

The Organisational Universe

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

Received: August 20, 2023

Accepted: August 29, 2023

Published: September 08, 2023

Citation: Penney D. The Organisational Universe. *Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys.* 2023; 5(1): 210-216.

doi: [10.18689/ijcaa-1000140](https://doi.org/10.18689/ijcaa-1000140)

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

This paper addresses the time after the creation until today and answers the many problems of evolution in a simple way as would be expected of a complete new model. Science is strained by the implausibility of the Big Bang [energy only], quantum mechanics [probability], the billions of galaxies [unlikely] and the extremely remote probability of Life starting from simple chemicals. However, a shift in thinking allows a sensible simple explanation of these phenomena as 'threads' afforded by the possibilities inherent in the structure of organisations that allows social science to become a real workable predictive science [11] that can be applied to the problems of society today. This simplicity is examined against the plethora of current top-down theories that bedevil the theory of the evolution of the universe, society and ourselves and examples are given from cosmology, mathematics, physics, social science and governance etc. The concept of possibilities explains what we probably are, and that we need be no more than possibilities to explain everything from the physical [that we see around us] and to establish the goals to which we should aim.

Keywords: Relativity; Creation; Evolution; Organisation; Possibilities

Introduction

- Homo sapiens is merely a transient, intent on getting somewhere that doesn't have a name or a purpose, doing little that is useful and not knowing specifically what should be done and is merely filling the planet with more hungry mouths. This theory provides the organisation and goals to right [and wright] this insanity by upgrading our concept of organisation and thinking to a level that is appropriate to attain the future goals.
- It now becomes obvious that the principle of least action has found a home as a necessary overall restriction to the space that contains the universe and secondly, that cosmology, in being the basis to all disciplines, become the long sought-after precursor to philosophy and moves from the fringe [of acceptability] to being the core of everything.

Preamble

The anthology *Chance: The science and secrets of luck, randomness and probability* edited by Michael Brooks is important not so much as a means of elucidating these secrets [because many are misguided], but as a vehicle to express the problems [a relativity] that we find in dealing with these subjects. 'Dig deep into the way everything works, and you find yourself dealing with quantum theory' (p 2), but quantum theory is, I believe, a misunderstood top-down version of the organisation in this theory [6]. 'One of the most famous quotes in science is Einstein's reaction to this, a refusal to believe it can really be how the universe operates. "God does not play dice"'. (p 3) As usual,

Einstein was correct for the wrong reasons [according to this theory [principle of least action applies]] because he had one 'foot' in classical physics. Basically, to understand this point, our view must change from the long held one that the universe is 'real' to contemplating that it is an organisation, but that is a problem because Newtonian physics does not consider organisation explicitly and modern theoretical physics was sidelined a 100 years ago.

Different authors naturally write about the subjects that obsess their minds [because they stick around unresolved] and they are the concepts that are crying out to be part of a context [and laid to rest]. The range of problems expressed in the book, under the broad title of 'chance', is widespread across science and social science and it is the purpose of this paper to show that there is a simple answer [organisation] that is, and has always been ignored by Homo sapiens, that better answers these questions, and further, that Homo sapiens is an imperfect transient variant that has lost it's way and is placing the world in jeopardy with it's fumbblings. The future of humanity [Homo completus] can only be seen by embracing organisation and heeding the forward planning that is inherent in it [1].

Setting the Stage

'The question of whether life is widespread in the universe is important. . . . We now understand that the secret of life lies not with the basic chemical ingredients as such, but with the logical structure and organisational arrangements of the molecules. . . . Nothing better illustrates the computational prowess of life than the genetic code. All known life is based on a deal struck between nucleic acids and proteins – two classes of molecule that, from a chemical point of view, are scarcely on nodding terms. The nucleic acids DNA and RNA store instructions, and the proteins do most of the work.' (p 15) In other words, Life is a combination of two orthogonal [scarcely on nodding terms] parts, organisation [DNA] and energy [proteins], which is to be expected in the fractal universe created from energy and organisation by the creation equation *energy plus organisation is nothing* [6].

