

Opinion Article - Special Issue

Open Access

Understanding Everything Means Understanding Nothing

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: dwpenny2@bigpond.com

Received: September 10, 2022

Accepted: September 21, 2022

Published: September 30, 2022

Citation: Penney D. Understanding Everything Means Understanding Nothing. *Int J Cosmol Astron Astrophys.* 2022; S1(1): 7-12.
doi: 10.18689/ijcaa-s1-012

Copyright: © 2022 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

Disclaimer

This paper is an 'opinion piece' and not scientific because the scientific method [as stipulated by Francis Bacon] contains measurement only and lacks relativity between two measurements [the theory], and secondly, the scientific principle is flawed because it relies on peer review of previous work and I believe that Newtonian physics is correct, but too complicated to allow modern theoretical physics to be seen. Because this approach is so new, it does not build on the peer reviewed work of others [energy plus organisation is nothing versus force equals mass times acceleration] and fills a hole in our thinking that currently lacks relativity by being top-down only. And, just what does 'times' mean? Surely not mass lots of acceleration or acceleration lots of mass! This paper shows that multiplication and division have physical properties [mathematical physics is obviously flawed] that are not understood and lead to the hyperbola of distance [quantum gravity] that complements the previous paper [10] that considered the hyperbola of time [Big Bang, cosmic inflation, accelerating universe etc.]. Thirdly, physics retreated back into Newtonian physics and measurement 100 years ago and is possibly resistant to change, and on understanding this paper, your mind may be changed [irrevocably] and that may jeopardise your standing in the physics' community because physics does not include organisation explicitly. Fourthly, 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.

Abstract

Physics is riddled with enigmas because it (literally) 'does not know nothing', and nothing, relativity, restrictions, logic and organisation are the key to that understanding. What is the true (according to this model) meaning of (mathematical) multiplication, the Big Bang, quantum gravity, the law of gravity, quantum mechanics, the speed of neutrinos and the structure of the universe, and for mathematics, what does Euler's equation mean, and that multiplication and division are manipulating relativity? Nothing can produce an accelerating universe [in an organisational sense] that forces a motion on everything that we believe is an attraction that we call gravity – silly us! No gravity waves or gravitons, just a new way of thinking. This paper suggests that we live in an organisational universe composed of nothings that are held apart as energy and organisation by an accelerating space that our universe has been found to be experimentally [Hoyle] and it's form, as atoms, by the lack of reactivity of neutrinos. Science and [it's orthogonal] social science are incomplete due to an incorrect use of science [lack of absolutes] and that lack is destroying civilisation and needs this model to show how understanding organisation can put us on a better path.

Keywords: Principle of Science, Big Bang, Gravity, Relativity, Euler's equation, Neutrinos, Multiplication.

The Aim

This paper follows the form of the universe through the hyperbola created by the division of the fractal generating creation equation by distance to create absolutes that show the *form* [of gravity, quantum gravity, law of gravitation etc.] of the construction of the organisation that is our universe. This follows the first paper [10] that showed the hyperbola created by time [functioning as the Big Bang, cosmic inflation, accelerating universe etc.] because distance and time are created by the restriction of an accelerating space that is required for the creation equation to exist. These relativities [energy, organisation, time and distance] describe the form and function of everything in the universe and show that Francis Bacon's measurement [form] needs theory [function] as well [as a relativity]. The purpose of science, as commonly thought, is to simplify, which allows our mind to improve its software to allow us to understand social science [7, 8, 9] and social engineering to control the technology that evolved from science. and thereby save civilisation from the incompetence of Homo sapiens.

Multiplication as a Concept

Homo sapiens thinks that it is pretty smart, and even wise [sapiens], but sadly, it harbours many delusions and one such is the multiplication of numbers that took so much effort to learn in school. Mathematics knows it as the number $axb = a$ counted b times, or b counted a times and 'one of the main properties of multiplication is the commutative property' (Wikipedia, Multiplication) This very restricted view is the result of only using the top-down approach and not understanding the basic [bottom-up] organisation of multiplication and so, it is the way of thinking [software] that may be the problem. Another example [3] is Newtonian physics that uses an absolute of $F=ma$ [where F is force, m is mass and a is acceleration] that was probably generalised from Galileo's $F=mg$ where g is the acceleration due to gravity] instead of the simpler creation equation [*energy plus organisation is nothing*], below. The muddled thinking of the above two cases is the problem that is resolved by realising that the creation equation produces a fractal which has relativity as its base and that the space created is orthogonal and entangled [4]. A fractal is derived from a simple expression and the space exhibits simplicity and similarity which is shown in the creation equation.

