

sharpen's

The

Engineering

of our lives

Peter K. Sharpen

DEDICATION

I am dedicating this work to my friend

Simon Shack

and his Web-site

September Clues

also to the many thoughtful correspondents
who have given their time to contribute
to this most excellent programme
of exposing the anomalies of views
of the planet upon which we live and
which are, upon closer inspection,
obviously false.

A handwritten signature in grey ink that reads "E. K. Harper". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large, stylized 'H'.

2020

sharpen's

**THE
ENGINEERING
OF
OUR
LIVES**

PART ONE

Who am I?

My name is Peter Kenneth Sharpen. The 'Kenneth' is my dear father's first name. I was born during an air-raid on 5th July, 1944 at Wanstead in Essex, England.

I was educated at Eastwood High School and later Southend Municipal College until I started work (1961) at Killick Martin (a shipping company) in London. I emigrated to Western Australia in 1963 with my parents and sisters. The 'land of opportunity' failed miserably and by 1964/5 I had had enough and decided to return to the U.K. by doing an overland trip. I failed since the ship upon which I was travelling fell foul to the 6-day war and had to continue via the Panama Canal back to the U.K. This tale is told in my book 'Diary of a £10 Pom'.

To cut a longer story somewhat shorter...

I married my first girl-friend in 1971 and we had two lovely daughters but sadly my wife took them away to pursue her own career. She did however, suggest I took a mature students course to become a teacher of English, which I did and have never regretted it.

I eventually landed a position teaching students with 'learning difficulties' and pursued this for the next twenty-three years both in

the U.K. and Western Australia (1989-2004) when I tried it again. Leaving Australia for the second time, I decided I wanted to retire in France where I now live with a new-found wonderful lady companion.

I have been writing ever since I could hold a crayon. I also am artistic and a great learner/researcher of that which I find interesting, having studied in some serious degree medicine, various ‘scientific’ studies and practical subjects. I had always loved the piano but never took ‘formal’ lessons but taught myself to play synthesisers (when they became available).

I had learned to play the violin when I was about seven years old but after hearing Ronald Chesney play the harmonica (Educating Archie), my father bought me a Hohner Chromatic harmonica and I taught myself to play this (I played it with the ships’s band on my return from Australia the second time).

My writings cover over 800,000 words in novels, stories, poetry, many articles on numerous subjects. I have written over 20 CD’s of original music. All these have been self-published.

I have been a published graphic designer during my work at the Science Research Council and later Sturtevant Engineering Company where I also did some exhibition works including one for a London Motor Show.

My main thrust in life has to *not be controlled* or indeed to control others. It is the backbone of my personal works and my teaching of practical subjects (including work experience) for my students. I firmly believe in positive *management*, not control.

In light of this:

Firstly, I must state quite clearly, that I do not, nor ever will, denigrate any human who has studied any of the subjects below and made their thoughts into what we call a theory which presents in our ‘history’.

What I *do* denigrate is the *acceptance* of ‘theories’ without realising that new data may or may not enhance the original

theory or even reveal the possibility of its falsity. I also denigrate the use of any theory for the purposes of *manipulation* by others by any means for their own ends, be they singular or plural.

Without theories, we would not have ‘adapted’ into the representations of our Natural world and engineered tools (e.g. art, devices to enhance our living) for positive ends. However, when a theory becomes sacrosanct and enforced, it no longer is a theory but a means of control, which can never be acceptable.

PART TWO

IMPORTANT NOTE: The following represents my personal views on the subjects I have chosen to research over many years. *Your* own research (on particular subjects) is up to you depending on the stance you might wish to take and the conclusions (if any) you may wish to draw from the resources available to you.

Here follows, my articles. Some were written for a well-considered Internet forum but I have reduced them (as far as possible) to specific essays thus preserving my own reflections upon the comments. They often follow no *particular* ‘events’ and they are in no particular order.

All the *subjects* upon which I have written have been usurped (definition: *to take control of a position of power, especially without having the right to do so for one reason or another*) by those who deem themselves superior to others.

ENGINEERING

To ‘engineer’ something is to start from a premise and construct a theory or physical item from which to work towards a positive (or

negative) end product. The product may be of a physical or non physical structure. Structure may, therefore, be something which can be used as a tool (such as a hammer) or an idea (which is peculiar to an individual who wishes to impose (in some way) upon others their notions.)

The human animal is a tool-maker. *However* since their earlier beginnings, human animals have been able to engineer devices for their particular survival. All animals, and indeed all flora and fauna have a natural ability to survive with or without tools but rely upon that which 'Nature' has provided.

The *notion* of survival is a concept held only by the human animal. Other flora and fauna merely survive in the biosphere (so-called) because it is their *nature*. Human 'fauna' can only survive by their propensity to accept Nature and create *tools* for their survival.

POLARITIES

We are led to believe in the notion of polarities (plus, minus, adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing). That is, there is a movement between the conception of a negative and a positive polarity. However, there is no viable evidence that there exist such singular polarities. The Universe (so called) can have no beginning or end, since no 'thing' can be constructed from nothing. Again whatever the Universe is, it cannot have been constructed from nothing, therefore it must always have 'been there/here'.

Constructing a 'god' (an amorphous omniscience) to create such a thing as a 'universe' would have to assume that such a 'god' was constructed by something else (or else we endeavour to head into something incomprehensible that cannot ever be deciphered). Hence we must have the notion of the engineering of what have become varying 'religions' to support our notion of any form of 'creation'. Common sense would surely indicate/dictate that 'creation'

of anything was a human construct and nothing else. Beliefs are one thing, *actuality* is something else.

Engineering is also a tool in itself. Thus we are able to engineer not only physical tools we can use but notions (ideas). We come to the concept of *control* mechanisms.

Control mechanisms are either practical (basically for survival, for example, building a shelter) or physically by controlling the means to *make* tools for basic survival by some form of rhetoric which is enabled by 'education', forced or otherwise.

Most 'formal Education' is not (but should be), the imparting of previous experiences of individuals upon others from what one has 'learned' from some-one else which may be either (to use polarities in a general sense) a truth or an untruth. A truth is something which is of value to survival and an untruth something which is of no value to survival.

What concerns me...

...is the engineering of all the facets of human nature (the mere survival of individuals) is that it has been usurped by those who would deem to control others for their own purposes by whatever means is possible for them to control and the ability to impose this upon others.

The human creature is capable of so much positive (i.e. means to exist as far as is possible with other creatures, despite their differences in locations upon this 'planet') that it is sad to believe that others would want to so usurp that. The conundrum continues...

It is from here that I had the notion that there are two types of the human creature, the human (what we call Nature) and the humanoid (which I call non-Nature), obviously not direct opponents to survival but such that prevent a potential survival for all 'human' creatures.

We (those of us who are alive at this instant of time) can have

no idea how much of the past has a truth which we can verify except by monuments, writings, art-work (or whatever) from that which we can verify with whatever senses are available to us at any one time.

We are reliant upon that which is available to us at any given moment. We can hold an ancient (apparently) piece of ‘art’ and discover that it may be a replica or even a falsity. We can have no *real* experience of its authenticity.

Reliance upon others should always leads us to question their evidence of something or their reliance upon our ignorance of the subject matter to convince us that something is real (reliable) as opposed to unreal (false upon investigation).

HISTORY

History is the learning process by which we always live.

‘What was I a second ago?

Surely not that which I am now?’

Peter K. Sharpen (c.1971)

History is shaped by those who either built things, engineered things, wrote things, drew or painted things. Ideas are not ‘things’ they are ideas from the magic of the biosphere. They are intangible, yet they have a power that motivates us all to continue in a positive (i.e. ‘Natural’ way) survival.

‘The only ‘life after death’ is the remembrance of one’s past existence in the hearts of others, good or bad.’

Peter K. Sharpen 2019

UNIVERSE

It has always been a notion of mine that if you cannot create something (some *thing*) from nothing (no *thing*) then what we call the ‘universe’ must *always* have been there/here (it was thus not *created* and cannot be destroyed). Matter can neither be created nor

destroyed.

The notion that a 'Prime Mover' created the 'universe' appears to be redundant except for purposes of belief), since one must ask the question, from 'where' did this 'Prime Mover' originate if all was 'there' before the 'Prime Mover'?