This statement requires a disclaimer that firstly, peers may not accept this interpretation [due to resistance to change] that is part [an absolute] of our evolution and more specifically they may maintain that the universe is 'real' [God created] and 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.

The basic fact to remember is that, when looking back, Homo sapiens was stupid, and currently is stupid, and that is apparent because Homo sapiens is in a transition from the animals that evolved from literally nothing to a logical necessity of an ultimate goal of Homo completus that acts [logically] in the interests of all citizens, animals and the planet. In other words, Mankind must become God-like and manage the planet and then Mankind might be accepted into

the universe's extraterrestrial community, and if there is not such a community, we must become that community. An example of Homo sapiens, in regard to quantum mechanics, is that physics is in a dither because physicists resist change; yet physics is crucial to society; physicists are loath to support what they don't understand; they do not understand quantum mechanics because quantum mechanics is organisation and Newtonian physics shuns organisation. An example is that physicists describe gravity as an attraction, instead of an organisational effect [5] and have seemingly, in desperation, held onto Newtonian physics because it works, even though they have no idea why it works. 'Nobody knows where these laws come from, nor why they apparently operate universally and unfailingly' (p 145) Even worse is that physicists have forsaken [100 years ago] the search for modern physics theory because they are baffled by quantum mechanics [and cling to Francis Bacon's mantra of measurement] and they consider the universe to be 'real', where their version of reality is of their own making and is not what is presented here [hence the disclaimer].

The question 'Where these laws come from?' begs an answer and I surmise that they came from Galileo's experimental law of motion [an absolute that $F/m=g$ is the force (F) on a mass (m) due to the constant acceleration due to gravity (g)] that was, possibly generalised by Newton and the reason that Newtonian physics works, in the main, is because it is based on an absolute in a relative universe [such as we have]. In other words, Newtonian physics works because it uses the form of this bottom-up derivation without the reasoning behind the creation, and the reason that it does not work properly is because it is different to the absolute that this model uses, which is, *energy plus organisation is nothing*. This becomes $energy/organisation=i^2$, where 'i' is the square root of (-1) compared to $F/ma=1$. The similarity is obvious [but the physical requires the use of energy [not force] because force requires a determination of 'how much' and depends on the measurer, 'ma' is an organisation and 'i squared', I believe, signifies a relativity that must always exist [both states are 'imaginary' without containing relativity]. [12]

I am not denigrating Newtonian physics because it is good physics where an experiment [Galileo] is theorised [contrary to Francis Bacon's edict] to make a useful simple tool that works but may not be correct as an organisation, likewise Einstein's contributions are similarly at odds with, what I believe is the functioning of the universe. The book [Chance, Ed. Michael Brooks], is similar in that it is a relativity [of ideas] that can be used by current practitioners to decide which theory to use because relativity requires two independent [yet entangled] ways of viewing measurements [as a concept or context]. The problem first appeared with the Michelson-Morley experiment where the speed of light was found to be constant relative to the measurer [regardless of their motion] and the answer lies in the definition of affordances [6] that there must be a specific question for a solution to be returned [to the measurer]. An example is [mathematical] algebra, where the unknown 'x' is specified

[and uniquely identified and defined] and can then be used in the logical process of the organisation [of mathematics] to derive the answer 'x'. In other words, vague questions do not work, presumably because the organisation is completely and exactly defined [through minimum energy].

Addressing the Problem

I need to present this message and *Chance* fits the bill by presenting the problems that are worrying the contributors and perhaps even that which the establishment is suppressing within their peers. A particularly pertinent example that is close to the core of astronomy is that as telescopes become better, we can see further back in time at the billions of galaxies that then existed. The question is, 'Are they really there, or more precisely, were they really there?', as they would have to be in a 'real' universe, or are they not there, but would have had to have been there for us to measure [or be here] in an organisational universe? These two questions cannot both be correct and yet they are similar to Einstein's retort and Michael Brook's 'Dig deep into the way everything works, and you find yourself dealing with quantum theory', where, as above, quantum theory is a misinterpretation of organisation.

