

Opinion Article - Special Issue

Open Access

## Social Engineering: The Context 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 Context behind The E.U., U.S., China And Australia. *Madridge J Behav Soc Sci.* 2023; S1(1): 14-21.  
doi: 10.18689/mjbss-s1-003

**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

Our civilisation is in danger from Homo sapiens' lack of control of society brought about by its ignorance of organisation and this theory, that commences in cosmology, shows the simplicity and similarity inherent in a fractal universe and suggests a society built on absolutes that will, over time, lead to stability and an improving race with a goal for the future.

**Keywords:** Relativity; Organisation; Fractal; Society; Creation Equation; Thinking

**Disclaimer:** *This paper is an Opinion Piece, not a scientific paper. Homo sapiens broke away from the hunter-gatherer lifestyle 13,000 years ago and due to the incompleteness of its thinking has placed the World in danger from global warming, population excess etc... This theory of organisation seems to work at every level of our fractal universe [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] and perhaps shows how society should be managed, however, resistance to change is a fundamental driver to success in our evolution and can lead to excessive intolerance to change in co-workers etc. to the detriment of careers etc. 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.*

If the disclaimer is to warn about a possible danger to lifestyle from reading this paper, there is an upside to the suggestions made in this paper that are of general interest, and that is that if marketing areas are created, many of the problems facing the world, such as terrorism, financial bondage, racism etc. are likely to be eliminated and allows alternate uses of the environment to be examined and rated.

### Voting Systems

A friend commented that there is a big difference between our system of democracy and a dictatorship, but it could be that he and a lot of people are mistaken and we should look closer into the political system that we think is superior. A true democracy, for the person, is often considered to be the ideal political system and requires an interest in a subject, knowledge of a subject and a vote when required and that can be done using mobile phones, so, a democracy is possible in a modern society, but do we want the hassle? We invest a lot of time, energy and money into children, so, why shouldn't we give them the best chance in life that we can, especially considering the 3,000 million years of contribution by ancestors. A discussion on voting to change the constitution, perhaps every 10 years might be sensible [8] because original Constitutions were created with top-down thinking and circumstances change as the years pass, but relative to this is the question of whether people are interested? If a citizen is not interested, do they deserve the benefits of society? Should they wish to be excluded

from the discussion when the basic driver of Life is to produce offspring at a significant cost to the parent and society? Should it not be their prime interest because that is the environment for their offspring. Producing offspring is a restriction on Life and necessary for life to continue and an interest in the preservation and growth of society is crucial [as would be expected in a fractal]. The relativity of voters is not considered [these days] and our politicians assume that every person over (say) 18 years of age should vote, but is each person's vote equal to another person's vote? Top-down thinking suggests 'no', with the voter ranked by interest [perhaps a minimum number times of accessing website], education level, age etc. This is a Socratic question where we do not know the answer unless we can find an organisation in the animals that tells us, and the herd system definitely says that everyone does not have the same rights.

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.' (*Upheaval*, Jared Diamond, p 372) Again a Socratic question because which of the people are better off in these two countries? But there seems to be a very clear message from the animals, and that is to do what most of the animals do, which is to create species that compete. We know that there must be a goal [Fibonacci series] and that goal is *Homo completus* [or *must be*, if we are to survive, because *Homo sapiens* is destroying the environment], but how do we attain that single simple organisational solution? The best answer might be to create a number of new species of humans for comparison and that should not be difficult because we already use a caste system based on where people evolved [around the world] using obvious differences in features. Clearly, we are not creating new species [because that requires an inability to breed together], but artificially creating a barrier to mixing to measure 'species' through competition, so this paper primarily considers this solution [of forming species] as an organisational solution to today's burden of *Homo sapiens*.