So far as I can discover, no such explanation has ever been found (at least to be satisfactory to my enquiring mind), or even described but cannot be verified.

The temptation to attribute this 'Prime Mover' to the creation of the 'universe' (merely the (unknown) medium in which we exist)) is merely an attempt to explain what cannot be explained in 'human' terms.

I was taught in my early school years that one cannot create something from nothing. This makes a 'common sense'. This must make such 'common sense' at any basic level. How could one contemplate otherwise?

Thus 'gods' of all shapes, sizes and forms appear to try to explain phenomena of which we are not capable of understanding, however we try. *Beliefs* in such are perfectly valid for reasons of survival or some sort of personal or 'community spirit' but not necessary to explain anything in concrete terms.

In trying to understand (however we accomplish this or not) we are as human fauna, given to 'inventing'.

Inventing tools (physical or mental (in the mind)), is a means by which we as (what we call 'human' creatures) *adapt* to our environment wherever we reside on an object (we call it a 'planet') upon which we 'exist'. There are no 'races' of people, merely human animals living in different locations who have adapted to their particular surroundings. Adaptation is a performance of all living creatures, whether flora or fauna to continue our existence which we call 'life' wherever from which we originated on land or sea. There is no *choice* regarding this, it is part of the structure of the 'universe' in which we are able to be 'alive' (to be 'conscious' of it and/or to respond to it) to appreciate (or decimate) it. 'Choice' requires a means to comprehend, understand and carry out various actions we may thus 'choose' between a possible positive or negative means for

our survival. To ‘choose’ is to be able to ‘weigh’ or extrapolate the best choice between one thing and another, in given circumstances, to a positive end.

The notion of a ‘positive end’ (life) is therefore crucial to our survival.

My personal definition of ‘intelligence’ is the ability to ‘extrapolate’ between that which is conducive to our well-being and that which is not conducive to our well-being. A positive choice is one for survival, the other is non-survival.

The difficulty with the *well-being* of the human creature is that there are elements (individuals, groups and so forth) who have extrapolated their choices, not for the well-being of the planetary population but their own ends. Thus, in my view, we have the notion of polarities (‘good’, ‘bad’ and so forth).

Polarities are a measure of scale. If, indeed, the ‘universe’ was always here and will be forever, the question of polarities is immune from definition; there can be no beginning or end, therefore there are no ‘absolutes’, merely something between one *thing* and another. The world (and ‘universe’) is what we might call ‘analogue’ (continuous) and not ‘digital’ (small discrete bits or pieces). This notion is critical in terms of human thought processes and leads us to the notion of what I call ‘nounification’.

‘NOUNIFICATION’

‘Nounification’ (in my own definition) is the process by which we attribute ‘names’ to what we call ‘objects’. Objects are those things that we sense with whatever senses are available to us at any given time (sight, hearing, feeling and so forth).

In general semantics (the study of meanings) the *name* of an object (e.g. a chair) does not tell us what it *is*. In the example of ‘chair’ there are so many variations of the object that we can only say that it is a device upon which we may sit, stand or any other variety of uses to which it may be put. It does not tell us what it *is*. It means whatever *you might want it to be* depending upon the use to which it

is put.

The problem with nounification is that we must not assume that everyone else has the same concept or that any definition (meaning of the word) is sacrosanct. This is where we run into real (or perhaps imaginary) concepts. What is a 'chair' to you, may not be a 'chair' to me (at any one given moment of time).

Concepts, ideas, theories and suchlike (thought processes) are generally given 'names' and once given names are regarded as being a reality or become an objective status. A reality is something which can be not only conceived but made into objects which may be realised in Nature by our senses. An object is one which we can feel, smell, taste and so forth depending upon which of our senses are available at any one time. Like life itself, concepts change by re-evaluation of *definition*.

The notion of the definition of an object or concept or happening (thought pattern, if you will) can change depending on what the person or persons define it as for their particular ends at any particular time suitable to their means and purpose.

EXPLANATIONS

Whatever the form they take, explanations attempt to explore the nature of the universe and those who appear upon what we call Earth. They are *tools* (in whatever form they take) to explore what we are, even if that, indeed, was a futile pursuit.

Explanations are perfectly valid but must *always* be subject to change providing any newer or later data is respected and does not become part of a means to deceive others for a particular agenda for whatever reason.

Thus, explanations must always be malleable and well researched. Explanations may be carried out by *anyone*, not just a few people who are supposedly 'qualified' in a particular area of research, thus they may be explored by *anyone* wishing to modify something which later turns out to be an untruth (or a solid object which we can accept or not accept), something 'new' or something already explained as accepted. Explanations should not be

sacrosanct to any one particular person or group.

Explanations of events whether real or imagined must not be high-jacked for use as a weapon of any kind, nor the imposition of controlling others. When explanations become 'nounified', they take on a reality and become objects which then become (unless otherwise rescinded) 'norms' and sacrosanct to those who will resist any changes.

Thus, I believe, do myths, legends and other fanciful stories ensue which then, paraded around enough and enforced by torture or some-such, become accepted as 'truths' and become inviolable.

The outcome is a series of deceitful behaviours to maintain these 'truths' to the extent of forms of vilification up to murder of those who remain free-thinkers.

It is obvious that a general public, who have a tough enough time trying to live a reasonable life, can easily be hood-winked by the explanation of events (real, imagined or staged) by those who would wish to control them. Humans are touched by natural emotions relating to their sensual apparatuses and dislike obvious violence. Much of this violence can be seen but there have been many ways to violate a natural demeanour without physical violence. Such methods as reporting events (real, imagined or staged) are the use of popular media such as television, radio, newspapers, magazines. However, I am absolutely sure that this form of deceitful behaviour goes back to our distant future (which cannot be known accurately).

BELIEFS

Beliefs are, according to regular dictionaries, as something like:

Belief (in something/somebody) a strong feeling that something or someone exists or is true; confidence that something or someone is good or ~~right~~— correct.

Beliefs, therefore are 'feelings', which are not 'concrete' actualities. In my view, this is most important. It is important because we are led to think beliefs are a 'norm', or that we should

believe something because someone else says so and is apparently 'qualified' to say such without fear of contradiction (which can carry heavy penalties for 'disbelief'). The machinations of non-belief render disbelievers sometimes fatal consequences.

Beliefs can, of course, do and can change. This notion is also important. Nothing can be 'written in stone', as they say but what if the stone is incorrect (or some scribe has interjected his/her own hieroglyphs?).

Belief is not knowledge (except perhaps to the believer). Knowledge of beliefs is.

KNOWLEDGE

Knowledge is that which we collect daily on our transit throughout our lives. Every day we learn something or something different. Without this learning we are doomed to an unsatisfactory life.

To obtain knowledge we require others, as well as ourselves. How else can we learn how to cope with our existence? Learning from others is a two-way process. It requires all our skills (ability to apply our knowledge to other things) as well as good fellow-feeling with those from which we would acquire further knowledge and skills.

Acquiring knowledge is also a skill. To so acquire, we may go to a suitable establishment to gather data for the acquisition of this knowledge.

As with (indeed) most things, this gathering of knowledge has been usurped by others and become 'education'. Now in the hands (arms, legs and feet?) of those who deem to create 'educational' establishments of their own, education in this form may well become a dirty word. Let us hope so.

THEORIES AND FACTS

A theory is (or should be) an attempt to explain something in a logical sequence and which is open to different interpretations which

can be modified as new data is found/discovered or contemplated.

A theory is *always* a theory and cannot (in my view) ever be anything other than that.

Conjecture is part of a theory, as is supposition and so forth.

A 'fact' is often derived from a theory. However, apart from the obvious 'fact' that we pass beyond personal existence at some time or other, little else can be considered a fact.

A fact becomes sacrosanct when it is *imposed* as such. This sacrosancticity has become a 'norm', not through constant adding new data to a theory but that the theory has been derailed in a mid-stream and be-dam/ned (if you will) unless you accept it.

SCIENCE

Probably one of the most misused words in a dictionary and everywhere else.

Cambridge dictionary defines:

(knowledge from) the careful study of the structure and behaviour of the physical world, especially by watching, measuring, and doing experiments, and the development of theories to describe the results of these activities.

The word 'science' has been applied to many notions and its use has been applied to many subjects. Science *stops* when it becomes an inviolable 'truth' rather than an ongoing subject of speculation (theory) or discovery of new data which negates or changes the original speculative theory.