Just as in the basis [absolutes] given above of physics [$F/ma=1$] and my theory [energy/organisation= i squared], there is a difference in the level [of complexity] behind the absolutes used and quantum theory, I believe, can be derived from the relativity [energy/organisation= i squared, [6]], whereas it cannot be seen from Newtonian physics. In other words, quantum mechanics is a construct of physics looking top-down, whereas quantum mechanics [the correct version] can be derived bottom-up from the relativity equation and by being a construct of the guesswork [top-down], physics has got it wrong again [I believe (in complexity)] because they base quantum mechanics on probability, which it is, but measurement [affordances] is possibility. Clearly, mathematical probability is complex, whereas a possibility is just that, a possibility of occurrence [which could not be simpler].

Possibility Versus Probability

There is a basic difference between probability, which is mathematically, a continuous segment where the sum of the probabilities of something happening at all those points totals certainty [with every point considered] and a possibility is that something can happen at a particular point. If there is a possibility [of something happening] physicists want to measure it's occurrence as a probability [principle of science] in a 'real' world [conceptual], but an organisation is orthogonal [contextual] and a contextual space is entangled and in particular, fully entangled. In other words, entangled locally and non-locally and includes every point in the organisation with the same logic and restrictions that apply to the total space whereas energy and organisation are bound at all times by the division of distance and time [the so-called speed of light, [6]]. Contrast this simplicity to physics' considering that

'God uses it to ensure that all of the universe's far-flung regions remain a coherent part of His overall plan' (p 154) This is an example of top-down thinking and making murky the operating of a simple fractal. Further, add to this the [top-down] supposition that alternate universes exist [alternate universe theory where alternate universes co-exist with our own] so that options can arise and be considered and we can see how an organisation simply answers our questions by selecting an appropriate 'thread' [the definition of organisation is communication].

Physics looks for 'How?', not 'Why? we are here, and assumes that God made us for some purpose. I suggest that we are the essence [to do the work] of 'free-will' and perhaps even answer Socrates' questions. We, being here, are the possibility that all of the requirements for life were fulfilled and that there is a 'thread' that leads to us being here. This is what relativity is saying, that our present rests on the past fulfilling it's destined role. Life did not necessarily start somewhere, but the possibility was there, even if the total probability was minute and even more minute at each individual point and time. Thus, it is ridiculous to worry about the difficulty of life beginning because we know that it could begin [because we are here]. This then covers the anthropic principle [that it explains why this universe has the age and the fundamental physical constants necessary to accommodate conscious life, since if either had been different, we would not have been around to make observations.' (Wikipedia, Anthropic principle)].

As an example, consider the question, that there appears to be billions of galaxies in the universe and do they actually exist or did exist in a 'real' universe? Alternately there is nothing physical. That is the difference between a 'real' universe and an organisational universe because the first exists and is incredibly complicated all of the time, and the other is simple [most of the time when not viewed], but just as complicated when viewed [and the logic appears in the same way that we 'see' the stars in the past]. This might sound strange, but organisation is everywhere entangled and dependent on logic and restrictions and any possible thread will be available [an organisation is a communication]. For example, the correct measurement of gravity [Eddington's experiment] showed that Einstein needed attraction as well as curved space to get the correct answer [even if gravity is relativity acting on two anythings composed of energy and organisation [under acceleration] [5]].

To put this into perspective, if we enter a shop, we have to ask for an item specifically [the question associated with an affordance] or we see it on the shelf [keeping the product in mind as is necessary for affordance] and the affordance reacts with emotion [in the measurer] on a match of the product and the question. We don't need to go beyond the store for the product, but physics looks at the products produced in the factory or farm because it refuses to recognise the organisation of the shop. Similarly, the top-down-looking software that we inherited from the animals cannot see the bottom-up organisational restrictions that are imposed on the universe

in its construction [4, 5, 6]. For example, the accelerating space [necessary for the creation equation to exist [*energy plus organisation is nothing*]] produces gravity [5] and odd effects near time zero produce [what we call] cosmic inflation [4] which is a natural effect of dividing by [near] time zero in our view [which is to destroy the relativity].