Multiplication works for us [as a counted b times, or b counted a times] in a simple and similar space [fractal] because the universe uses it in some way that we do not realise, and that is as a product [not multiplication] of the creation equation [*concept plus concept is nothing*] and the requirement of absolutes. 'Bacon's method is an example of the application of inductive reasoning' (Wikipedia, Baconian method), is organisationally top-down and leads to (effectively) guessing, whereas to properly theorise, we need a science that is

predictive relative to absolutes. Francis 'Bacon's influence led to a focus on practical experimentation in science. He was, however, criticized for neglecting the importance of the imaginative leaps that drive all scientific progress.' [Scientific Revolution] (*The Little Book Of Philosophy*, p 57) Organisation is a context and is more difficult to understand than concepts, so I will use examples, such as that physics is based on energy [concept] for simplicity because energy is a quantity that is a linear variable [continuous from zero to infinity], whereas organisation is equally variable in the sense of complexity, and they could be called orthogonal because each is totally independent [but entangled] of the other [2].

If we use a creation equation such as *energy plus organisation is nothing* to describe the physical, then obviously these two things must be kept apart to exist and that can only logically be done in an accelerating frame of reference, and this was verified by Hoyle [all stars are accelerating away from us]. Note that there must be acceleration in the radii, and it is pretty obvious when you think about it because gravity comes from the acceleration of the space, and even $F=ma$ suggests that. If the universe started with the Big Bang, the creation equation came into effect, time and distance started and with energy and organisation became the dimensions, where the dimensions are orthogonal, and entangled. Notice that entangled specifies an organisation and everything must be entangled through the creation equation and that brings the concept of a 'real' universe into question.

The celestial scene makes for good experimentation because it is (effectively) a closed system with limited relativity, which is important because relativity is not like Einstein's relativity because this model says that everything is relative, and in particular, considering a sun and its planet, the relationship between the two, the so called law of gravitation, had never been derived, but was an 'inspired' guess on the part of Newton. Is it true, that after 350 years with satellites, cosmology and astronomy being rampant, the basic equation has never been derived? Could this be taking Bacon's requirement of measurement-only to extremes? I would hazard a guess that we do not understand the multiplication and division that is used in the equation $F=mg$, but first an example of the fractal that we live in and how multiplication [and later division] are really forms of relativity that arise out of the creation equation.

Let's look at Euler's equation [5], which is claimed by Mathematics as the enigmatic relationship between the fundamental mathematical quantities π , e , i , 1 and 0 , though what 1 has to do with the others appears a little strange. However, as a description of the physical universe [as a fractal], it makes more sense because it reflects the form of the universe [$(e$ to the power i times $\pi + 1) = 0$ can be written $(e$ to the power i times $\pi + e$ to the power $0) = 0$, which is an expression of orthogonality and describes an expanding [e, simple interest expansion] sphere [π] from 0 symmetrical [i] through the centre (reflecting the lack of relativity)]. This 'subsuming' is the expected result in a fractal and Euler's equation appears enigmatic because of the appearance of 'i'

[the square root of '-1'], but it's appearance becomes obvious due to relativity. Consider the quotation "wave functions generally contain 'imaginary' numbers – one involving the square root of -1, which is not something that has a physical meaning" (*Beyond Weird*, Phillip Ball, p 53). I am drawing attention to it because it shows the current confused thinking of physics, in that 'i' is an operator from quantum gravity because relativity is shown by '1' and '-1' and that must be generated by 'i' and that is why "wave functions generally contain 'imaginary' numbers" because 'i' [and every number] is not only a number [concept], but also an organisation [context] and quantum gravity is the 'spread' from the atom [quarks] to gravity in galaxies. In other words, 'i' is imaginary, and does not exist, because relativity always exists and not because it does not make sense in mathematics.