Science has (again) been usurped by those who have a vested interest in any subject for the *control* of others.

The word assumes that those of us who have no *particular* knowledge of a subject, are thus not able to contribute to a theory, speculation, assumption, or whatever.

Many (or most) 'scientists' we have today are un-named entities. They are undeclared 'experts' from known establishments to 'toe a party line' of establishment rules to declare themselves as such. They perform no experimental work (thought or practical) and

merely follow their leaders and teach others to do the same. It is rather like fairy stories about animals who are made to have human characteristics and can talk as though they are real and we are to believe them.

Thus 'science' has in many ways, become fiction as though it is real, obvious (maybe) but certainly not what science was about in its original guise.

DECEPTION

Deception is deliberately making others believe what has, or is not happening.

With (often plainly) deluded, false, misleading, doubtful, contentious, unfounded, 'science', we live in an un-natural world of deceit, the pursuance of which will be (in my opinion) so-called *Man's* downfall. Everything left will be 'there/here' after Man has long gone. It is possible this has all happened before many times during this planet's lifetime, we can never know. Time-scales are an invention for convenience, they do not, in my belief, exist in Nature.

Deceit, of course, can take effect on our own personal level, possibly if one can realise or discover the fact. The difficulty is deceit or belief. One can deceive oneself on a subject for any one of many reasons. Belief can be a comfort and is in no way detrimental to ones 'way of life' so long as it is not *imposed* upon others.

Man tries to introduce a rigid structure upon Nature by failure to comprehend that everything transforms from one thing into something else. It is not a 'law', it is just what happens (laws are for lawyers). Up to some point or points, I suppose, this may be useful but we tend to forget that what we are doing in the process is to remain in a 'plaster-cast' without the offending limb (or whatever) ever seeing the light of day and thus transforming itself into that which it was not before it's incarceration.

COUNTRIES AND RACES

Regarding the nounification of objects, we also must see that the nounification of abstracts, such as ‘country’, ‘race’ also present difficulties to a great number of people.

The planet upon which we live is, according to Man, constructed (I do not use the term lightly) into ‘countries’ and there follows the notion of ‘races’ of ‘people’ (who abide in those areas). This notion appears sacrosanct in most people’s minds.

Thus we are called, according to the location in which we were birthed, whatever ‘country’ was allotted to us by whatever, or whomsoever.

‘So what am I?’, one might ask.

To make light of this rather silly question, I will give my own example.

I was born in 1944.

Does that make me a 1944ian?

I was born at an address in Wanstead.

Am I, therefore, a Wansteadian?

I was born in England (United Kingdom, Great Britain).

Am I Englishian, United Kingdomian, Great Britishian?

How far does one have to go?

How far, indeed does anyone need to go?

By creating a location for peoples living at various locations upon what we call a ‘planet’ we are inferring that such peoples are separate from others and we therefore regard them as different ‘races’.

Upon that conjecture, we assume that the human creature is different because of their location and not that we are different because of their adaptation to environment.

There are those who would have it that because of this, there are some who are 'superior' to others because of this false notion.

One of the things that I find interesting is that what we call 'art', for example, (in all its guises) is a universal use of the 'technology' available at a particular location and time. Art is a value which transcends all locations and whoever produces them. Without art, we would have little to appreciate except for the wonders of Nature. Art is Nature reduced to any forms from which it is created, realised and performed in all mediums known to those who produce it. Without, indeed, the values we attribute to certain what we call flora and fauna for their comfort and ours, we would have little to sustain our lives. Beauty may be in the beholder but beauty (something which aids our lives in all things) is timeless and self-sustaining.

ASSUMPTIONS

Assumptions are things that we may 'take to be read', or even 'taken for granted' as we say. This may be fine for certain things but assumptions must not be regarded as truths and inviolable. In fact they can be dangerous if we are not very careful. This may seem self-evident but that does always hold.

LIES

Lies are a deliberate ruse to deceive for a particular purpose. They are negative to survival and sometimes difficult to observe.

Lies, of course, rely upon deliberate fakery such as staged events, events manipulated to make them worse than they already are and of data and so forth in written form.

PART THREE

ENGINEERING CONTROL

To engineer is to start from a premise to a positive (useful for

the purpose of comfort) and productive end, whether an object (something we can touch, feel or otherwise) or a negative productive end (which results in a mechanism of control).

To control *others* is a product of negative minds and is only productive (in a limited extent) to their own ends.

Engineering control, is therefore a negative for any pursuance of the greater masses of humans who 'inhabit' the planet, depending on their means so to do.

Thus I conceived the notion that there are two types of the human animal, the humans (Nature) and the humanoids (anti-nature). The difference is essential to the pursuance of the human animal towards a possible positive end.

It is essential to acknowledge this to understand that humanoids have only their limited existence (they age the same as those they leave to continue their servitude to the humanoids).

Humanoids are the bandits on this planet. They rape, pillage and often mutilate their off-spring and anything of real value (engineers of comfort and well-being) for a meagre masturbation of their egos and strange beliefs that are in no way conducive to their, or anybody else's comfort and well-being.

I cannot find (or even conceive) any other animals (and certainly not flora) who would do such a thing.

What started the humanoids on their destructive behaviours, is totally lost to myself, at least.

I am reminded of a poem that I wrote many years ago in 1968. I reproduce it here:

TIME

Time saw them in a senseless world,
mindful children made into sages,
creeping through a history of ages.

Time saw them stop and listen,
to the sounds that filled the air;
It saw them struggle

against the earth that put them there.

Time saw them grow and nurture,
fighting all against One
and One against all,
where symbols won.

And Time saw them pass;
gone into the æons of its ceaseless self,
where Life grew dusty on some hidden shelf.

Peter K. Sharpen (1968)
(From SHARPEN The Poems)

Virtually everything that we hear and see (if we have those faculties) is only real if we listen to Nature. Our so-called ‘modern’ World is rarely interested in an education that is not controlled by others.

I do not mean the education given by our closest caring relatives or friends because they aim to educate us in notions that work for our benefit as humans and their own satisfaction of having done so. What I mean is the ‘education’ we are given by those who have an interest of their own and for their own ends, which is the means by which they can control.

How they control, is pretty much known by those, like myself, who realise this. Many do not realise this and many reluctant to do so.

Modern ‘education’ is a controlling mechanism by which Humanoids attempt to instil their own version of their own world upon others, based (they know, some of them) on vacuous notions which sound pretty good on stone tablets, paper and so forth. Many ‘alternate’ authors have tried desperately to get the message across that a lot of this is all nonsense, fairy-tale and so forth. Many still do but are stymied by those who have engineered this control by methods of their banditry either by word or deed.

Many people have succumbed because their only *real* life is

one of trying to 'make a living' and in trying to do so, have become victims of their own unfair ignorance of the engineers who wish to use them as fodder for their personal machinations. Thus these humanoids have invented 'religions' and worshipful states of apparent Kings, Queens and other devious personages to fulfil their dreams of control. Many people like the shiny things in life (water droplets shining in the sun, for example), it is a human trait to like shiny things but the extreme is not a beautiful thing. It is exaggeration.

Engineering is a deliberate attempt to create or change something. Those changes are manipulations. In terms of the positive, we have, of course been able to lift ourselves into the air (literally). In terms of the negative, we have lifted ourselves into the air to drop things on the innocent whilst pretending to do otherwise.

Most of what appears to us, either in education or what we see hear, or read from those who deem to control us ('governments', priests, so-called 'royalty' and other self-appointed and opinionated individuals) is *engineered*, which incites me to write various articles upon those subjects which I believe have been deliberately engineered to fool people into belief of humanoid 'truths'.

Here is a list of *some* deliberately engineered products designed (sometimes in ignorance, it must be said) to mislead, misdirect, misinform and generally tell, in simple, lies. Most, if not all of these are based on a false premise. The list is not exhaustive by any means.

