

Organising Organisation

Darryl Penney

Pebble Beach Anti-ageing Philosophy Centre, Australia

Article Info

***Corresponding author:**

Darryl Penney
Pebble Beach Anti-ageing Philosophy
Centre
Country Corner, 40 Pebble Beach Rd.
Batemans Bay, New South Wales
Australia
E-mail: dwpennney2@bigpond.com

Received: December 27, 2022

Accepted: January 10, 2023

Published: January 16, 2023

Citation: Penney D. Organising Organisation.
Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys. 2023; S2(1):
26-32.
doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s2-015

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

We measure, and we accept what we find and call that the scientific method [Francis Bacon] but we don't ask 'Why?' and because we do not ask 'Why?', we do not seek suitable organisational goals, so, we could be accepting a second-rate society and indeed, one that seems to be destroying itself. Unfortunately, we inherited our thinking from the organisation of the survival of the fittest and we need new software for a modern age that can only come from using a different organising of our mind. That goal, as shown by relativity and the Fibonacci series, I call Homo completus. In nature, the offspring seek change, but that is too slow and cumbersome in a modern world and we need to use knowledge to enhance the software of the brain to change thinking so that the mind can organise humanity into a new selected form with a vision for the future. This paper presents that field of organisation in the form of a fractal built on relativity and examples are given that show how modern life is being put in jeopardy because we don't know how to, or are unwilling to change the past.

Keywords: Organisation; Relativity; Creation Equation; Goals; Fibonacci Series; The Mind

Disclaimer: *'The Neolithic revolution, which began in Southwest Asia around 13,000 years ago (and separately in a few other places), saw the emergence of agriculture and permanent human settlement. . . . Humans have continued to expand, with a global population of over 7.9 billion as at 2022.'* (Wikipedia, Human) *Homo sapiens went from a hunter-gatherer to potentially destroying the world [global warming etc.] in 13,000 years and this paper shows how it possibly went wrong by ignoring organisation and that the knowledge of organisation could, and should, change our thinking, putting us at odds with present society, a society that resists change because resisting change is the source of our success throughout our evolution. Secondly, physics retreated into measurement a hundred years ago and, by default, has passed theoretical progress to cosmology because cosmology contains the simplicity that we need to progress and understand society to make it work. Thirdly, 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.*

The Model

Several years ago I wrote a paper on organisation [6] that was rejected because it was considered too complicated, and rightly so because context is infinitely complex, or is it? The model presented here is extremely compact because it uses the property of a fractal and this paper will unpack it's various parts to show the simplicity and similarity that a fractal promises. Because science does not use organisation explicitly, and yet organisation apparently comprises 50% of everything, it is important that the effort be made to understand organisation because our ignorance is literally killing us, both in the state of the world [global warming etc.] and the health aspects [obesity] and the

personality [stupidity, criminality etc.] of people that needs to be addressed by social engineering. The form and functioning of this model is given below, but the majority of the paper is to try to upgrade the mind to understand it, namely to change from Homo sapiens to the goal of Homo completus. This upgrade does not change the brain, but adds goals [as relativity] and bottom-up organisation to the mind for completeness [8].

The simplest organisation is that of the universe, simply because it must be the simplest to exist [there cannot be two answers for any situation because that would create magic, absolute 5 [3]], so, finding organisation gives a basis [social science] that could lead to social engineering that might show us how to create a worthwhile society that lasts. In other words, I will try to explain the organisation that physics ignores, not to progress physics [which will happen anyway after reluctance] but to fix social science which does not contain the organisation that is needed to avoid the social problems that have been caused by an incomplete physics [that has led to materials engineering, technology and a world that is out of control].

We start at the beginning [cosmology] with:

A: The creation of concept-context [a relativity] as the language of organisation [creation equation [3], thinking [8], social engineering [9, 10, 11]],

B: A relativity of reality [that we see as speed [7]] inside of the interval 0 [in particle organisation] to c , the speed of light [energy and organisation] that contains speed v inside [particles] and i , the square root of -1 , outside,

C: The relativity of B., that the organisation and the measurer must interconnect [by the square [1] because each must recognise the other] that is produced by the creation equation [affordances],

D: An expanded logic [[4] because true-false is not adequate] and is a function of the expanding space, and

E: Sundry restrictions, such as that the space [containing the universe] must be accelerating to allow A to exist, and that creates [what we call] gravity [1] which is also a function of the space [no gravity waves or gravitons].