These odd effects are odd to us, but necessary for the universe to function and for an accelerating universe the fixed form is the mathematical division [removes relativity, [6]] and an example is the constant speed of light being the division of distance by time [for all energy and organisation]. A crucial logical restriction [on the universe at all times] is that the energy and organisation must be equal and minimal, simply because an organisation cannot function if two possibilities exist [so-called chaos results]. This simple restriction led to the principle of least action, 'the principle remains central in modern physics and mathematics, being applied in thermodynamics, fluid mechanics, the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, particle physics, and string theory'. (Wikipedia, stationary-action principle) Clearly, this postulate has widespread ramifications and yet, strangely, does not form a basic part of physics because, I presume, physics has not been established on a logical bottom-up foundation, as I believe occurs in the theory presented here.

As above, the creation model suggests a simple form of the physical including gravity and cosmic inflation, but does little to explain the multitude of problems associated with Life and ignores the chance that was necessary for humans [and Life in general] to live on this planet. For example, 'the universe didn't have to produce matter, or a planet with a stable enough climate for life to evolve. What's more, life – especially complex life – didn't have to evolve. Neither did species. By the time we get to the chance mutations that made humans what they are, you might just marvel at how lucky you are to exist.' (p 6) 'Next on our list of flukes is the formation of the moon. . . . That's a big deal for us. If there were no moon, and obliquity varied significantly, the conditions for complex land-based life might not exist. . . . And how did we get started? By chance.' (p 12) Clearly, these questions need answering and the 'thread' possibility is a simple and concise twist to our thinking that lays the confusion to rest.

Adding to the Theory

That the universe is an organisation is apparent for a number of reasons, from the number of stars [it is simpler that they be a logical requirement rather than to be actually there (and 'real')], the derivation of this theory, that Life is affected by aspects of the physical, such as gravity, which appears to be an attraction, but is [according to this theory] a result of relativity and an accelerating space [5]. Other indications, such as the diffuse boundaries in an organisation, resulting as the Heisenberg uncertainty principle [6], or that a mathematical function can be expressed as an infinite series of whole numbers etc. [2], also, it was found that the ratio of the terms of the Fibonacci series produced the series that became the Golden ratio which indicates an absolute, but it was a result

that was not readily explainable at the time [see below]. Now, I would like to explore how this observation fits into the theory presented here that our universe is an organisation and not 'real'. This is important because an organisation, derived from a simple equation is a fractal that demands simplicity and similarity, which allows us to better understand our 'place in the sun'.

An organisation appears to be constructed of line segments that are unbounded [by tending to limits] and are [internally] continuous, for example, energy, organisation, time and distance are all linear [to the extent that the space is always accelerating], but currently accelerating close to zero [asymptotic to zero, so that the creation equation continues to exist] [4, 5, 6], and you may well ask 'How close to zero after 13 billion years of expansion?' and the answer is, of course, so close that experiments are not going to resolve the eternal question [of astronomy], 'Is the universe accelerating, static or decelerating?'. The universe is always bound by the rule [of logic] that it must always be in the simplest possible form and must be expanding at all times for the creation equation to exist. This begs the question of 'What is logic?' and suggests a combination of restrictions [accelerating space that produces gravity, the (so-called) principle of least action which is the requirement of the least energetic/simplest action of everything etc.] etc.

Another question that must be asked is 'Does our universe exist?', and that requires an answer like that asked of quantum mechanics [6], which is 'Does quantum mechanics exist [as an organisation] when we do not understand organisation?' [7]. The problem is in our thinking [3]. The basic answer to 'Does the universe exist if it came from nothing?' is in the restriction of an accelerating [just slightly accelerating] space that contains the universe. These questions only make sense to a mind [measurer] that recognises the completeness of relativity and bottom-up organisation to go with the top-down thinking that we inherited from the animals. This theory, I believe, is the completeness that provides the software behind our thinking [mathematics of concept-context] and includes restrictions such as the accelerating space [for existence] that provides the 'gravity' that we assume holds everything together. Actually, in this theory the effect of 'gravity' [the attraction and universal entanglement] is a result of the relativity of measurement [5] which is the entanglement of the elements of the creation equation [not an attraction].