Modern medicine (including psychiatry, Germ theory, gene theory (a.k.a. D.N.A.), cancer theory, most psychology)

Biology

Religion (e.g. gods or devils worship)

Space travel (rocketry and such-like)

Atomic theory (e.g. atoms, molecules, nuclear 'bombs', radiation)

Astronomy

Archaeology (including 'dinosaurs')

Evolution

‘Racial’ theories

History in general

Engineering the ‘Illuminati’ and other ‘Powers that be’

Engineering ‘Climate Change’

Engineering Wars

ENGINEERING COMMUNICATION

Given closer inspection, these subjects are pretty much all patently false if explored in depth but considered fact by those who either in ignorance or deliberate engineering and claim them as ‘truths’ and one is not ‘allowed’ to contest them upon pain of some sort of retribution. They are all contentious subjects, of course but it should be inviolable that allowance is made for further study and none of the present explanations of these should be ‘cast in stone’.

The subjects themselves are perfectly valid, of course but it is how they are portrayed (and for the reasons they are portrayed) that is the death throes of humanity that will be apparent more and more as they are becoming so.

It is contentious who ‘invented’ the notion of Science Fiction, however, in terms of the above list (at least) I contend that most of what we call ‘Modern Science’ is indeed, *Fiction Science* and fraught with the same distractions.

ENGINEERING BIOLOGY

Biology refers to the study of what we call ‘Life’, or life-forms.

Traditionally it refers to plants and animals (flora and fauna). However, life is only an expression of the whole of Nature as presented to us upon this planet whilst we exist as individuals.

The study, is perfectly valid, of course. My problem is that many studies so far have been accepted as a ‘truth’ so long as they fit within the structure suited to those who have taken it upon themselves (for one reason or another) to produce conclusions that suit their purposes and not a continuation of exploration when new

data is found that negates or adds data that interferes with the premises which suit them.

This logic is followed in all my articles.

ENGINEERING DEITIES (e.g. gods or devils worship)

Belief in deities must surely be a crude way of explaining what we call our 'Universe'.

It is not easy to contemplate 'how we came to be here'.

Thus, a more 'primitive' human animal, who has become aware of itself and without possible explanations to the contrary, invents a tool which has come to be called that of the notion of some kind of 'prime mover' which then morphs into a system which may be called a 'religion'.

One should not have a problem with this notion but we always seem to come into a situation where a religion (way of thinking about the universe outside a physical life of learning to exist from day to day) is usurped by others for some means of control.

Today, religions seek to polarise. The invention of some kind of amorphous omniscience resulted in the invention of such or its opposite, a devil. We thus end up with the notion of 'good' and 'bad'.

My argument has always been that if there is a 'god' then it must *know* both 'good' and 'bad'. How then did this 'god' become polarised? What was the reason (?) for this?

I submit an answer as: control by those who had the time to contemplate this and foist it upon others merely wishing to get their daily bread but still had questions about their existence. What does a lazy Sharman have to do but sit back and let others do his bidding exhorting that he or she has some special 'knowledge' unavailable to others. Whether this 'knowledge' came from the imbibing of some substance which took them away from the Natural world is another matter.

ENGINEERING SPACE TRAVEL (rocketry and such-like)

In short, there is no acceptable, viable proof that any so-called Man-made object can escape what we call the atmosphere of this planet. The notion may be a dream (accompanied by fanciful stories, wishes and so forth) but can never become a reality.

Yes, we can make ‘rockets’ shoot into the sky. However, rockets (fireworks or models) indeed leave the Earth’s surface and they go ‘Woosh!’. Other alleged rockets (it appears) and said to go beyond the atmosphere) do not go ‘Whooosh!’, they hang about on the ‘launch-pad’, issuing enormous volumes of smoke(?) and appear to lumber upwards, always on an arc and disappear. They appear to *accelerate!* How would you make an explosive (which completely transforms virtually instantaneously into an uncontrollable ‘force’) be controlled?

However, given that this rocket device actually rises into the atmosphere (even being able to be accelerated), what happens after that, is anybody’s guess. No evidence of what happens afterwards (except video screens of some sort or other patently able to show moving pictures not related to the ‘launch’). My guess is that the sea-bed somewhere is piling up with spent rockets (even if they were real in the first place).

This is not the place to explain the ‘science’ (or non-science!) of rocketry. It is a waste of time if so-called ‘space rockets’ can’t leave the atmosphere. It is pure science-fiction based on fiction science!

However, we are inveigled into believing all sort of ‘space’ stuff that passes for real.

Conclusion: If no rockets can leave the Earth’s ‘atmosphere’, nothing else is possible.

ENGINEERING ATOMIC THEORY (e.g. atoms, molecules, nuclear ‘bombs’, radiation)

‘Atomic’ theory derives from the notion that the Universe (that

which is outside the perception of animals except from tools such as telescopes) is made up of 'particles', (in simple), *bits* of something which we call 'matter', thus reducing everything into what we call 'solids'.

This notion has devolved to such an extent that these imaginary particles are constantly reduced in size until we are told to believe in an 'ultimate' particle. None of these 'particles' can ever be realised in reality and verified except by the use of tools that supposedly are able to 'see' them (e.g. 'cloud chambers').

Thus we are reduced to believing that such things exist in reality.

A good theory, perhaps, but not recognisable in Nature.

It is all conjecture.

However, given these illusive 'particles' we then have to imagine (engineer) the extent to which they may be put for negative purposes. They are given properties which boggle the mind of reasonable people and they invent means by which their apparent properties can harm others, if used in a particular way. Thus the invention of 'atom' (or 'nuclear') bombs and suchlike because we are led to believe that 'splitting' the atom will result in some catastrophic disaster.

The whole notion beggars belief.

The notion of atoms in the first place may seem reasonable, I suppose but it is entirely questionable until one realises that the universe is entirely homogenous with no beginning or end. Particles, therefore, may be convenient (as an explanation) but not a reality.

Like many other things, if we invent 'atoms' for explanation, then we can invent 'atom' bombs.

ENGINEERING ASTRONOMY/COSMOLOGY

Astronomy: Lexico defines: *The branch of science which deals with celestial objects, space, and the physical universe as a whole.*

Cosmology: Lexico defines: *The science of the origin and development of the universe. Modern cosmology is dominated by the*

Big Bang theory, which brings together observational astronomy and particle physics.

Science: Lexico defines: *The intellectual and practical activity encompassing the systematic study of the structure and behaviour of the physical and natural world through observation and experiment.*

Intellect: Lexico defines: *The faculty of reasoning and understanding objectively, especially with regard to abstract matters.*

Faculty: Lexico defines: *1. An inherent mental or physical power. 2. An aptitude for doing something.*

So let us put all these definitions together and we get something like: Astronomy and Cosmology are the studies of that which appears to lie beyond the atmosphere of the 'planet' upon which we apparently reside and speculate what is beyond.

Any questions we have must surely be speculative, whatever arguments may be put forward otherwise as we can never in truth get there to find out.

However, studies made by thousands of observers, either by thought or deed may present their theories for consideration and indeed do so.

These studies, like many of the 'sciences' have produced valuable data as to some of our understanding of the 'universe'. However, unless these studies meet certain criteria which can 'prove' or 'disprove' a previous theory (or notion) we are still left with speculation.

Like all 'sciences' a problem arises when any of these theories are *held* to be sacrosanct (written in stone) with no arguments unless one believes in an 'official' version most often fraught with questions still remaining.

Like 'life' itself, theories should have no end but continual development.

ENGINEERING ARCHAEOLOGY

(e.g. ‘dinosaurs’)

Archaeology is, according to Lexico: *The study of human history and prehistory through the excavation of sites and the analysis of artefacts and other physical remains.*

‘Oh! What a contentious subject we weave!’, one might say.

History appears to rely upon ‘calendars’ and so forth. Useful devices but they present many difficulties, not the least of which is how do we measure time?

‘Time’ is a concept. It has no reality other than that we pass (transform) from one state into another. The notion, I submit, is almost impossible to contemplate.

Nonetheless, we have created devices which apparently measure ‘time’ into our favourite *digital* media. Time, of course is analogue (continuous or without a ‘break’). However, as tool-makers, we are able to convert this analogue into digital, (the minor fluctuations of matter) into the hands of a mechanical clock or (even less) digital means.

For humans it is possible to remember the past events of our lives but the ‘time factor’ is often reduced as we become ‘older’. To remember before we were able (e.g. when we were ‘babies’), is impossible because for us, since ‘time’ did not exist in our comprehension that indeed we were ‘alive’ (to be ‘alive’ is to be able to be aware of ourselves).