F: Life must do the best that it can in any circumstances [if it is to exist] and successful instances exhibit successful outcomes in similar conditions throughout evolution [and these outcomes become organisational absolutes that we can use to plan ourselves [9, 10, 11]].

G: Questions in our society [Socrates-like] that can only be answered by democracy, fiat etc.

If this looks complicated, it is, but also, it is not [logic of the half-truth] because everything is entangled within the universe just as the simplest purchase at a shop has a complicated supply-chain behind it, that we do not appreciate [unless we think about it]. A well run organisation appears 'real' and we have accepted a simple reality [continuous and constrained] for society, which has crashed at times, but now our run-away population problems are threatening the whole

world [global warming] and it is time to do better, and better we can do, because organisation begets social engineering and a better life for all.

The Philosophy of Organisation [Section A]

The concept of pi has a context that is an infinite series because concepts and contexts must be orthogonal [independent yet entangled] and the opposite to a single concept is an infinite series of forms, where each form is the mathematical division of the number line organisation. This is explained in *Exploring Numberland* [2] and is a product of our fractal universe where concept and context are entangled in such a way that must contain logic and in this case [of the square and circle] they are orthogonal [basically different] and the closer that we look, the more exact must be our view [infinite series], but we can never actually see the difference [being independent]. [Notice that calculus makes the switch from context to concept.] If we could see the difference, we would have to live in a 'real' universe. A similar explanation suffices for the Heisenberg uncertainty problem [3]. This is Zeno's dichotomy paradox, 'if 0.999... is a different number from 1, then there must be space between them on the number line... Counter-intuitive though it is, $0.9999... = 1$ ' (Alex's Adventures in Numberland, Alex Bellos, p 276) This counter-intuitiveness is the difference between an organisation [fractal] and the 'real' world that we assume that we live in, and this dichotomy creates quantum mechanics in our minds, which cannot be understood until we accept organisation.

In other words, there are parameters that stretch from zero to infinity, like energy or complexity, but then there is an enforced segment, such as velocity, there must be a way of containing the organisation within those limits. In the physical that is done by changing the values as the limits are approached and this is accomplished by changing the relativity so that certain absolutes remain unchanged, An example is easy to see, although difficult to comprehend because the energy, mass, length, time and organisation change to ensure that the speed [of a particle] does not reach the speed of energy and organisation [the photon]. Also, it seems that neutrinos [logically] 'piggyback' the photons. Clearly, this cannot happen in a 'real' world where everything is fixed, and is a sign of a moving, accommodating organisation. Thus, there are only two options [orthogonality] to belief, a fixed universe and a variable universe that is part of the software in the mind-brain and the mind must be included because everything is based on measurement.

We would like to live in a 'real' world and have even assumed that we do [live in a 'real' world], even if it means believing that a God had made the universe, continually looks after us and even listen to our prayers. Surely organisation is not that terrifying, or is it? Are we even intelligent enough to understand it? Considering that it has taken us only 13,000 years to potentially destroy 3,000 million years of evolution, so we need to embrace organisation, and as our minds are built on organisation, understanding organisation will change the software of our thinking. The first thing that relativity

teaches is that we must have goals and this is shown in the Fibonacci series in mathematics [2] and this necessary goal I call Homo completus because Homo sapiens is the present that is in the process of destroying itself.

