Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys.* 2022; S1(1):1-6. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-011
6. Penney D. Understanding Everything Means Understanding Nothing. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys.* 2022; S1(1): 7-12. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-012
7. Penney D. Can Affordances Save Civilisation. *Mind & Society.* 20(1): 107-110. doi:10.1007/s11299-020-00265-x
8. The Logic Of The Half-truth And Plato's Cave (From an unpublished paper)
9. Penney D. Organising Organisation. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys.* 2023; S2(1): 26-32. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-014
10. Penney D. Social Engineering: The Context behind The EU, U.S. China And Australia. *Madridge J Behav Soc Sci.* 2023; S1(1): 14-21. doi: 10.18689/mjbss-s1-003