## Democracy or What?

Is our political system a democracy? If it were, where do I vote for less public servants and less taxes? I can't because our system is a dictatorship and we give very handsome remuneration, pensions and free travel if and when politicians step down. Those that are silly enough not to step down, start a war and cause great hardship, because we know what happened to Hitler [and many others], and there are current leaders that 'rattle sabres', even in the face of previous World Wars. Our political system is really between two groups [relativity], the rich and the poor [Labor/Liberal, Republican/Democrat etc.] and always returns to that, unless an exceptional leader emerges. Further, 'Americans as a whole are becoming polarized and politically uncompromising. . . . our coasts and big cities are now overwhelmingly Democratic,

and our interior and rural areas are overwhelmingly Republican. Each political party is becoming increasingly homogeneous and extreme in its ideology.' (p 347)

We already separate the coasts and big cities from the rural areas by way of electorates of various types with our cumbersome representative system, and in Australia, I won't drive in the major cities because I don't have e-tags for crossing bridges and using tollways etc., besides, the population tend to remind me of 'rats in a maze'. Phone voting naturally isolates voting to the respective residents. The U.S. used caste to combine immigrant Europeans under a generic White banner against the African-Americans, but the efforts of the last century to restrict populations have proven to be in vain because 'in the summer of 2008, the U.S. Census Bureau announced its projection that, by 2042, for the first time in American history, whites would no longer be the majority in a country that had known of no other configuration, no other way to be.' (*Caste*, Isabel Wilkerson, p 6). This shows that 'no-pass' borders are needed to restrict the inevitable movement of 'economic migrants' from poorer areas into progressive economies so that areas can be quantised (see below).

## Marketing Areas

Britain left the E.U., in part because it felt that it was losing its identity with an unrestrainable influx of people seeking economic benefit and the same apparently occurred in the U.S. to the extent of the above quotation [White's becoming outnumbered]. This is multiculturalism where different groups from around the world migrate to form ethnic groups that are often slow (if ever) to integrate, but enjoy a higher standard of living in a safer environment. What happened to Adam Smith's idea that an individual's action is the nation's gain? Or, "Ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country." (John F. Kennedy). There is relativity here and only what is good for the country contributes to the most successful marketing area ['species'] and immigrants with their different cultural ways are inflicting inefficiency. These people are using the nation for their own gain and often do not contribute much, but are, I suspect, beloved of politicians, especially Labor/Democrat for their vote [usually long-term and lifetime.

People in general are xenophobic [fear or dislike of anything that is perceived as being foreign or strange] and it is a natural survival trait when dealing with the unknown. Hence, any group of countries with free travel between them should have similar people with similar customs and if the borders are closed, this will eventuate, but society, for various reasons, such as caste, religious beliefs etc. contain differences which create tensions. Ideally, in any marketing area [with a free flow of people] there should be homogeneity and it is the government's duty to ensure this in the formation of a strong community. It seems to me that government is failing its citizens by allowing religious freedom, immigration etc. for the reason of giving some people what they [selfishly] want. What of strengthening the country? It is much more efficient

to use 'home grown' children that fit in, than to bring in diverse immigrants and especially (so called) refugees from war-torn areas of the world, and also it is an opportunity to improve the population by genetic selection [1]. This shows that politicians are not leaders, but have an agenda. Is it any wonder that a better system must be found? Immigrants have hidden costs and a better way [of attaining social stability] is to increase the birthrate in a controlled manner by use of monetary compensation, genetic selection and raising the prestige of women.

Leaders, in my opinion, crave the limelight and usually make poor planners and the problem is accentuated with multiple countries, so, a 'marketing area' is a group of countries with open borders that act as states and a federal system, much like many countries do today, and other countries, that are not progressing as well, could be [partially or voluntarily] absorbed and gradually mix and become indistinguishable. The rationale is to become part of a marketing area that can compete [with other areas] and eliminate some of the chronic poor countries by raising their standard of living, similar to the European Union, and allow everyone the chance to grow into a successful [species-like] user of an environment. If that is the goal [concept], there must be a way of achieving that goal [context] and every marketing area must have the chance to excel, unlike with today's "international police" powers [ Monroe Doctrine] of the U.S.