The scientific principle must change to establish absolutes [that do not change] because we need reference points for comparison, but currently, the scientific principle is peer review where there is general agreement that a process should be called a 'law' and an example is the law of gravitation that was 'inspired' guessed by Newton 400 years ago and has never been derived. This is a chilling accusation to make against physics and needs the simple explanation [derivation] below. Absolutes are easy to find in a relativistic universe because the relativity in the creation equation [*energy plus organisation is nothing* [3]] can be easily removed by mathematical division. The four operatives of mathematics [multiplication, division, addition and subtraction] can be better expressed as *form* [division] and *function* [multiplication] [2] as well as addition and subtraction [with their own restrictions, such as orthogonality]. If not using absolutes is indicative of the poor state of physics, how bad is mathematics [or mathematical physics] that does not understand the significance of the basic operations of multiplication [functioning], division [form] and the limitations of addition and subtraction [orthogonality]. Homo sapiens are just not good enough to survive and that is playing out at the present time [population, global warming etc.].

Section C

The creation equation [section A] could be called a given [3], so from [1], [section B] the form of the creation equation is [division] $E/O=i^2$ where E is energy, O is organisation and i is the square root of -1, denoting relativity. Off the particle, we can only measure with a photon [whose speed is c] the measurement is $E/O=c^2$, with the relativity of measurement [between the measurer and organisation (of the universe)] being c^2 [Einstein's equation] and within this interval [0 and c] is the realm of energy and organisation $E/O=v^2$, where v is the speed of the particle, which is the equation of movement due to gravity. The functioning is the multiplication of the absolutes [of the dimensions, E, O, time and distance d that are required in a necessarily accelerating universe [for the creation equation to exist]] of E/d and O/d , for two masses 1 and 2, such that:

apparent attraction is $(E_1 \text{ times } E_2)/d^2$ addition of $(O_1 \text{ times } O_2)/d^2$.

Note that firstly, addition is mathematical adding and secondly, this is a doubling of Newton's equation that Einstein attributed to the addition of 'curved' space, which is an organisation and verified by Eddington's experiment.

Thinking organisationally is a little different to demanding the safety of a 'real' world, but our thinking must change because we are, I believe, deluding ourselves and the price might be the destruction of our society, as has always happened throughout history. For example, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle that wants to measure things exactly is

'real' world thinking because position [organisation] and speed [energy] are orthogonal [from the creation equation *energy plus organisation is nothing*] and you cannot measure two independent things simultaneously. [as above, calculus or pi [conversion of context to concept [2]] is our way of ignoring relativity.] Quantum mechanics does not exist except in our incomplete way of thinking and is a misunderstanding of organisation. No wonder physics is so baffled in trying to understand the physical without organisation! So, be prepared that organisation is not a small thing [except in the start with the creation equation], but expands as part of the cosmic inflation that is a result of the *form* of the universe [(energy plus organisation) divided by time] when time starts at zero and things go off with a Big Bang [5].

Section B

The real battle is to change the desire for a simplistic 'real' world to an organisational society which only becomes apparent at the boundaries because organisation requires segments with bounds and the bounds are usually zero and infinity [concepts are infinitely defined numerically while contexts are infinitely defined complexly], but an important exception is from 0 to c, the speed of light. Also, it is apparent that the segment 0 to c also [relativity] shows the division of particles by speed [7], which drastically simplifies the organisation of the sub-atomic particles from hundreds in the current physics model to: the standard model could do with a little revision and I suggest the following:

Concept: everything is relative and energy plus organisation equals zero in everything, so this is a table of operations categorised by the *organisation of speed* [tier one] and lifetime [tier two], the acceleration of the universe affects everything as a gravity and internally as quantum gravity [(energy plus organisation) divided by separation relative to something else]

Context:

plus [tier 1]: quarks up and down [*no speed*]
proton, electron [*less than light speed*]
neutrinos assorted [*near light speed*]
photon [*light speed*]

Plus [tier 2]: bosons, muons, taus, neutrons and other quarks [*organisation changelings*] [7].

Section D and E

True-false is the only option of common logic, because we cannot comprehend a logic that is different, even though we use it every day in speech, writing and communication in general that selects the correct meaning. For example 'The sun is shining' is true on the sun, off the sun [photons], on that part of the planet turned towards the sun, above the clouds etc. and our mind toggles these to assume that the narrator is speaking logically, but it includes an implied relativity. True-false is orthogonality, but is a concept to the context of logic that I call the logic of the half-truth and a complete logic is [4]:

true, false, alternating true-false, our-other universe, chaos, restrictions, fractal-social engineering.