What is the Fibonacci series? Mathematical number theory describes it as explaining [mathematically] the growth in population of rabbits, under the restriction that only one kitten is born [3]. This restriction [of a single birth] is important because it contains the similarity of a fractal [and the minimisation, above] that a number of kittens can be treated as one similarly. The sequence also shows up in the packing of sunflower seeds etc. Why? Basically because the Fibonacci series is an organisation, and I suggest, that Homo sapiens seems to recognise Occam's razor ['that the simplest way is usually the best'] as the sum total of current 'formal' organisation whereas the creation equation suggests that

organisation is the 'grab-bag' of the relativity of the energy of the Big Bang hypothesis. 'The concept of "information" is rather woolly, though this is usual when a subject is in it's infancy. Two centuries ago, energy was an equally vague notion. Scientists intuitively recognised it as significant in physical processes, but lacked mathematical rigour. Today, we accept energy as a real and fundamental quantity, because it is well understood. Information remains bewildering, partly because it crops up in different guises in so many scientific fields.' (p 21) Notice that emotional energy is excluded from Newtonian physics, possibly because energy is created and a basic law of Newtonian physics is that energy cannot be created nor destroyed [which is absurd in an accelerating space].

The Fibonacci series is that each term is the sum of the two preceding terms, which does not seem exciting in top-down thinking, but bottom-up it shows a series of relativities that we can label past, present and future and this sequence shows the importance of forward planning [that a future goal is necessary in any endeavour [1]]. This sounds simple, but our political system seems to ignore the longer-term goals and planning that should be in place, but are not, and this lack is, I believe, because organisation is not recognised and not considered. If physics is 50% organisation [from the creation equation], social science is closer to 100% organisation and it is even more essential that forward planning is vital, but not being used by public servants because, for example, multiculturalism is creating future problems [species, see below] etc. [1, 8, 9, 10, 13]

The form of the Fibonacci sequence is shown by division of the terms [removing the relativity]:

F2/F1, F3/F2, F4/F3, F5/F4

'or (to three decimal places): 1, 2, 1.5, 1.667, 1.6, 1.625, 1.615, 1.619, 1.618 ...

then the values of these terms gets closer and closer to phi, the golden ratio.'

Thus, the Fibonacci series is a context of the structure of Life and the form is to divide the terms [of the context] that form an infinite series that leads to the concept, and that is phi, the golden ratio. However, in a fractal, we can expect a particular result [because of relativity at least] and indeed we find that this is a general organisational result of any sequence that shows the 'way of Life' by using the requirement of relativity [past and future goals]. 'So, just say we start with 4 and 10, the following term will be 14 and the one after that 24. . . .

10/4, 14/10, 24/14, 38/24, 62/38, 100/62 . . .

2.5, 1.4, 1.714, 1.583, 1.632, 1.612, 1.620, 1.617, 1.618 . . . '

(Alex's Adventures in Numberland, Alex Bellos, p 291)

The author [Alex Belos] goes on to say 'I find this a totally enthralling mathematical phenomenon' (p 291) and this is a typical top-down response because it is, as he says, but from the bottom-up it says a great deal more, that any numbers [say 4 and 10] that are acted upon to give a sum [14] and so

on, the lack of relativity converges to an absolute [phi]. Clearly, the Fibonacci series is one series that Life uses for it's own purposes that is an organisational absolute of profound importance, and that importance is [possibly] the relativity of the creation equation, that says that *all* time has a past and a future that must always be considered. In other words, the dimensions [energy, organisation, time and space] are saying that energy and organisation [linked together by relativity] are found/applicable in all time and space [as we would expect].