## The Personality of the Political Process

There is a class of people that often become politicians and some business people [such as Alan Bond (DVD House of Bond)] that seek the limelight and frequently create problems because being a leader means that they have leadership skills, but not the knowledge of where to lead. Thus, politicians fight elections on the usual orthogonality of the rich and poor, with the middle class swinging from one camp to another. On occasion an important question arises and there is bilateral support, but in the main, a democracy is thought to be augmentative, but we don't live in a democracy [above], so why should there be argument? Argument is divisive and suggests an orthogonality, so, let's suggest a different approach, where leaders front the camera and the decisions are made democratically, using a modern device, such as the phone, which is now a part of us [bionic addition].

The current system of voting is out-of-date with the arrival of modern personal phones and is currently based on representatives in a hierarchy of expensive politicians that are supposed to represent us. Surely a simple app that lists two sides of (possibly) 5 or 10 questions with a short explanation of why each side is preferable and a count of the voting for each side, is all that is needed and satisfies democracy [interest, knowledge behind the question and a vote]. Surely a few experts can put the reasoning [for and against] behind a stance succinctly, and provide a useful tool to those wishing to vote.

## A Parable of Incompleteness

Long ago in a United Kingdom, that was not completely united, and had one religion [Anglican] and a bit that was left [Ireland] that was Catholic and somewhat forgotten, but it's population was allowed to grow [8 million versus 4 million now] because of a new food [potatoes] and the population became a cheap source of labour until a disease in the potato caused famine and an exodus occurred. Many were sent to Australia as convicts and in time a call was made to Britain to send women to balance the numbers and a shipload of Irish lasses were duly dispatched that, as religion follows the mother and due to the small population, made Australia significantly Catholic and sectarian problems inevitably followed. Fast forward to today and we see, below, that this multiculturalism may have placed the whole Nation in jeopardy [8].

'The Aboriginal activists saw Mao's China as a pot of gold that could help finance social revolution back home. . . . In China Aboriginal people could see themselves. Here too was a nation invaded, occupied and brutalised by foreign powers.' (*The Beijing Bureau*, Ed. Trevor Watson & Melissa Roberts, p 290) 'And the Irish were my people. . . . In Belfast I was home. Mixed with my Indigenous heritage was a deep Irish ancestry. I belong to those called the "shamrock Aborigines". My great-great-grandfather, John Grant, had been banished from Ireland for trying to kill the landlord's son. . . . When I arrived in Ireland I felt old John the rebel whispering in my heart. And the Chinese were my people. I felt it from the first time I stepped outside the plane in Hong Kong.' (p 294) 'I belonged to a race of people who were expected to die out.' (p 291) And many have become indistinguishable from the broader community except for culture and the government's generosity in handouts.

'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, (presumably) not from scholarship, knowledge and desire to help the country and thirdly, that they make up a contextual group with disturbing 'cultural legacies' [Irish, Catholic][8] that appear to run counter to Australia's best interests.

The workers, for a long time, were interested in the material benefits for the working-man that led to the White Australia policy and not the self-seeking and sectarian divisions above, that Labor leaders now seem to be pursuing that tend to be composed predominantly of pro-communist, Irish descended Catholics that appear to have 'cultural legacies' that somewhat conflict with Australia's goals, and these goals are difficult to reconcile presumably because

Homo sapiens has no apparent organisational goals. This 'brotherhood' of the mindset of (at least) the people referred to above, that are assumed to support the good of their country [but is debatable], can be contrasted [relativity] to Adolf Hitler and 'his direct, totally uncompromising stance stood out among less decisive colleagues. As he put it typically in late 1922; "The Marxists taught – if you will not be my brother I will bash your skull in. Our motto will be – if you will not be a German I will bash your skull in."' (*Easily Led*, Oliver Thomson, p 269) On the other hand, business is just as self-seeking and the goal of this paper is to create a shared goal through individual voting.