If true and false have their normal [orthogonal] meanings, there is then room for a context to this concept. A hundred years ago the answer to the question of the wave-particle duality of light was apparently solved by Einstein saying that they were both forms of energy, whereas I believe that they are better expressed as energy-organisation where the wave is energy and the particle is organisation and the photon shows both features [as states] oscillating too rapidly to be measured individually. This assumption is reasonable because logic is all-pervasive and has no speed or inertia. Our-other universe is the relativity of black holes leaving our universe except for gravitational effects, Chaos is the relativity to the other terms, whereas restrictions are those things that resist chaos [such as an accelerating universe that provides gravity, absolute 5 etc.]

Section F

Section F is completely different, but necessary because we are parasites on A to E, and form a subset or sub-organisation that is interconnected. We may consider the world to be 'real', but we cannot escape the relationship between the two ['real' and an organisation], even if we ignore it. We accept gravity and use it without understanding it because according to this theory it is a result of the necessity of our universe requiring an accelerating space [for the creation equation to exist in the long term [1]]. Section F is our society and if we ignore the physical or do not understand it, it will return to haunt us, as has happened with global warming, poverty, hunger etc. How much better could everyone's life be if our numbers were controlled, no one was hungry or mistreated, caught up in wars and other peoples' plans etc. This is the last term [fractal-social engineering in the logic] which suggests the concept of the simplicity and similarity with the context of the effects of social engineering that is the using of a social science that contains organisation.

Science requires the use of absolutes so that comparisons can be made [relativity], mathematics has organisational absolutes [golden ratio, logarithmic spiral etc. [8]] but what are the absolutes of organisation for us? Clearly, in the physical, it is the creation equation that states that organisation must always be equal and orthogonal to energy, but once we get away from the physical, such as Life, what organisational absolutes should we use? Evolution is the key, where the reproduction of a species in a niche [under survival of the fittest] ensures that only the fittest survive to reproduce. The organisation [of the fittest to survive], with a subtle change [from animal to human], provides the best indicator to the best organisation that we can imagine [that is rooted in practice]. I should point out that recent human history is useless because we have had few goals and restrictions placed upon us and this is why it is so important to have a goal [relativity] that is the superior being [Homo completus] that we can work together to attain.

Whilst the physical has the constraint of minimum energy and organisation, a different distinction must be made in human affairs, firstly, those that have an underlying organisation, above, that pertain to all animals including us

[with the restriction of the previous paragraph], and secondly, those below [section G] that are personalised to ourselves in a modern world. Humanity seems to try to dissociate itself from the animals, but there are many similarities that give guidance to outcomes that we can use as predictable goals and setting goals that work for the animals increases the chances that they work for us. For example, it is well known that animals kept in close proximity become deranged, and that is happening in cities as population pressures mount and personality changes, crime increases etc. This is the realm of social engineering [9, 10, 11].

Section G

There is a class of organisation that I call Socrates-like, that like him, can be exceedingly annoying because there is no simple answer [no absolute] that we can see from Life. Socrates' questions have to do with aspects of human behaviour that are not (totally) reflected in animal behaviour and are usually decided by someone [Kings, Queens, Dictators, laws or some sort of democracy etc]. Our current idea of (so-called) democracy is a far-cry from that practised by the ancient Greeks, and is often a choice between two major parties that are aligned [usually behind the rich and the poor] and tend to look after their own members' interests. In terms of organisation, it is a replay of the parable of Sodom and Gomorrah where Homo completus [the goal] is drawn out of the destruction of a people with no goals and no effective social organisation that is destroying itself [genetically and morally]. Again, this is the realm of social engineering [9, 10, 11] and we need to answer 'What are the properties of this Homo completus?' and 'How must we work towards them?' and these questions need the organisation outlined here..