Why are We Here?

'With all these accidents in place, Earth was ready for life. But that raises another question: did life have to happen? (*Chance*, ed. Michael Brooks, p13) 'Many assume that life should arise inevitably, given Earth-like conditions, a stance known as biological determinism. But it is hard to find any support for it in the known laws of physics, chemistry or biology. If we relied solely on these laws to explain the workings of the universe, it would be reasonable to conclude that life can only have arisen by sheer good luck – and that it is therefore exceedingly unlikely to be found elsewhere.' (p 13) Remember that in an organisational setting it is the possibility ['thread'] not an actual occurrence that should be considered and that an organisation is a communication device and if a question is asked, it is answered truthfully and specifically and this is called a physics-experiment, but the questions asked are top-down and meaningless unless asked in terms of bottom-up and we need to change our thinking to understand this [3]. When we consider life, we are offered an answer that could have occurred under the restrictions binding a universe that could have started if two somethings were created out of nothing in an accelerating frame of reference etc. No one is saying that we exist, or that we will ever exist, but there is a possibility, and on the other hand, no one knows what we would do [in given circumstances] until we do it [Socrates' questions]. In other words, physics wants to know the intimate details of every item in the shop, whereas organisation allows us to ignore what is not necessary [the question in affordances], which rationalises/formalises/directs our intellect. An unwieldy physics results from not having a theory of modern physics [as this hopefully is] and results in a plethora of top-down surmises that has thwarted the understanding of physics and an example is quantum mechanics.

Thus, physical experiments tell us what is possible, not what has been produced [and has some probability] and the same organisation can be used in social science. Consider that 'speciation still remains one of the biggest mysteries in evolutionary biology' (p 34) and the answer is to be found, I believe, in this theory as relativity, and because I have done some work on the [possible] bad effects on society of multiculturalism [1, 8, 9], I venture the following. A group of animals, birds, humans etc, that consume the same food tend to split into two groups so that they have an opposition that they can identify when food is scarce, social problems arise or other stresses [of many types] produces an aversion to sharing

and relativity [safeguarding breeding stock] comes to the fore. The 'exponential curve indicates that speciation is triggered by a **single accidental event**. Best fit for **78%** of evolutionary trees' (p 36) and droughts would seem to be the most likely trigger.

Looking forward is similar to looking back and relativity is necessary [Fibonacci series] and 'the six evolutionary accidents that made you the person you are today' (p 45) 1) 'Jaw dropper . . . single mutation in MYH16, which encodes a muscle protein' (p 46), 2) 'Brain gain . . . ASPM sequence' (p 48), 3) 'Energy upgrade . . . the brain uses about 20 per cent of our energy at rest, compared with 8 per cent for other primates' (p 49), 4) 'Gift of the gab . . . FOXP2 protein' (p 51), 5) Helping hand . . . HACN1' (p 53), 6) 'Switch to starch . . . Humans have much higher levels of amylase in their saliva than chimpanzees' (p 54). We are here, working well because we evolved the correct way, which is to be successful, and that is the organisational rule of survival of the fittest. Indeed, Darwin's [organisational] contribution is one of 8 listed as Homo sapiens unrecognised [occurred as a single entity] organisational contributions throughout history [11].

The Scaffold of Organisation

The structure of organisation is fluid because an organisation needs to grow [organically] and this is shown by the representation of operators, such as pi, as an infinite series [2], but embedded are organisational absolutes that do not change [as limits], such as the golden ratio [phi], above, which I interpret as the limit of a segment of emotion from 0 to phi. I do this because emotion [energy] and organisation are related through the creation equation and the maximum organisation of a line segment is, I believe, the golden ratio. Pi, on the other hand, I interpret as the operator linking a circle and a square, but what of 'e'? Consider that 'Prussian soldiers all faced a small but finite risk of deaths from horse-kicks . . . The result is 2.71 – within 1 per cent of e. A fluke? Not at all: it's to do with the mathematics of what are called Poisson distributions. Probability theory shows the e can be expected to pop up when lots of randomly triggered events are spread over a restricted interval of time. The same is true of events spread over a limited region of space'. (p 110) This indicates that restrictions introduce non-randomness into the organisation [e represents simple interest accumulation [number theory]]