This parable shows, I believe, that the lack of completeness in creating a (truly) United Kingdom [leaving a multiculture, concept] has created problems, over time, that have multiplied and spread around the world, especially to Australia, Britain and the U.S. To restate the obvious, to minimise these effects we should close the borders of a group of countries [marketing area] to travel and business ownership [but not import/export] to isolate ourselves from the past and foreign influences. The object is to create insularity because 'another prime minister, Alfred Deakin, declared, "Unity of race is an absolute essential to the unity of Australia." (*Upheaval; How Nations Cope With Crisis and Change*, Jarad Diamond, p 268) and 'when many people of African origins finally did arrive in Britain from Britain's colonies after World War Two, the eventual result was Britain's Nottingham and Notting Hill race riots of 1958.' (p 269)

'Political polarization to be the most dangerous problem facing us Americans today' (p 356), tempered by 'our long history of maintaining the same two political parties - the Democrats since the 1820's, and the Republicans since 1854 – is actually a sign of flexibility rather than of rigidity.' (p 377) This might be a sign of flexibility rather than of rigidity, but so what? Setting poor against rich is divisive and an orthogonality where we need agreement. This rich/poor divide is the default position when not much is happening, but this paper is suggesting an organisational re-evaluation using absolutes [1].

## The Public Servant Wars

The rise in complexity of modern life, together with poor political organisation, has produced a series of the most disastrous wars in history, including the American civil War and World War I and II. 'Amid the emergence of increasing virulent and hostile sectional ideologies in national politics . . . the compromise that was reached (the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act) outraged many Northerners and led to the formation of the Republican Party, the first major party that was almost entirely Northern-based.' (Wikipedia, Origins of the American Civil War) This war against the secession of the slave states for an irreconcilable orthogonality [slavery] that cost the lives of about 700,000 soldiers may have been better served by they being allowed to secede and not creating a war. In other words, a democracy is a fallacy in considering an orthogonality and if the orthogonality is important, it is better solved by a

split and not a vote. 'By the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century the United States had become a nation of two distinct regions. The free states in New England, the Northeast, and the Midwest had a rapidly growing economy . . . the South was dominated by a settled plantation system based on slavery . . . Slave owners controlled politics and the economy, although 75% of white Southern families owned no slaves.' (Wikipedia)

Thus, slavery, being conscionable, is irreconcilable and led to a war, because relativity was not considered, and similar is suggested for the coast-interior of the U.S., above, in a state-like division. Homo sapiens does not understand the power of organisation, especially when considering questions posed by leaders. 'Fifth-century [B.C.] was quite different from the society that Plato imagined in *The Republic*. It was a democracy of sorts, though only about 10 per cent of the population could vote. Women and slaves, for example, were automatically excluded. But citizens were equal before the law, and there was an elaborate lottery system to make sure that everyone had a fair chance of influencing political decisions.' (*A Little History Of Philosophy*, Nigel Warburton, p 6) Surely a mobile phone app would be better.

As an example that leaders and public servants are not just empty-headed, limelight seekers, but (possibly) have mental issues as well. 'About one hundred thousand Americans died in World War II in the Pacific' (*The China Mirage*, James Bradley, p 371) 'The U.S. did not enter World War II to defend Britain or oppose Hitler. On December 8, 1941, the United States declared war on Japan and only Japan. Three long days passed, and the United States did not declare war on Germany to defend England. It was only when Adolf Hitler rashly declared war on the U.S. that Americans went to war in Europe.' (p 8)

'First, the State Department would decide how much oil Japan could purchase . . . State's decision would move to Treasury, which would calculate how many Japanese-owned dollars had to be unfrozen to meet State's dictate. Then the Foreign Funds Control Committee (FFCC), a newly created three-man panel, would release the Treasury-approved dollars for the Japanese to use to purchase their State-approved oil. . . Little did Roosevelt imagine that an obscure committee deep within his bureaucracy would catapult America into World War II.' (p 268) 'Acheson and Morgenthau passed the buck back and forth to each other, running the Japanese through a bureaucratic maze. A Treasury official later wrote, "The Japanese tried every conceivable way of getting the precious crude oil, but to each proposal the [FFCC] had an evasive answer ready to camouflage its flat refusal.'" (p 271) Thus, the Japanese had to invade further southward for oil.