Organisation has been considered bottom-up, but what of the relativity of top-down organisation, where the question is, 'What is the relativity of our thinking?' before and after reading this paper? Looking at the universe, it was clear [to current thought] that someone made it, and we called that person God, but an organisation has the property [similar to a God] that it must answer a query [measurement], otherwise it does not exist [to the enquirer] and further, it must answer uniquely every time, and that is [the basis of] physics with its measuring experiments. Thus, religion offers a God, that cannot be questioned, physics questions [measurement] without direction [no organisation], and traditionally philosophy has investigated the rest [of top-down thinking], but now, if this theory is accepted, cosmology [A to E] underlies philosophy [F, G]. Cosmology has 'waited in the wings' after physics withdrew back into measurement and Newtonian physics, and promulgated theories that are alien to this model which stresses simplicity, similarity and a theory that is understandable to everyone. After all, a concise theory that does not contain enigmas is preferable to a correct theory that is not understood, even by scientists themselves. Consider the quotations:

'If we do discover a complete theory, it should in time be understandable in broad principle by everyone, not just a few scientists' (A Brief History Of Time, Stephen Hawking, p 209)

'People distrust science because they don't understand how it works. It seems as if we are now living in a time in which science and scientists are in danger of being held in low, and decreasing esteem.' (*Brief Answers To the Big Questions*, Stephen Hawking, p 241)

There are very real problems with a measuring physics [without theory] and the [working] intellect of physicists that lack relativity that have been discussed previously [8]. Madridge publishers are to be applauded for their Opinion Article-Special Issue 'Newtonian Physics' that offers this option to its readers for comment, however, being so basic [like this theory] it presents problems of demarcation of subject matter [concepts] and faces the problem of context, which this model requires from relativity. Hence, the organisation [of cosmology] intrudes into mathematics [2], social science [9, 10, 11] and literally everything because of the fractal nature of the universe and, are included, initially in cosmology [5, 1]. Theoretically, increasing the concepts and contexts that form the software of our thinking [8] should move us toward the goal of Homo completus and leave the tumultuous reign of Homo sapiens behind.

Section F Example

Trying to run a civilisation without adequate organisation is a recipe for failure, so, is Homo sapiens capable of getting itself out of this mess? Consider the question 'what are the chances that we will encounter some alien form of life as we explore the galaxy?' (*Brief Answers To the Big Questions*, Stephen Hawking, p 83). He says 'I prefer a fourth possibility: that there are other forms of intelligent life out there, but that we have been overlooked' (p 85) [8]. Really! As an example of unpacking the (intentional) complexity of the organisation, above, consider unpacking F, that says look at the animal's organisation, so, how should we approach a wild animal that you might like to befriend. Direct confrontation would be acting like a predator and provoke a defence mechanism of flight or fight, so, raising an orphan or slowly domesticating it by feeding it and letting it see you occasionally would be the sensible option, as we undoubtedly did in the past.

Homo sapiens is a wild animal that survived by forming groups [species] and attacking opponents [other species] if they threatened their existence and our society is built on groups, such as religions, physics, a form of democracy that benefits distinct groups [a moneyed class, worker class, the old, the sick etc.], a military class and various police and secret groups that seem to have their own agenda, so, how does society control these various groups? Kings, Queens, Dictators and democracy are the usual means, but our use of democracy is flawed in that it appears to be a democracy of groups which is another name for survival of the fittest in which we evolved.

What do we do with a dangerous wild animal? We observe at a distance with showing ourselves a little at a time to see if the animal accepts us, or not. Some animals can be domesticated [horses] and some not so well [zebra]. We might think that it would be best that the animal join our community, but not if it displays dangerous behaviour

towards us. Consider what is happening with unidentified flying objects [UFOs] where it could be that we are the dangerous animal because the military tell us to ignore them as we [the public] are subject to hallucinations while the military presumably seek new technology from anything that they can shoot down. Possibly, our social organisation is similar to that of ants that have the soldier ants and the worker ants and are incapable of change and have been doing the same thing for countless aeons. Is that what we want? We do find it very difficult to change, because it is a basic evolutionary strategy that the successful continue and the offspring seek new niches.