That being said, the notion of even a hundred ‘years’ becomes almost impossible to comprehend. The notion of thousands or billions of ‘years’ is an impossible exercise. It is the use of these so-called vast dates that leads us into the notion of past events which we cannot contemplate and they have the effect of ages so far past that they become meaningless and incomprehensible.

We are constantly assailed by notions of xx billion years which can have no hope of their contemplation in any *real* terms. All these ‘billions’ of ‘years’ are therefore redundant, for who (and with what) can measure time?

We might rely upon old manuscripts, carved rocks for our

knowledge (acquisition of data) for some insight but what level of 'knowledge' can we deduce from these? In what 'time-frame' can we actually place these that make any sense?

To be sure, we may be able to uncover certain items buried in the ground but how do we know from whence they came and when with any certainty?

Many anomalies are evident with certain 'finds' with which we are presented, (for example, the 'pyramids') and especially the notions of 'dinosaurs' and other fanciful creatures including humans.

Pyramids (or remains of them) may be actually viewed with those who have the propensity to see them but alleged creatures from so far ago we cannot comprehend but are touted on the flimsiest of 'evidence' and their farcical appearance should not make the belief of them to students more than those suddenly bereft of swaddling clouts. Imagination rules, apparently. Control should not.

ENGINEERING EVOLUTION

Evolve: Lexico defines: *Develop gradually.*

Develop: Lexico defines: *Grow or cause to grow and become more mature, advanced, or elaborate.*

I do not have a problem with the 'develop gradually'. We also might easily understand 'grow' since we can readily view this happening. However, we must be wary of the notion of 'maturity', for example, because that which 'matures' in Nature, gradually de-natures as 'time' goes by. An apple, for example grows from a 'seed' and becomes an apple, which, left to its own devices, gradually becomes what we call 'rotten' and devolves back into the ground if left alone. What then is maturity on this case? Humans are the same.

'Advanced' is merely a term that is a notion, as is 'elaborate'. Definitions abound and there can be no consensus.

Evolution is most often referred to as the evolution of the creature we call Man. This does not exclude other flora and fauna, of

course.

The *standard* references to 'Man's' evolution was determined by a chap called Charles Darwin. An interesting 'theory' but patently false if we believe in *transformation* and *adaptation* as a biological process.

In my view, 'evolution' must be changed to 'adaptation'. All creatures have *adapted* to their surroundings. Often these are not conducive to sustain life and thus they fail the transformation or adaptation test (if such was possible) and what we say 'die out' or fail in existence.

ENGINEERING HISTORY IN GENERAL

History, like most our knowledge, has been engineered for specific reasons, again, those humanoids who claim to control others without permission.

No-one can be really sure of *any* past history unless we have experienced it for ourselves, which means our 'time-frame' can only that with which we have personally lived ourselves and the extent to which we are able to recall it without modification for one reason or another. The rest must surely be conjecture and relies upon that which we have been 'taught', 'truths' or otherwise.

What we might call 'ancient' history can only be found from the writings, sightings and so forth of others about whom we can know nothing except from what they leave us in art or other tools. We must therefore be vigilant in deciding what we *believe* in this instance since (as we must observe), history is written by those with the same or similar problems of discovery of what has or has not happened.

They say that history is written by the victors. The 'victors' in this instance or are ones who decide the history that they wish to impel others to believe.

Artworks are the only real history we can see as a truth, although the original arts have been copied and possibly/probably engineered to present events that have never occurred. Who could

know?

Given that so-called ‘modern technology’ is able to create the false (in forms not before seen), it is not uncertain that any art that portrays events is not engineered for a particular purpose other than that of ‘telling what it is’ in any form the artist wishes for his or her own reasons.

Art comes from the essence of a human wishing to preserve a moment in time for his own (at least) posterity, whether it be for their own satisfaction (like my writings) or a deceit for another purpose.

ENGINEERING ‘VOTING’

The notion of ‘voting’ is only valid, if the ‘voters’ are aware of all the relevant data (so far as is possible) for such an act which can be confirmed or validated by those ‘voters’. If data is withheld, then the voting cannot be valid on a significant basis. Those who wish to be voted for must declare their open *curriculum vitae* so that voters can make a reasoned choice as to their suitability. The ‘reasoned choice’, of course must be one based upon an education that does not include all the other engineered projects forced upon them.

The main problem arises that a group of people (no matter how small or large) may need some form of *management* but they do not need ‘government’. Management relies upon *rules* to continue, not laws. Government requires *laws* to subjugate others with a threat of some kind of violence if not adhered to.

Further, the notion of voting and the greatest number (i.e. fake ‘democracy’) of ‘aye’ for a particular person or idea that concedes the victory has to be a no-no if the margin between ‘aye’ and ‘nay’ is small enough to be insignificant, especially when we might count in millions of persons.

This is a quandary difficult to reconcile, of course.

ENGINEERING THE ‘ILLUMINATI’ AND OTHER ‘POWERS-THAT-BE’

It is believed by many that the World engineered by what we call Man (as opposed to the world that which came about naturally) is controlled by a faction know as the 'Illuminati'. The word itself means the 'illuminated' ones who claim to have powers that the rest of the population of the planet do not have. They are also known as the 'powers- that-be'. They are would-be later versions of the Shaman.

My dispute is that obviously they have no more 'knowledge' than anyone else but have managed (engineered, if you will), their alleged status, thus calling themselves, kings, queens, clergy and any other title to which they take a fancy, propelling themselves into the lives of others, who merely want to get the best life possible for themselves and their loved ones.

There is no doubt that, whoever they appear to be, they are simply bullies, bandits and other riff-raff who have convinced others that they have these 'powers' and amassed enough followers by devious means into believing their superiority.

Whoever they may be, they are not Human but humanoids.

ENGINEERING 'CLIMATE CHANGE'

This is becoming an old saw, like many of the subjects I am describing. Once known as 'global warming', it has since been expanded into 'climate change' thus widening the thrust of a completely spurious notion for the purpose of fear-mongering and even more control.

The notion that a puny group of people (even in billions (even if that is true)) can affect a planetary system in any way, is redundant. Of course it is possible to affect local areas but that is entirely another matter to affecting the planet as a whole.

There is no doubt, that cloud-seeding (for example) is possible on a local location but the whole planet would require more vast resources than we can imagine. I stand to be corrected, of course.

However, it is not the notion that is or is not possible but that certain elements (such as so-called 'carbon dioxide' is a 'deadly gas',

which it isn't since it is a minuscule part of the atmosphere but is something most people have heard of, even if they do not understand what it is or does (or doesn't in this case!)

ENGINEERING WARS

Once again, wars are another control mechanism of populations. They are real only for the fact that huge numbers of Humans are set against each other for the controllers' benefit and gains either for living space, money, or any other nefarious reason. They are coerced into fighting their fellows when they are forced into armies by the war criminals.

For example, it is a strongly held belief that the First and Second 'world wars' were engineered from the start to give a group of people a place to live that was not theirs in the first place.

[It is believed that they were engineered by a criminal known as Cecil Rhodes, the greatest diamond thief known (having plundered South Africa of its diamonds).]

One cannot read better than George Orwell's '1984' since he had first-hand knowledge of one of the largest propaganda organisations in the World, the B.B.C.

ENGINEERING COMMUNICATION

Communication is the ability to connect with other flora or fauna or even the wider 'world'.

Communication relies upon the sensual apparatus we inherit from (in simple) our parents. This sensual apparatus is usually defined as seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting or vocal.

These are not sacrosanct, however, as what we might call 100%. We might have varying degrees of these from nothing to exceptional (blindness, deafness and so forth).

There *are* other senses, which can or cannot be defined without difficulty by any sort of terms. They are Natural and inexplicable and result in abilities which defy explanation, such as various forms of 'art' which defy definition.

Communication relies entirely upon personal experiences and availability of senses (at any one given time or location) which may be applied to whatever it is with which we might wish to communicate.

Language is not only written, inscribed, drawn or otherwise available to the sighted. Language is communication between one or more individuals (flora or fauna) that equates with a reaction, hopefully positive but in survival terms positively negative for survival reasons.

ENGINEERING RACISM

PART ONE

Please note: For the purposes of this essay, all the following definitions are taken from the on-line Oxford English Dictionaries.