The conclusion is that businesses have power and responsibility [in their own domain], whereas public servants have power and no responsibility. The public servants on the losing sides were hung for crimes against people, but not against the organisation, and most assuredly not the American public servants that caused the U.S. entry into the Pacific War, and also into the European war. Homo sapiens is incompetent because it does not understand organisation, for example,

'Acheson had just secretly changed Roosevelt's Asian policy and done the specific thing the president feared would lead to war'. (p 271) 'Dean Acheson was not the first to attempt to cut Japan's oil supply. Morgenthau, Ickes, and a number of Washington Warriors within Roosevelt's helter-skelter administration had all given it a try. In each of those cases, however, Hull, Welles, or Roosevelt had become aware of what was going on and intervened before any serious damage could be done. The only thing that was different about Acheson's successful exploit was that – supported by Morgenthau, Stimson, and Ickes – he got away with it.' (p273) Obviously the organisation was deficient as were the public servants who were not doing as ordered.

## Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is presumably considered to be the mixing of people of different cultures, with the assumption that they will assimilate, but this does not seem to happen in a few cases and can cause problems. Those that do not assimilate [to form a common people] are different in skin colour, facial features etc. or belong to a group and have difficulty assimilating because they identify with that group and not the country of residence. In particular, the Catholic faith, the Jewish faith, Islam and the nationalism of the Chinese vie with the country or regional groupings. This is why each marketing area should have one religion, one people and a restriction on marrying within the same sub-group to eventually bring people into one group. The purpose is to differentiate 'species' [into different marketing areas] so that each can concentrate on being the best 'species', and over time the best 'species' will takeover the planet and will have been shown to be the best [by being the best].

Organisations and religions, in particular, appear to be addictive, to such a degree that they are immutable, old and cause sectarian difficulties and examples are, as above, Catholic, Protestant, Islam, Jewish and Chinese. 'One of the earliest examples of innate propaganda skills producing lasting results was the remarkable achievement of the Jews . . . total contempt for the visual media'. (*Easily Led*, Oliver Thomson, p 90) 'Christ by an extraordinary communications *tour de force* did achieve what was probably the single most effective example of image projection in human history.' (p 113) Thus, it could be said that Homo sapiens is immature and a victim of propaganda throughout the ages, and currently with poker machines, video games, fast cars, unconscionable behaviour to others etc. Homo sapiens is too immature to handle multiculturalism and we need separation because there are too many races, and it is too early, to decide which are the best for the future.

Propaganda appears to be based on the creation equation [*emotional-energy plus organisation is nothing*] and is generated purposefully 'as with so many early civilizations, the main characteristics of ancient China's propaganda were myth, monument and ritual.' (p 95) These organisations are designed to create [literally] emotional energy in the minds of the beholder and the effect of this communal emotion to the

viewer etc. is real and grows stronger the more involved the person becomes and the more organisation that they encounter. This is a manifestation of the process that created the universe and is a recipe for addiction, namely emotional highs that increase with the depth of involvement [with the organisation], without the problem with drugs of needing greater amounts for the same level of emotion [habituation]. This is a very potent recipe for addiction that firstly, increases throughout each person's lifetime and secondly, increases with the 'past cultural leanings' of the centuries and millennia, as above. Is it any wonder that religions persist over thousands of years? Physics is possibly an example of this 'petrification' [turning to stone] by apparently abandoning the search for modern physics theory [4, 5, 6].

When the creation equation is recognised, the modus operandi of governments and religions becomes obvious [uniforms, huge buildings, parades etc.] and that knowledge allows us to realise that we are being used and brings us a step closer to the mind [mental organisation] of Homo completus. As an example, 'Australia's main contribution to World War One was to contribute a huge volunteer force – 400,000 soldiers, constituting more than half of all Australian men eligible to serve, out of a total Australian population under 5 million - to defend British interests half-way round the world from Australia, in France and the Mideast. More than 300,000 were sent overseas, of whom two-thirds ended up wounded or killed.' (*Upheaval*, Jared Diamond, p 270) Firstly, this is an example of the homogeneity of population [White Australia policy] and the resultant strength of purpose, secondly, the destruction of the fittest males and thirdly, the power of politicians' jingoistic posturings.

Consider what would happen today. 'From the late 1960s . . . Australia turned it's back on the White Australia Policy and began to admit . . . considerable numbers of non-European immigrants, especially from Asia. . . . Rather than being expected to assimilate to a pre-existing Australianised Anglo-Celtic cultural norm, migrants were now officially informed that, as Australia was in fact a multicultural society, they could become fully Australian without first jettisoning their old cultural identities and ethnic ties.' (*The Howard Years*, Ed. Robert Manne, p 3) I can only repeat that government by public servants without goals is not governing at all and is a recipe to be left behind.