So, having deconstructed Euler's equation back to the creation equation, let us construct the law of gravitation from the creation equation because it shows that multiplication is adding relativity and division is removing relativity. *Finally, it can be realised that addition, subtraction, multiplication and division are the relativity [context] of a number [concept] that parallels the top-bottom organisation and sideways relativity of thinking in this new theory.* Relativity is the functioning of the universe and a lack of relativity is the form of the universe and a lack of relativity is easily created [and our understanding of the universe] by the ratios of the dimensions [energy (E), organisation (O), time (t) and length (l)] created by expansion. The five absolutes are firstly, the sum of energy and organisation is always zero [from the creation equation *energy plus organisation equals zero*], secondly, energy and organisation are necessarily created as infill to balance the necessary acceleration [relativity for the creation equation to exist] of the universe [$E/t+O/t$, all volume], thirdly, the constant speed of light [with respect to any measurer] is l/t (all E and O) and fourthly, gravity [so called quantum gravity] is $E/l+O/l$ (all t). The fifth absolute is that the universe has to always contain minimum energy and organisation (principle of least action) [1].

Thus, the variability of the fractal has been eliminated by considering the absolutes [of the dimensions] that construct our universe and we will see that it is the acceleration of the universe [a restriction] that creates gravity [what we call the 'attraction' of everything to everything else], and in particular, the 'attraction' to both concepts and context, being energy and organisation in the physical. The word 'attraction' is used by us (because that is what it appears to be), but it is an effect of the acceleration [of the universe, and a restriction], as we shall see. Einstein postulated 'curved space' to double the effect of the attraction of matter [which he equated to energy [gravity waves]] and gain the correct answer [Eddington's experiment], whereas this theory says that length, time, energy and organisation are linear with the acceleration a logical restriction. Consider the following, where a distinction is noted between 'position and momentum' [effectively energy and the organisation (that physics explicitly ignores) from the creation equation] and 'energy and time' [between the creation equation and a dimension that is a restriction]

'Heisenberg's uncertainty principle...This restriction on precise knowledge does *not* apply to all pairs of quantum properties. It applies only to some, which are said to be "conjugate variables". Position and momentum are conjugate variables, and so are energy and time (although the uncertainty relationship between them is subtly different from that between position and momentum) ... I have never found an intuitive explanation of what makes two variables conjugate'. (p 150) The universe is created from an orthogonality [independent, but entangled at the origin] of energy [momentum] and organisation [position] and trying to measure an orthogonality [measuring each exactly is the same as between the two] is logically impossible because it is a restriction on the creation equation [independence]. Energy and time, along with organisation and length are dimensions and must be orthogonal so that ratios can uniquely define absolutes.

The role of Occam's razor and the principle of least action is crucial to the understanding of the functioning of the universe and the latter asks 'why does light travel in a straight line?'. Newton's laws of motion say that a photon *must* travel in a straight line otherwise the laws do not work and so misses out on vital information and is, again, 'up in the air'. I believe that the answer is that there has to be a unique answer and the only unique answer in every case is the minimum and the organisation that belongs to the minimum energy is the most efficient organisation. I can say this with conviction because if either energy or organisation were not at a minimum, there would be two solutions at the same time and this would cause chaos in the functioning of the universe. This last sentence questions whether our universe is "real", although derived from nothing is a bit of a difficulty, but then, what or where do we expect it to come from and suggests that it is an organisational solution based on possibilities created by measurement?

As above, Newton 'inspire' guessed the law of gravitation and Einstein corrected the law by doubling the result by postulating 'curved space' and predicting gravity waves. However, 'according to recent theory, the reason that mass is proportional to gravity is because everything with mass emits tiny particles called gravitons. These gravitons are responsible for gravitational attractions. The more mass, the more gravitons. Graviton theory also accounts for differences in gravitational attraction over distance. Most gravitons exist in a cloud around the object. As distance from the object increases, the density of the graviton cloud goes down, so there is less gravitational attraction. (www.grg.northwestern.edu) I have to point out that waves are energy and that gravitational waves are top-down thinking, and similarly with gravitons, although they do possess organisation [as particles], but don't mesh contextually with the form of the universe. The explanation in this theory is that gravity is (possibly) an illusion and is a product of the acceleration restriction on the universe, and that that is the *form* of gravity whereas the *function* is the communication that must exist in an organisation as a logic [and necessary for it to be defined as an organisation].

This paper also describes the software that I believe is used in the brain that is built on this model because the mathematics of concept-context is assigning a value [compare emotion] to the context of the value [compare affordance] that that concept has to your wants. The next step is to compare [numerically – level of emotion] two values to make a decision on which to choose [11]. This suggests that a principle of science that has been built on measurement [Francis Bacon] without theory [relativity between measurement] with laws agreed to by peer review is ridiculous. Compare the thinking that comes about by using the mathematics of concept-context based on the creation equation as used in this paper with the thinking that postulates gravitons, gravity waves and just plain attraction of masses [as has occurred through history]. The more that we organise our thinking, the better that we think.