This UFO question has reached the ludicrous stalemate that lengthy books [such as *In Plain Sight*, Ross Coulthart, 344 pages] have been written on the subject trying to prove that UFOs exist and that the very existence of UFOs has been ignored by government. It seems to be the government's position that the general public could not handle the idea that there are more advanced civilisations out there. As far as this model is concerned, it is irrelevant to worry about observers watching our progress because we cannot do anything about it, and they appear more interested in nuclear storage and test sites, presumably 'because they have our best interests at heart'.(p 155) and possibly our sociability is so poor that we apparently remain too dangerous to confront openly.

Where will this UFO question end? Apparently never because they appear to be concerned with our planet-destroying nuclear weapons that could wipe out 3,000 million years of evolution. Consider that God may have created the universe, but there are many universes and our own cannot know itself [being built on orthogonalities], until life provides the affordances [relativity] and so, we could consider the universe to be a God, but on the other hand [relativity], we could consider the UFO civilisation to be God, or perhaps a goal [Homo completus] to aim for, but unless we understand organisation [bottom-up] we will not get to our goal. We need a better form of government that can change our direction.

Section G Example

Socrates seems to have asked questions of a particular type, those that pertain to humans and have no organisational absolutes upon which can be built a definitive argument and a definite answer, hence they require a separate section. If Socrates were alive today and asked the same questions, he would receive the same perplexed answers because philosophy has not progressed in organisation in that time. Forcing [he could have fled] a (so called) democracy to kill him [by verdict] for a triviality [of asking questions] is such a potent political accusation of the failure of democracy that it has come down to us over 2,500 years, and yet today we laud a democracy that did not even work for the ancient Greeks. That problem is for another day, but we do need to understand how Socrates' class of organisation fits into the structure of social engineering.

It is well known [on the internet] that you cannot add apples and oranges, which is both true and false [logic of the half-truth] because you can add properties associated with them [numbers] because apples and oranges have similarities and also differences that are orthogonal, so, adding oranges and apples is the sum [mathematical] of the sameness and the context of the differences [orthogonalities]. This could be called organisational addition and subtraction and we see it as speciation, races, tribes, countries etc. Governments, religions, Kings etc. much prefer to rule a country with a homogeneous population that have similar goals to make for a strong peaceful society, but multiculturalism is an easy way out for politicians looking after their own benefits in the short term. Multiculturalism creates division, disharmony and problems for future generations. Such is our present democracy, that is as flawed as the democracy was of the ancient Greeks.

Simply put, the harmony of a population is increased by homogeneity and this can be seen in animals that create species by excluding outsiders and can be seen in groups in our own populations that purposely segregate themselves [religion, cultural etc.] and for this reason we have to be careful in looking to the animals. Socrates asked 'What is loyalty?' and 'What is courage?' and they have to be taught and multiple standards set, because standards are contextual and need concepts to be applied to them [affordances]. Religions have attempted this role using top-down guesswork and need this organisation, especially as religions are old and set in another time. Consider the Church's stance on no killing, versus soldiers needing to kill to defend or take over another country.

The above organisation is intentionally compact and as an illustration of it's power to answer questions, I have selected two occurrences that have been enigmas for 80 years and are so shocking that they have been ignored in the interests of cobbling together a fractured world organisation to achieve (so-called) world peace. These examples foreshadow social engineering in [10, 11], but are being used here as an example of social engineering that is relevant to today and to give simple answers to national problems that have been swept under the carpet. Two and a half thousand years ago, the Old Testament was laid down as an organisation to live-by that incorporated the dietary and legal strictures that made a particular society work, but a radically new idea [Christianity] erupted two thousand years ago that humanised people into a supposedly anti-savagery group. It was bold and successful, to an extent, but did not change with the times and is becoming less relevant today and needs social engineering to incorporate it [or certain aspects] into a modern world.

Yes, Christianity was a magnificent example of social engineering, but not well understood, and needs the organisation above. The first and second World Wars changed politicians and (so-called) leaders' ability to create mischief and cause wars and examples of that mischief are in full force today, 80 years after the events unfolded. Politicians do not

have the right to apologise on behalf of a nation for previous wrongs perpetrated by previous leaders because we do not have true democracies and the reason why atrocities occurred is not understood nor are they being corrected. Social engineering is about understanding [present] why something happened [past] and doing something about it [future goal] that is the absolute of the Fibonacci series. An apology is suspect unless the cause is fixed and being contextual, the ripples extend far and wide.