## The Chinese

The quotation of Australia's behaviour in World War One is telling, in that it would not happen under the multicultural makeup of Australia today that appears to have resulted from the machinations of politicians after World War Two. Homo sapiens has used military might to increase trade and well-being and a new player is emerging due [in large part] to countries outsourcing their own production [8] to take advantage of lower wages overseas. Thus, China has been given a huge boost in confidence, and 'after he'd been anointed the next president in late 2012, Xi Jinping announced that achieving the China Dream of "the great rejuvenation of

the Chinese Nation" would be his grand ambition.' (*Silent Invasion*, Clive Hamilton, p 18) Unfortunately, the rest of the world may have made a mistake, according to this model, by off-shoring it's production and promoting growth in China.

'Tentatively from the year 2000, and totally since 2011, the party revised its attitude towards overseas Chinese – from distancing itself to the "embracing of every foreigner of Chinese descent as one"' (p 25) to create "'a massive operation involving incorporation and co-option of the Overseas Chinese at every level of society, and managing their behaviour and perceptions through incentives or disincentives to suit the situation and structural circumstances that the Chinese Communist Party desires"' (p 26) Clearly, this is a form of propaganda, and even worse, an invasion that 'cashed-up Chinese bidders are taking homes from Australians. The rate of immigration from China is too fast to allow assimilation, so that parts of Sydney no longer feel like Australia. Chinese-heritage (and other Asian) students are monopolising places at highly desirable selective schools' (p 4) Given that the Chinese do not assimilate well, may be part of an invasion, manipulating the public sector without public servants acknowledging this [8] shows that our social organisation is lacking and our country and way of life is in danger.

## The Diaspora and Illegals

Adolf Hitler restricted the employment of Jews in the government and universities [a hundred years ago] and I have always assumed that it was part of his vendetta against the Jews in Germany, but there may be more to this because the Jews appear to owe allegiance to their religion and compatriots and not to the various countries that they inhabit and work within. The question is 'should they be allowed to take jobs in sensitive area?'. Many Jews [according to Wikipedia] give meritorious service in Australia, U.S. etc., but should they be employed in government and science where secrecy exists? Consider that physics retreated into measurement [concepts, and Newtonian physics] a hundred years ago and abandoned the search for theoretical modern physics [as this theory is, contextual], so, the openness of the practice of physics becomes questionable [with proprietary measurements not published theory] and this information could be important to the Chinese diaspora and passed to a belligerent China to the detriment of our safety.

The concept of closing borders, as an organisation, is becoming increasingly necessary because 'illegal migrants' are flooding across borders and into the U.S. and increasingly in Europe etc. where they distort populations, such that, above, 'for the first time in American history, whites would no longer be the majority' and yet measures were taken to limit immigration to presumably prevent this happening. 'In the late nineteenth century, smugglers took Chinese aliens across the Mexican and Canadian borders into the United States. Their methods were later mimicked in the 1920s, by smugglers taking Jews from Eastern Europe into America. These smugglers were operating in contravention of America's new immigration quota restrictions.' (*Smuggled*, Ruth Balint and

Julie Kalman, p 2) "'Honestly", he writes, "the people who help asylum-seekers the most are people-smugglers. And these asylum-seekers want to be smuggled." All of the people whose stories feature in this book are willing participants in illegality.' (p 7)

There is a relativity [as is everything] that must be borne in mind, namely 'asylum-seekers' from their point of view and 'illegal-immigrants' from the point of view of residents and I have to admit that I couldn't read very far into the book because the book is, in my opinion, amoral and should not have been published by the University of New South Wales. In fact, the title *Smuggled: An illegal History of Journeys to Australia* seems to state that itself. Considering that 'amoral meaning is "without morals" or "having or showing no concern about whether behaviour is morally right or wrong"' (Internet), the book is clearly amoral [against the law] and could be inciting illegal acts [hence the strange title]. To my mind, the book is suggesting that people trash my house and periodically return to break windows because the gene pool has been altered by the new arrivals. On the other hand, if determination of the parents produces evolution, the selfish and illegal acts of these people might be a useful addition to the gene-pool [basis of evolution] and a 'blind-eye' was used to help them, below. On the other hand, people that commit illegal acts should (perhaps) be discouraged from breeding if we are to become [truly] civilised as a species.