Multiplication as a Context

'The implication is clear (or at least, it was clear to Einstein): Gravity causes acceleration, and acceleration causes gravity. They are absolutely identical.' (www.space.com) This statement is true to the extent that gravity (apparently) changes in a lift and there is a recognised acceleration due to gravity on falling objects, but it does not tell us what gravity is, or where it comes from. This model suggests firstly, that the restriction of an accelerating space on the creation equation produces gravity that is overall [across the universe] which is similar [in effect] to the graviton theory. Secondly, quantum gravity is simple and well defined by the absolute $[E/I \text{ plus } O/I]$, as above] and acts as faint at large distance and organisational [quarks] within the atom [hyperbolic with separation]. Thirdly, the law of gravitation, in this theory, is as simple as can be and is the product [multiplication] of the absolutes of each body, bearing in mind that both energy and organisation are included ($[1]$, and that $(E+O)/I$). Notice that the result is achieved without postulating 'curved space' [plus attraction] and simplifies to an overall effect.

Fourthly, looking at the creation equation, there is a relativity between energy and the organisation of a particle that must always be a minimum and we can destroy that relativity [by division] and we find that E/O is $i(\text{squared})$ on the particle, but what if we measure off the particle? Our universe is a very simple place with particles that have the form delineated into four types, below, by their speed and if we wish to investigate them, we have to specify the particle, in the same way that we must ask a specific question with affordances [because our universe is an organisation and must return a unique answer]. The question is what are we using to measure and the most obvious is the photon that has speed c [the alternative is to be on the particle, which is $E/O=i(\text{squared})$ that shows the relativity only [$i(\text{squared})$]], thus the communication speed is c and only c [and that is why the organisation is so simple]. Thus the *form* is E/O and the *function* is c , hence adding [actually a multiplication] relativity [the organisation must record the measurement] the *form* of the creation equation becomes $E/O=c(\text{squared})$ and this is Einstein's equation. Thus, in the correct *context*, $E=mc(\text{squared})$ becomes a triviality and shows that this derivation is on track.

Fifthly, an organisation requires communication [as a restriction] and our universe uses four speeds to delineate the components, rest, moving, squeezed into the asymptote and the speed of light. Physics seems to not recognise this organisational restriction that simplifies the hundreds of atomic particles that have been found, and also, that neutrinos are elegantly handled [in the asymptote] and that illustrates the restriction of continuity [reality] that must occur in an organisation [absolute 5].

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*] [6].

Sixth, the restriction of reality is vital to an organisation, otherwise magic can occur and magic is the possibility of two different outcomes at the same time, which is why absolute 5 is necessary. Reality can be unbounded and continuous like energy and organisation, above, or four discrete steps, as speed, above, but those steps can be bounded and speed can be zero, greater than 0 and less than c , just under c , and c . We have found the forms for the extremes [$E/O=i(\text{squared})$ and $E/O=c(\text{squared})$], but what of the particles [having speed v] themselves relative to the universe because the reality affects them by necessity? In other words, what is the *form* of the creation equation because we have only been looking at it's functioning? That would be $E/O=v(\text{squared})$, which is parabolic, so, in a celestial setting with a sun and planet [for relativity] (effectively) isolated, this equation would suggest that they would affect each other as if they were attracted to each other with an attraction according to the law of gravity above. This is as expected, where the [independent] parts of relativity would be expected to produce the same effect. Indeed, orthogonality suggests that both a conceptual proof and a contextual proof is available throughout an organisation [at the same time] and how this is another problem with physics [relativity links two independent things together to simplify].

I have read that Einstein was the last of the classical physicists, and he seems to have put forward a hybrid model that seemed to accept the attraction of mass-energy as well as the inclusion of the generation of gravity by acceleration by postulating 'curved' space. This guess gave the correct answer [Eddington's experiments] and that quieted physics, but this model uses simple space and time and the acceleration of the

universe supplies all of the [albeit decreasing] gravity. Notice the point that was raised in the last paragraph that, is it the restriction to the creation equation, and the 'square' of relativity that produces a 'curved' space and produces gravity, or are we seeing two co-joining effects as seen in the derivation of the law of gravity, in effect a relativity that cannot be avoided? At least it is comforting to realise that the necessary decrease in acceleration will never reach zero [asymptote].