Racism: 1 *Prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one's own race is superior.*

'a programme to combat racism'

1.1 *The belief that all members of each race possess characteristics, abilities, or qualities specific to that race, especially so as to distinguish it as inferior or superior to another race or races.*

'theories of racism'

Racist: *A person who shows or feels discrimination or prejudice against people of other races, or who believes that a particular race is superior to another.*

Race: *Each of the major divisions of humankind, having distinct physical characteristics.*

Ethnic: adjective. 1 Relating to a population subgroup (within a larger or dominant national or cultural group) with a common national or cultural tradition.

‘ethnic and cultural rights and traditions’

‘leaders of ethnic communities’

1.1 Relating to national and cultural origins.

‘pupils from a wide variety of ethnic origins’

1.2 Denoting origin by birth or descent rather than by present nationality.

‘ethnic Indian populations’

1.3 Characteristic of or belonging to a non-Western cultural tradition.

‘ethnic jewellery’

‘folk and ethnic music’

2 archaic Neither Christian nor Jewish; pagan or heathen.

Noun (dated, offensive) A member of an ethnic minority.

Usage:

Ethnic is sometimes used in a euphemistic way to refer to non-white people as a whole, as in a radio station which broadcasts to the ethnic community in Birmingham. Although this usage is quite common, more specific terms such as ‘black’ or ‘Asian’ are preferable. Note that use of the word as a noun is often regarded as offensive, especially in British English, and is best avoided.

All the above definitions may, in some way be valid. However, there is a contention that the human animal is not divided into 'races' but that depending upon the circumstances of their geographical location at the time of their birth, they may indeed be different in many ways but that is how they have adapted to their surroundings over many, what we call 'years'.

However 'many' years we can have no idea, since our personal knowledge of 'age' can only be within the range of our personal existence.

We may be aware of what we call our parents, grand-parents and possibly even great-grand-parents. However, beyond that, in actuality, would be conjecture. Those persons who may be 'adopted' for some reason will surely have other notions of their origins.

If we take the definition (above):

'racism': *I Prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one's own race is superior.'*

I believe we have the concept here, if I may be allowed, in a 'nutshell'.

At least, that is the notion that prevails at this time in 'history' when others talk of 'racism'. The ignorance lies in the engineering of prejudice for what one might call (in litotes) political reasons.

The word 'prejudice' devolves from the word pre-judgement (Old French).

The notion of 'race' seems to be that what we call human creatures, is conflated with the fact that humans can be divided into other species of some kind such as creatures we call, cats, dog, birds and/or whatever else. The 'moral' dimension of 'race' is singularly lacking, of course.

PART TWO

A lesson in grammar for those who might need it, or have forgotten some of its implications.

LABELS

A label is a written or verbal device attached to an object (which in the case about which I am writing may refer to a static object or a living entity).

A label is, in grammar, a word which is called a noun. A noun is a 'naming' word. Thus we may describe an object with certain attributes as, for example, a table (with which we may be familiar in a general sense) as a device upon which we may place other objects with a desire to their use for various purposes.

Labels are useful, but may also be applied (against their will) to anything at all, and morally, with positive or negative connotations.

We should be wary how we apply them.

To objects, we may apply a descriptive word (adjective). We might say, for example, add a 'large' or 'small' appellation to our 'table' thus rendering it with a 'quality', in this case its size.

Engineering of a noun, for example that a person is a 'racist' (which is a noun) is fraught with difficulties unless we remember that 'racist' is applied to a person (noun) without any explanation as to why it was applied in the first place without an explanation as to what a 'racist' might be in the first place.

Who might really care what the colour of a table is, if it serves a useful purpose?

However, we are sure that labels can be dangerous. They are applied to everything that we observe. I repeat, we should be wary of them, they are not a survival mechanism.

Labels are chosen (engineered, if you will) to distract us. Labels do not tell us anything that is useful for us in regard to human behaviours.

PART THREE

Of aboriginals

According to the Oxford English Dictionaries:

Aboriginals: *adjective. 1 Inhabiting or existing in a land from*

the earliest times or from before the arrival of colonists; indigenous.

This definition suits my purpose here.

From where we personally derive (were born) upon this planet, is of no consequence. In a sense, we are all aboriginals (the original inhabitants of a place whereupon we were born). Our personal heritage is that only.

To deny others, for whatever reason, must be contrary. There is no entity to deny otherwise, other than deny the entity that so proclaims.

To claim that one is 'born' in a certain place at a certain time and thus is 'such and such' a person 'belongs' to that situation cannot be a truism, since we can 'move' anywhere we are predisposed given the means to do so. Thus we move from place to place to find a suitable environment for our future survival.

To remove or try to change original (aboriginal) inhabitants for our own purposes is inhuman.

That we may have the ability with our tools to decimate an aboriginal community or communities, is neither here nor there.

PART FOUR

Immigrants and Emigrants

Just to get things clear, immigrants are those people who are forced to go somewhere else because their 'home' situation is intolerable and they go wherever they are not 'thrown out'.

Emigrants are those who wish to go somewhere else other than their usual place.

No 'moral' conclusions should be derived from these definitions.

A personal story (typical of many).

In 1962, I was working in London for a shipping company. A

cousin of mine was *emigrating* to Australia. I had easy access to Australia House and was intrigued. My family decided that the notion was interesting. We thus emigrated to Western Australia in 1963.

Thus we were *immigrants*. We did not have to go, it was a decision.

This issue is very important because we are (apparently) assailed by the notion of 'immigrants', usually of a 'race' (depending on the 'flavour' of the month) into Europe from countries determined to undermine legitimate 'regimes' from their healthy purpose and thus possible 'immigrants' which has devolved into 'migrants' (as opposed to 'displaced persons', which was a canard of the WW2 scenario).

Frankly, one should not be bothered by this tripe of 'racism'. I have worked and loved all the people that I have met. My own wife was not of my 'race'. Most of my dear friends are not of my 'race'. For them, I would not be what I may be. Bless them.

In short, 'racism' is applied by the same entities that proclaim all the other deceptive filth they peddle.

PART FIVE

Of restaurants and other places

In all major cities and towns, we apparently visit places of interest, whether to placate our appetites or for various other reasons. Where is the 'racism'?

We imbibe German beers, Pizzas, French cheeses, MacDonalds, Kentucky Fried chickens, Fish and Chips, Thai restaurant foods and a plethora of other delights. The list is endless.

Where is the racism?

Who or what is 'calling the tune' here?

'Racism' is a state of mind perpetrated by the *ignorati*. They are the would-be controllers who manufacture or engineer your lives if you so wish or want.

Dear esteemed members.

My apologies. In my previous post I wrote:

'Racism' is a state of mind perpetrated by the *ignorati*. They are the would-be controllers who manufacture or engineer your lives if you so wish or want.

I would like to retract that statement in the light of further thought. I am not saying I disagree with it but it serves no useful purpose at this time.

In a sense this is a very difficult subject to broach (to say the least). It is very emotive, as we are very well aware.

Just to get things clear, immigrants are those people who are forced to go somewhere else because their 'home' situation is intolerable and they go wherever they are not 'thrown out'.

Emigrants are those who wish to go somewhere else other than their usual place.

A correspondent wrote:

Since you make an effort in defining words here, isn't immigrant simply what you are called in the country you move to regardless of the cause?

My apologies. My statements were badly worded. Actually, I should have mentioned 'refugees'. Refugees are those who, for some reason are forced (or perhaps feel forced) to leave a certain location. They are often called immigrants when they end up somewhere else where they may be seen as not wanted (or indeed required).

This notion is apparent with what is called (in Europe, at least) the 'Immigrant' or 'Refugee' crisis. The terms seem to be interchangeable depending on your location of sources of data. (A deliberate confusion?)

Going on...

I think that there are some questions which need to be addressed. There must be many more.

How does one define 'race'?

Are 'Americans' a race? No, they are people who live on a continent we call America.

Are 'Australians' a race? No, they are people who live on a continent we call Australia.

Are Jewish people a race? No, they are people who live within other lands since they are a nomadic people.

Which 'race' are my own children? They have a 'West Indian' mother and a 'British' father.

Are there any 'races' at all? No, they are people who live in various locations.

Does 'racism' then actually exist or is it merely that one group doesn't like another group for whatever reason they concoct for themselves?

Is 'racism' inherent in different groups of people?