Conclusion and Prediction

The parable [the preserve of organisation] of the shop, above, shows physics busily garnering information about all the producers and the minutia of their production, shipment etc., when all that is needed is to visit the shop to experience the products in the shop, yet Homo sapiens is so slow to define organisation and to aim for future goals, above, that it is a menace to the future of civilisation and needs an urgent upgrade in the software that it uses [in the mind] and hopefully that this paper supplies.

Relativity [in demanding a prediction to the conclusion] is the most important concept and is apparent in Born's Rule [6] and the propensity to movement that we call gravity due to the [necessary] acceleration [5] that requires the square rule in measuring, for example, Pythagoras' theorem that uses the squares as relativity and uniqueness [principle of least action] that demands that there is no higher power that satisfies this relationship [Fermat's last theorem that took a couple of hundred pages to solve using mathematics]. We assume that multiplication is 'so many lots of something', but it has a much more important role, I believe, as the agent of relativity, for example as the relativity between two masses or charges [2, 5] that leads to the ubiquitous square that keeps popping up when a comparison is made, which possibly signifies the relativity of our measurement.

If the universe is an organisation, we can influence it, as it influences us [gravity] and this can be felt every time that we recognise [appreciate or measure organisation] beauty, music, Church services, parades etc. in and about society and this effect of affordances [use of the creation equation] is [I believe] the interaction [relativity between measurer and thing measured] whereby the organisation measured creates emotional energy in the measurer *and* adds to the organisation of the measured [by adding/measuring/recognising the measurer] and the relativity is the product [producing the square]. For example, it is possible that Homo sapiens is being manipulated by a increasingly complex religion [and government] as shown by the creation of a Church hierarchy that grew out of the simple message of religion, 'these various strands were pulled together if not actually masterminded by the first of three great propagandizing Popes, Leo I (390-461) . . . Gelasius I (fl. 492-6) . . . Gregory I (540-609) . . . the propagandist known as Denys the Areopagite, who developed the image of the Pope as an exceptional church ruler above the law and above criticism' (*Easily Led*, Oliver Thomson, p 126). Thus was created a Church hierarchy that continues to this day that increased the splendour and complexity of the Church and also increased it's emotional appeal as a draw-card. [10].

If I seem to have concentrated on physics examples it is because physics is more conceptual [50%] versus social science that is more organisational [100%] and the above example shows the organisation behind the affordances generated by the creation equation. A very different example of relativity is given in [13] where [hopefully] a class action will succeed against the government valuing 200 square metres of hillside at \$600,000 when it is supposed to be the unimproved value of the land. The case is that it is impossible to value anything unless it is in the form that has value to another buyer [which is a relativity] and that the subdivisions [currently 150 and 50 square metres] should be made large enough to be built upon and thus have a value to others [building blocks of one hectare each], which can be simply done by changing the figures.

The prediction is that cosmology is the creation and will be acknowledged to be the basis of everything leading to

philosophy, physics, social science and everything that is part of the organisation of Life including the universe and perhaps the Ancients were correct that we are the centre of everything. Also, given that we are possibilities in a relativistic universe, being of zero size is just as likely as any other size, and the simplest case is that we do not exist at all! So, perhaps Occam's razor becomes the central organisational tenet that we [and the rest of the universe] are possibilities residing in nothing!

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-s1-015
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
9. 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
10. Penney D. Propaganda: A Relativity Used By The Other Side. (An unpublished paper)
11. Penney D. Management as a Science. (An unpublished paper)
12. Penney D. Why Are Physicists So Mentally Challenged? (An unpublished paper)
13. Penney D. The Changing Face of Australian Governance. *Madridge J Behav Soc Sci.* 2023; S1(1): 22-27. doi:10.18689/mjbss-s1-004