Notice that a hundred years ago, it was not the constant speed of light that was the problem, it was that the speed was constant relative to every observer, no matter how they were moving and physics 'shut down' theoretical modern physics in the face of this, because the physical apparently interacted with the mind of individual people. This fact [Michelson-Morley experiment], swept away the very basis of physics, that was the unchanging 'realness' of the universe that had been assumed for thousands of years. The scientific principle that research was built up by succeeding generations was thus suspect, and the edict of measurement [Francis Bacon] was also suspect [as man-made rules], but if the universe was not 'real' and [basically] unchangeable, physics no longer had a basis in science [no absolutes]. In other words, firstly, the [man-made] laws of physics were suspect when extended to theoretical modern physics, and secondly, if the universe interacted with people directly, it must be an organisation and physics was literally unfounded [because it did not contain organisation explicitly]. No wonder that there was a shut-down of theoretical modern physics' theory and a concentration on measurement for the last hundred years until the situation clarified itself. In essence, a possible conspiracy may have come into being that altered career paths and the amount of money allocated to research that may have been redirected. I believe that this theory easily resolves the problem because this theory is more basic and does not affect Newtonian physics except at the extremes. In other words, we can use relativity to simply separate the two systems to make a complete [relativistic] system [everyday Newtonian physics and modern physics].

Seventh, it could be considered that every particle is composed of energy and it's associated organisation [wave-particle duality in a fractal that switch between the two and so are held apart [concept and context]] and that what we see as different particles are actually the same particles delineated by speed only, with all moving under parabolic paths. Now that is simplicity, and a necessary simplicity according to absolute 5. There is no logical reason why two views of the organisation cannot alternate [as long as it is too fast to be measured] as the wave-particle theory hints, and I believe that Einstein was awarded the Nobel prize for suggesting that the wave particle duality was two forms of energy, whereas the creation equation considers them to be energy and organisation [not a subtle distinction]. Remember that the inertia of the Newtonian concept of mass is localised, whereas this theory considers the overall interaction within an organisation and shows the relativity expected between the universe and Life.

Eight, a restriction is apparent, that come from the formation of charges and neutrinos that result from the decomposition of the unstable neutrons. Clearly, if a proton approaches an electron they should attract and [if the neutrino were available and reactive, it should form the unstable neutron] resulting in a loss of information when the neutron disintegrates randomly. However, atoms necessarily follow the same form as gravity and form minute planetary systems. Is it any wonder that the law of charges emulates the law of gravity and that both have not been derived. In other words, although the results are similar and simple as required in a fractal, the mode of gravity and charge attraction are fundamentally different, a supposition that is not apparent in current physics, indeed the opposite is assumed [attraction of masses and (opposite) charges]. Further, the restriction of the necessity of the unavailability of neutrinos to react ensures that atoms form and provide the continuity of existence necessary for the universe and us to have evolved.

Ninth, the above is based on the simplicity of bottom-up organisation and is foreign to the top-down thinking of Homo sapiens and therein lies the problem that affordances to the measurer [the conversion of organisation to emotional energy in the brain] requires a [unambiguous question with only one answer (absolute 5)] question by the measurer and the question that needs to be asked is unavailable to Homo sapiens because the physical [organisation and energy] uses a logic that we don't recognise. A complete logic, I believe is [4]:

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

and Homo sapiens uses the first two terms only [in science] the remainder referencing the physical and social science. As an example of not being able to ask the necessary questions, physics does not recognise organisation explicitly and the last term [social engineering] is lacking in our organisation of our society to the extent that social science is not a science because it does not recognise organisational absolutes and this lack is responsible for the present social problems that we face worldwide.

Tenth, relativity is part of everything and is the reason for goals and viewpoint [Homo sapiens versus Homo completus] and I could continue with the entanglement of organisation, but particularly pertinent is to replace the historical 'real' universe with an organisation of possibilities, and yet we maintain traditions of religion and governance that are 2,500 years old and flawed. This can be seen in the form of Pythagoras' theorem that shows the 'squares' that occur when we consider orthogonality [the form of the universe]. Life and the universe [the organisation] communicate when a 'right' angle is involved and this 2-way communication is similar to that considered to be the preserve of some of the Gods. The social engineering behind religion needs updating because we now know that the universe is large enough to be God and this realisation should bring science and religion closer together.