Consider, 'people smuggling had become the "fastest -growing area of organised crime", he wrote, "nearly as profitable as illegal drugs"' (p 5), sanctioned by the people themselves with the aim of bettering themselves at the cost to the present inhabitants, so should we build walls, as Donald Trump has started to do, to try to keep them out, or let them in to make more profit for farms and businesses by creating an underclass and boosting population? These are crude scenarios compared with 'many journeys lasted years, with false starts, detours and returns, prompting us to rethink the global map of Australian migration as one that has as many back doors and multiple entry points, as it does conventional routes and pathways. . . . Alien smuggling also involved the manufacture of fake passports, identity documents and travel visas. It involved deliberate defiance of ethnic migration sponsorship rules and racist quota restrictions on the part of brave or corrupt officials, by leaving names off lists, or on lists, or simply turning a blind eye.' (p 9)

'In February, 1950, Turbayne warned that "there has been a great deal of manipulation and falsification of documents in regard to Landing Permit Holders". The people involved were practically all Jews from Iron Curtain countries. "They are generally interested in Black Market dealings and are known as Cafe inhabitants", he wrote. "They are not good types." They were also problematic from a security point of view.' (p 33) The opposite view is 'the fact that many Jewish survivors who wanted to come to Australia after the Second World War had to do so illegally was because Australian immigration policies were decidedly anti-Jewish in this period.' (p 30) Perhaps this situation is best summed up by 'Henry (Jo) Gullett

told the Australian Parliament in 1946. "Neither should Australia be the dumping ground for people whom Europe itself, in the course of 2,000 years, has not been able to absorb." (p 30) This shows that the context [absorption] is not understood and that the Jews are pursuing a goal of their own that includes not being absorbed.

## Conclusion and Prediction

Australia is currently a country adrift, pushed by the Irish Catholic sectarianism into a multicultural Hodge-podge, and part of a socio-capitalist (so called) Free World centred around the U.S. appetite for profits that uses 'democracy' as its stance and World's Policeman as its modus operandi. It needs a new vision for the future, perhaps 'the UK is a member of the "Five Eyes" intelligence-sharing community along with the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. . . . As part of a wider economic policy, the UK would like to broaden Five Eyes into a loose trading partnership'. (*The Power Of Geography*, Tim Marshall, p 129) The EU is a basket-case of indecision and China is held in the grip of an autocrat that knows what happens if he loses power because 'his father, his family and Xi himself suffered terribly during the Cultural Revolution, the ten-year eruption of mayhem and violence that Mao Zedong unleashed as a way of shocking society, purging his political enemies and regaining control of the party.' (*Red Zone*, Peter Hartcher, p 144)

Clearly, leaders have an agenda that is not that of the populous, who just want to get on with their life in their own small sphere and not fight public servant's wars which are the contextual outcome of some leaders. A little organisation can prevent many deaths, but the relativity is to reduce the birthrate [selectively] to compensate [and improve] the population and the sooner that we leave Homo sapiens behind the better, but it must be done with the knowledge that this theory contains. Unfortunately, the goal [Homo completus] is a goal and we can never reach it, just get closer because in an organisation there is never closure [as in a 'real' world] as shown by every concept being equal to an infinite series of integers on the counting number line [2].

The organisation of a future is written in the Fibonacci series and this theory appears to work all the way from the creation equation [6] through cosmology [4, 5], mathematics [2], the mind [3], organisation [7] and social science [1, 8], but the effect must be world-wide so that every ethnicity can show it's worth. Marketing areas appear to be the solution to racism, globalisation etc. above, and also to people-smuggling because those at the lower economic end cannot afford to lose the people [that the others don't want] because they are needed to boost the poorer areas. Our fractal shows the same organisational solution for people movement as for population control that is the carrot/stick solution [1].