Is 'racism' apparent because there is a perceived 'threat' to something, jobs, housing, benefits?

Personally, I believe one of the main reasons that some groups do not like other groups is because they are perceived as a threat of some kind (real or imaginary).

I will give an example.

In the U.K. in the early 1960's they was created a deliberate influx of what was chosen to be called the West Indies. They were invited into the country to take jobs in industries such as car manufacturing and especially the railway system. It caused havoc in communities where darker-skinned people were considered not only inferior but were 'taking our jobs'. The fact that no-one else wanted to be a baggage handler (or whatever) did not enter the equation. Signs appeared in the windows of many boarding houses reading 'No blacks' (for example).

People would sell their houses if a West Indian family moved into next door. I know this for certain because one of my family living in London, did just that (much to my shame).

Later, I discovered that I believe there was some jealousy because 'they' knew all the 'tricks' of getting any benefits they could, when the 'ordinary' Englishman hadn't a clue because they didn't get the same literature given to the 'immigrants' (which has become a dirty word).

When I emigrated (with my family) to Australia, from Australia House in London, we were given a fairly thick volume giving us all the entitlements we could get in Australia, I think I still have it in my library. I am sure the 'Australians' didn't have one.

These things create dissention.

There is another big issue. Why don't certain people like other groups from 'foreign' lands?

I believe it could well be that it is due to (manufactured) wars and the invasion of other countries to plunder and take control of property and resources. This seems to be especially what we call 'Western' groups (for example, what the British and French call the 'colonies').

It is no wonder some people don't like others. Not inherently (which I think is very important) but because people have been forced (on pain of death, sometimes) to fight them without knowing why (except for untruths). Think both 'World Wars'.

If you believe that there are 'races' of people, then I suppose

one must entertain the notion of 'racism'. However, if you just believe that there are different people living in different locations who have adapted to their situation, then they are 'people who live in [.....]' (insert name of location).

What really bugs me is that we are constantly bombarded with traits that certain peoples have that we might find offensive, humorous or whatever and to which we attribute labels. The French don't like the British. The British don't like the French etc. *ad nauseum*.

And now for a little light relief. Warning! some 'strong' language.

I think this man really nailed a deal of things. You have probably heard of him. His name is George Carlin.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jQHN1ipLPdY>

Be well.

ENGINEERING CONFUSION

Confusion:

Meaning of confusion in English (Cambridge Dictionary):

A situation in which people do not understand what is happening, what they should do or who someone or something is.

I would like to amend this to:

A situation in which people do not understand what is or has happened, or **not happened**, what they should do, or who someone or something is.

Present and past events are included.

I believe that this is very closely allied with the art (in the negative) of engineering *deception*. It is also part of the ‘divide and conquer’ syndrome.

If one *allows* oneself to be confused by reading, listening or watching the plethora of drivel from regular main-sewer ‘news’, you are entitled to be confused. The object of this ‘news’ is to confuse, however it is perpetrated.

ENGINEERING DISEASE

Correctly or incorrectly, I am voicing my observations and opinions within my experience and readings over many years.

So-called ‘modern medicine’ (allopathic medicine) is every much a hoax/scam/entrepreneurial exercise as are all the other scams this forum (in my view, correctly) demonises. Why quote others (regarding my views) about whom I know nothing and who might agree or disagree with what I am saying. I am not asking anyone to agree with my input here, merely to discuss it in a (hopefully) agreeable manner.

The word ‘cancer’, for example, must surely be one of the most hyped words in a medical dictionary.

Ralph Moss has written a book called: The Cancer Industry of which the title explains all.

<http://www.amazon.com/The-Cancer-Industry-Ralph-Moss/product-reviews/1881025098>

I am singling out this fake ‘disease’ (‘cancer’) because it

encompasses everything from what is assumed a 'common cold', to 'influenza' which just makes the 'germ' perpetrator a 'virus' (or unseen and ever a less-able-to-be-seen 'enemy').

The pronouncement of a 'cancer' to an individual by a so-called 'doctor' is a death sentence par excellence. It's utterance, even by those who apparently possess enough data to be compos mentis and including the likes of 'health rangers' and so forth, is astoundingly obtuse.

Why? Because the results of external 'treatment' are slash/burn/poison in any order you wish and the ignorance of the purveyors of this 'treatment'.

It is totally incorrect to assume that 'cancer' is a singular 'disease' (as usually presented).

For example: 'He/she has cancer, I have cancer, I have a relative/friend who has 'cancer' and so forth.

There are very many 'types' of cancer, therefore it should only be used in the plural, whatever you beliefs otherwise. This is a very serious issue. This is the fakery of natural processes.

Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer and his research... (German New Medicine)

I became aware of this man's work a number of years ago. Having studied medicine since I was about twelve years of age (and that is over fifty years ago) I found his explanation suitably academic (in the real sense of the word, which is continual assessment of data and changes thereof) perfectly rational.

According to Dr. Hamer the real cause of a cancer and other 'diseases' is an unexpected traumatic shock for which we are

emotionally unprepared and all are a response to the body from the brain.*

These unexpected traumatic shocks cause a conflict which needs to be resolved before a proper healing can take place.

The body is a self-healing entity providing the correct nutrients are ingested in sufficient quantities and this especially includes sunlight, as a prime mover, without which we would not exist in the first place.

*I would have to say that I would extend this definition to perhaps more seemingly minor health 'problems' that arise. This does not preclude, of course the ability of the mind or body to react negatively to foreign proteins or other poisons. ALL dis-ease is due to lack of correct nourishment (whatever that may be, in simple).

The following list shows some of the relationships between conflict feelings and target organs.

- * Adrenal cortex – Wrong direction, gone astray
- * Bladder – Ugly conflict, dirty tricks
- * Bone – Lack of self-worth, inferiority feeling
- * Breast milk gland – Involving care or disharmony
- * Breast milk duct – Separation conflict
- * Breast, left (right-handed) – Conflict concerning child, home, mother
- * Breast, right (right-handed) – Conflict with partner or others
- * Bronchials – Territorial conflict
- * Cervix – Severe frustration
- * Colon – Ugly indigestible conflict
- * Oesophagus – Cannot have it or swallow it
- * Gall Bladder – Rivalry conflict
- * Heart – Perpetual conflict
- * Intestines – Indigestible chunk of anger
- * Kidneys – Not wanting to live, water or fluid conflict

- * Larynx – Conflict of fear and fright
- * Leukaemia – A "self-devaluation conflict" refers to a loss of self-esteem or self-worth
- * Liver – Fear of starvation
- * Lung – Fear of dying or suffocation, including fear for someone else
- * Lymph glands – Loss of self-worth associated with the location
- * Melanoma – feeling dirty, soiled, defiled
- * Middle ear – Not being able to get some vital information
- * Mouth – Cannot chew or hold it
- * Pancreas – Anxiety-anger conflict with family members, inheritance
- * Prostate – Ugly conflict with sexual connections or connotations
- * Rectum – Fear of being useless
- * Skin – Loss of integrity
- * Spleen – Shock of being physically or emotionally wounded
- * Stomach – Indigestible anger, swallowed too much
- * Testes and Ovaries – Loss conflict
- * Thyroid – Feeling powerless
- * Uterus – Sexual conflict

Note: The above list is not on my making but the author is unknown to me however, I owe him/her my thanks.

Examples of unexpected trauma shocks leading to conflicts:

Surgical shock...

This is very common and can take forms such as a bite from a venomous creature including stabbing with a needle, common inoculations/vaccinations, knives, bullets, surgical knives (operations) and suchlike.

Feelings or emotional shocks...

Loss or perceived loss of a loved one, employment, or anything else that is important to a particular person.

Diagnostic shocks from your local 'doctor'...

The diagnosis of a 'cancer' is probably the worst but anything that affects a person directly in the negative.

Various other shocks...

Severe accidents of any description (cars, falls, breakages etc.)

Rapes and other physical assaults upon a person, including verbal assault

Threats of violence

Fear, whether actual or perceived

These may all relate to another person who is very close to you; they do not necessarily include yourself.

I have in my possession a book called 'The Trauma Trap', written by Dr David Muss (my version 1991) which details how to recover from what is known as Post-traumatic Stress Disorder. His site is still available at:

<http://www.davidmuss.co.uk/therewindtechnique/>

I have had this book long before my introduction to Hamer but it compliments his work admirably.