'In the view of Chinese and Koreans, Japan hasn't adequately acknowledged, apologised for, or expressed regret for its wartime atrocities.' (*Upheaval*, Jarad Diamond, p 313) 'About 22,000 Australian troops captured by the Japanese during the war were subjected to unspeakably brutal conditions in Japanese prison-of-war camps, where 36% of the Australian prisoners died: a far higher percentage than the 1% death toll of American and British soldiers in German prisoner-of-war camps . . . Especially shocking to Australians was the Sandakan Death March'. (p 275) 'One cause for optimism is Japan's history of success at resolving crises . . . Twice in modern times, Japan has provided outstanding national success stories of re-appraisal and selective change.' (p 320) but unfortunately not in religion, where Shinto is an indigenous spirit religion and not a neighbour-loving religion like Christianity is supposed to be, and a possible cause of their soldiers' behaviour.

What of German atrocities against the Jews and others in the second World War? This is apparently the exception that proves the rule because Hitler was following the Church in it's traditional treatment of the Jews, that are, of course, not Christian. 'Hitler biographer John Toland offers the opinion that "Hitler carried within him its teaching that the Jew was the killer of God. The extermination, therefore, could be done without a twinge of conscience since he was merely acting as the avenging hand of God . . ."' (Wikipedia, Religious views of Adolf Hitler) The above gives insight into the problems of religion and the governing of the State that has had troubling consequences in the past, such as killing in the name of religion [Crusades, Hitler, South America etc.] versus invading and defending armies and the relativity of religion and state that seem to be closely aligned. Consider 'Nobiscum Deus in Latin, Meth hemon ho Theos in Ancient Greek, was a battle cry of the Later Roman Empire and of the Byzantine Empire.' (Wikipedia, Gott mit uns) and their use blurs the orthogonality of state and Christianity. This is more fully considered in [10, 11], but it does indicate that it is time to remodel religions, that are a form of social engineering, with a complete organisation.

Conclusion and Prediction

I am not suggesting that this idea of a fractal universe is the correct one, but I believe it to be a much better description of reality than the hodgepodge that we have at the moment and brings the disciplines [concepts] that have been hived off from philosophy together again [context] in a sensible orthogonality [horizontal relativity] with the vertical

organisation [top-down and bottom up] with the aid of absolutes that make a mockery of the scientific principle and completes the scientific method [theory with measurement]. The stakes are high with the choice between an organised future, or the chaos that we are heading towards with unrestrained breeding and movement around the world. These problems need organisational solutions [9, 10, 11] to restrain breeding and direct it into an improved genetic base for society in marketing areas that allow unbiased comparison of the ability of people to prosper and thereby indicate the races that should inherit the Earth. The relativity of what I suggest [bottom-up], can be married to the top-down method proposed by Jared Diamond in *Upheaval: How Nations Cope with Crisis and Change*.

References

1. Penney D. Understanding Everything Means Understanding Nothing. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys*. 2022; S1(1): 7-12. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-012
2. Penney D. Exploring Numberland. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys*, 2022; S1(1): 13-18. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-013
3. Penney D. Can Affordances Save Civilisation. *Mind & Society*. 2021; 20(1): 107-110. doi:10.1007/s11299-020-00265-x
4. The Logic Of The Half-truth And Plato's Cave. (From an unpublished paper)
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. The Unification of Symmetry, Simplicity and Similarity in a Fractal Universe. (From an unpublished paper)
7. The Standard Particle Physics Model Versus Modern Physics (From an unpublished paper)
8. Penney D. A Penny for your Thoughts. *Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys*. 2022; S1(1):19-25. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-014
9. Social Engineering: Using Social Science To Improve Ourselves And Society
10. Social Engineering: The Concepts Behind The E.U., U.S., China And Australia
11. Social Engineering: The Context Behind The E.U., U.S., China And Australia