This paper is a theory [relativity plus bottom-up addition], but outcomes can be seen in the world around us: the Jewish society; the amalgamation of the EU; the Five Eyes possibility, the Russian EU confrontation; the economic policies of the

'Free World' that are destroying it etc., but we go in the wrong direction as long as power resides in leaders and not a democratic vote.

## Justification for this Model

The concept of entanglement and organisation is completely new because the only inkling is contained in Occam's razor ['that the simplest way is usually the best'], which is hardly rigorous nor particularly useful, so, I will use a historical fact to illustrate the relativity that produces orthogonality, which is the heart of this theory. 'For many centuries algebra evolved in parallel with geometry, rather than integrated with it. . . . geometry was the more distinguished elder cousin . . . algebra was the newcomer, a slippery, Arab-inflected symbolism which, for many in the West, carried a hint of the occult. . . . It was Descartes . . . plotted geometrical shapes on perpendicular axes that we still call "Cartesian coordinates" in his honour.' (Shapeshifters, Gavin Francis, p 169) In this theory, the power of algebra, that it allows the future [the solution 'x'] to be manipulated is because Life is built on an absolute [2] called the Fibonacci series that links past, present and [an estimate of] the future.

Descartes used orthogonality in, what could only have been a top-down [albeit inspired] guess, to describe the relationship between x and y in an equation, and that showed 'how the two disciplines were part of the same cosmic continuum' (p 169). These words ['same cosmic continuum'] in this quotation become understandable through this theory when derived bottom-up but unfortunately, so much of philosophy contains this meaningless type of description ['same cosmic continuum'] and that is because it is a top-down description that is not definable and not based on an absolute and so is not reproducible. Science must be based on absolutes, and thus it is all too easy for Homo sapiens' thinking to allow public servants to obfuscate or 'muddy the waters' [for their own benefit, [1]] and create needless complication in world affairs and the above paper is a simplification that rids us of racism, sectarianism, wars etc. around the world, so, as an illustration of the method of the paper above, let us look at Homo sapiens attempt at similar that took hundreds of years.

The unknowns [x and y] must be different and being different means that if we take the sameness out [that part lying on the same axis [x or y] we must be left with quantities that lie on different [orthogonal] axes. This is why Descartes' coordinates axes work because orthogonality is a restriction on the creation equation [*energy plus organisation is nothing*], where plus is an orthogonality and is needed for energy and organisation to exist independently of each other [and another restriction becomes necessary, that the space must be accelerating so that energy and organisation never meet [as they would at the origin, and annihilate each other] and this acceleration produces gravity that attracts everything and so on to derive the universe [6]]. This also explains Heisenberg's uncertainty principle in contextual terms as well as where gravity comes from [the acceleration], the cosmic inflation

that was faster than the speed of light [near time zero], the organisation of the mind-brain and the affordances that allows us to see the organisation around us, emotion etc.

The body of this paper hopefully produces a contextual world-wide society built on a theory of relativity of concept and context [energy and organisation] which demands the orthogonality that Descartes used in his coordinate system, and they are the same orthogonality because the universe is a fractal [because both are derived from the simple creation equation]. This comparison is pointing out that [probably] this system [the paper] is workable and uniquely so, because it is based on absolutes, but, Homo sapiens hates change, is selfish, (somewhat) dishonest, personality poor and barely civilised to the extent that extraterrestrials are shy of revealing themselves and we are in dire need of goals, such as this paper, to produce a society that we can take into the future.

### 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. Why Solving Cosmic Inflation Could Change Your Mind. *Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys*. 2022; S1(1):1-6. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-011
5. Penney D. Understanding Everything Means Understanding Nothing. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys*. 2022; S1(1): 7-12. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-012
6. Penney D. Can Affordances Save Civilisation. *Mind & Society*. 20(1): 107-110. doi:10.1007/s11299-020-00265-x
7. Penney D. Organising Organisation. *Int J Cosmol Astro Astrophys*. 2023; S2(1): 26-32. doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-014
8. 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