Conclusion and Prediction

This paper redefines multiplication and division in terms of relativity, shows the form of the universe through the dimensions [energy, organisation, time and distance] as well as the form of the creation equation [energy, organisation] that shows the relativity that produces an organisation that must be entangled with the energy and that "you can't have one without the other". In other words, our thinking has been incomplete [without organisation] that has created the problems of science and especially for the social sciences because, while physics has an absolute [albeit complicated], the social sciences have no organisational absolutes.

If our modern technological society came from [materials] engineering built on physics, there exists a social engineering based on social science [for relativity] that we need to organise and manage our society and the state of the world. [Consider 'a stitch in time saves nine']. I have written a predictive social science [7, 8, 9] that is based on the creation equation that should allow a transmission from Homo sapiens to Homo completus by changing the software used in our brain. This has been the goal for thousands of years and, in many forms, by all the religions, and, in particular, the Second Coming that can be effected by ourselves.

This paper is about simplicity, from first principles and defies Homo sapiens' propensity to complicate things, such as masses attract each other, gravitational waves and now gravitons, whereas this theory says that there is no gravity, but the effect is simply the result of restrictions [acceleration, relativity etc.] required to define an organisation for the universe to exist. Of particular importance is the suggestion of a revised table of subatomic particles based on speed and lifetime which shows the additional restrictions of charge and the neutrino's lack of availability that allows for the organisation that is Life. It is also difficult to overstate the simplicity of the derivation of the law of gravity as the sum of the product of absolutes [of energy and organisation], but simplicity and similarity is a product of the creation equation [producing a fractal]. A consideration of relativity shows that goals [time and place] are necessary and Bacon's requirement of measurement must have a reason behind the measurement [a requirement of all affordances], and that question is the theory that must be associated with measurement. In other words, Bacon's idea is incomplete, the critics are correct and organisation must be used explicitly in the method of science, particularly absolutes in a fractal universe composed of relativity. Given this situation it is obvious that multiplication is relativity and division creates the necessary absolutes that must be used to create a science and not the abomination that is the principle of science [peer review built on published work].

The universe is simple when the brain [that we inherited from the animals] has its software changed, and that changing is 'part and parcel' of this paper, but physics has, I believe, become a religion secure in the knowledge that Newtonian physics works [in the everyday], although it is excessively complex [3]. After the debacle of the last 100 years [typified

by 'use quantum mechanics, but don't try to understand it'], this theory could be what physics needs. Needs, but not wants, might be the case because a safe unchanging 'religion' is presumably what physics wants, but the organisation can be applied to social science and has been submitted [7, 8, 9] and must be considered eventually for inclusion in physics.

This leads to the necessity of expanding Bacon's requirement [measurement] to include relativity [theory], organisation [creation equation] and embrace the generalist [context] because relativity says that specialists and generalists don't think the same way. In other words, Newton and Einstein [and me] were outside of the scholasticism of the mainstream and did not follow Bacon's edict, made guesses and mistakes, but perhaps this model is a better fit, and obviously simpler, when our thinking changes, and change it must because we tend to ride 'roughshod' over everything we touch and it needs understanding if we, and the environment, are to have a secure future. When we look at the present science and social sciences, with its enigmas and lack of organisation in the new light of this model, it must be apparent that the time has come to sweep away the old and use a new software for an old brain to make a Homo completus that has a future.

References

1. Penney D. Form of the Universe, Can Affordances Save Civilisation. *Mind & Society*. 20(1): 107-110. doi:10.1007/s11299-020-00265-x
2. What Is Economics? (From an unpublished paper)
3. A Letter to Physics. (From an unpublished paper)
4. The Logic of the Half-truth And Plato's Cave. (From an unpublished paper)
5. The Unification of Symmetry, Simplicity And Similarity in a Fractal Universe. (From an unpublished paper)
6. Tweaking the Standard Particle Physics Model versus Modern Physics. (From an unpublished paper)
7. Social Engineering: Using Social Science to Improve Ourselves and Society. *IJSSS*. (From an unpublished paper)
8. Social Engineering the European Common Market. *IJSSS*. (From an unpublished paper)
9. A Future Scenario for Common Markets. *IJSSS*. (From an unpublished paper)
10. 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
11. The Mind, Society, Socrates, Social Engineering and Symbiosis. *Mind & Society*. (From an unpublished paper)