WHY 'ALTERNATIVE' CANCER TREATMENTS WORK

I do not like the word 'alternative' for natural 'cures'. I believe that the 'alternative' referred to should relate to the notion of 'orthodox' treatment or 'modern (allopathic) medicine'. That is, slash, burn and/or poison.

Having researched the subject of cancer treatments exhaustively, I am of the firm opinion that Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer's hypothesis in his New German Medicine shines above all else as the beacon of explanation because it relates to the study of embryology of which it has a 'real' scientific foundation (there are little or no vested interests that I am aware of).

I am not going to attempt to explain German New Medicine, as that is not my point here. There is ample data available on the Internet to read far better than I could ever paraphrase.

I might suggest you look at some or any or all of these lectures which describe Hamer's work:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3zYWtzq4XBk>

My point is that there are many other notions regarding successful treatment of cancers (and other dis-eases) and this may be confusing to those looking for natural help and I believe they are all complimentary to Hamer's hypothesis.

As with the alleged remark made by Florence Nightingale ('there are no specific diseases, only specific conditions') there are no specific remedies but only the conditions of their use, providing they are supplied by Nature. Nature has been supplying these for thousands of years and never to a detriment! A great deal has to be related to T.L.C. (Tender, Loving Care).

Thus, there can be no one complete answer to the cure of cancer (or any other so-called 'dis-ease') and there does not necessarily have to be any conflict between them. This is very important.

If Hamer is correct, then any form of answer will be correct if it has a natural implementation.

Health is a matter of maintaining a correct terrain.

Terrain is the body in toto, that is, it is holistic (the total body).

If the terrain is compromised by whatever means, then it will not function correctly but since the body is self-healing, it will endeavour to do so and any 'help' will be made use of.

An organism is mind (whatever that may be and at whatever level of awareness it is) and body (the 'meat' of the subject).

For example, if one has several different fields (as in farming), then depending on what one wants to do with those fields, they all have an underlying structure (terrain) that must be treated accordingly to its purpose if one wants to grow corn in one and have cows grazing on another.

Treatments of 'dis-ease' come in as many flavours as there are 'dis-eases'.

Dis-ease comes about from a compromise of the terrain.

There are no bad or good 'germs', no 'immune system', 'antibodies' and so forth. In dis-ease, there is only compromised terrain (mind and/or body).

Thus, any positive natural treatment will aid in recreating a non-compromised terrain and therefore will aid in the self-healing of the body/mind.

Hamer refers to 'conflicts' as causing disease and the more difficult the conflict, the more the terrain is compromised. At the same time, there may be a number of conflicts. These must all be dealt with; probably on their own particular terms, which complicates the situation.

A conflict is something which occurs unexpectedly.

However, the less the body is compromised, the better able is the body to self-heal.

The reason that I am not going into specific dis-eases or treatments is because as long as the terrain is not compromised by the treatment, it will all work to aid self-healing.

So-called 'orthodox' or 'modern' medicine can do little or none of this self-healing. It aims at 'symptomatic' treatment. Treating symptoms is nowhere near aiding self-healing (preservation) and is

most often detrimental to the point of non-survival. There may be a temporary placebo effect (which we know is real) but modern medicine has no hope in trying to 'cure' a dis-ease; it merely attempts to treat the symptoms. In this event it usually fails and at the same time further compromises the terrain.

All pharmaceutical (Man-made) drugs are foreign to the body and will therefore have effects up to and including the point of death. It is well-known that over 80% of pharmaceutical drugs are ineffective to begin with. This was a statement made by a retired chemist in the industry but I am unable to find a link).

It is also well known that physician induced deaths out-way the dis-ease related deaths.

Allopathic medicine constantly touts 'cure' but can never achieve such a thing because that is not the intent of its 'medicine'.

Even the word 'cure' should not be used at all, since it is an end product and life can never be an end product because it is dynamic. There will always be a new compromising of the terrain to heal.

What we call death is an end product but if we are all composed of pleomorphic fragments a lá Bechamp et al, then our de-organisation (i.e. death) is only the beginning of some other life form.

The only useful thing for any 'orthodox' medicine is for accident and emergency, where some techniques are useful but the use of any man-made (i.e. pharmaceutical) drug should be limited to those that have as natural a basis as far as possible or have a well-proven track record without disastrous side-effects (they still only treat symptoms, not the 'cause').

My main thrust is that all natural treatments from Essiac tea to various diets, sodium bicarbonate, Vitamin C, Vitamin (actually enzyme producer) D3 (a.k.a. sunlight), meditation, TLC (tender loving care) are all perfectly valuable in producing a terrain that is available for the self-healing properties of the terrain.

Cancer is not a death sentence unless you allow 'orthodox' medicine to be used as a treatment or even a diagnosis. The death sentence is in the treatment.

Remember also, that diagnosis is very difficult and many times

cancer is not the cause of symptoms. The symptoms are the healing process and should be managed, not destroyed.

Any 'tumour' is part of the healing process and needs to be accorded its value in the healing process.

Most of 'modern' or 'orthodox' medicines, diagnosis, treatments, vaccinations are an invasion of a whole creature and produces an 'attack' conflict resulting in a dis-ease of the whole creature.

Peter K. Sharpen

Most of 'modern' or 'orthodox' medicine, diagnosis, treatments, vaccination is based on profit, not a healing of the unwell.

Peter K. Sharpen

If you follow the N.H.S. (UK) vaccine regime (for example), your new-born healthy baby will be stabbed 19 times and injected with toxic chemicals and foreign proteins, without its consent, in the first 13 months! Would you want that on your uninformed conscience?

[Responses were rather mixed and this article caused quite a stir. However, it prevailed for a long time. It did degenerate from my original intention, which prompted the following reply.]

Oh, dear, I shall be banned...

I was reading the thread regarding having a section on nutrition and I must say, pretty horrified, since I knew that it would result in a load of 'diet' stuff.

My apologies for not quoting the member who said the same thing in different words.

Now we get 'Observer' giving over his/her interpretations of ill-health and the drivel that ensues with all the fairy-tales of

so-called 'science' regarding what Nature does or does not supply. In a word it is pathetic.

Whatever Nature is, or how we perceive it (masculine or feminine) it is from that that we are produced (or come about). Nature is not self-destructive, only the creature known as 'Man'. There are no 'germs' or 'viruses' (or indeed 'aliens' from outer-space).

'Bacteria' are non-existent until required by a self-healing body (if it is allowed to). 'Good' or 'bad' exist only in the minds of the ignorati.

Nature is a continuum within what we call the 'universe'. It must be a dynamic continuum, which I do not believe that we are able to fathom, merely explore ideas. There is not, in my view at least, any way we can explain it to fruition, any more than we can explain the activities of leaves on a tree or the dear creatures I call my 'feline' companions.

It is said that 'You are what you eat'. This may be fine in itself but we have to remember that we live in a conducive atmosphere (or did) for our lives and not all 'eats' are available, or can be assimilated and so forth..

All this tripe about 'carbohydrates' 'calories' (units of measurement) and other invented chemicals (including the theory (!)) of atoms and molecules belongs in the fantasy and pockets of those promoting it for their own ends, not ours. Whilst sometimes useful for alchemical reasons, these theories (except as we may want them) are not actual products of Nature, only the transformation of one thing into something else.

A label (noun) doth not maketh Man or anything else. A noun does not describe, it only attributes a label for convenience.

Unless it is compromised by intervention, Nature gives us

everything that are our needs, if we accept them and learn how to apply them. Nature also requires SUNLIGHT to activate our ingestion of substances (whatever they may be called).

The creature we call 'Man' has had a long time to find out what is or is not conducive to our 'health' and survival as individuals.

We cannot single out any particular substance/s for our health. Our health is determined to the extent to which we allow others to determine it.

It should be obvious that given the differences in our geographical locations (whatever they may be) that some things are 'good' for us and some things are 'not good' for us. This is the process of learning. To tell others is a question of a learning process for them. To tell others that such-and-such is good for them may well be their downfall.

One might even consider a thread on the fakery of food...

My apologies if I have misrepresented anyone.

As always in good faith,
Sharpstuff

ENGINEERING 'DIVERSITY'

Thesis:

The apparent move by those we may not accept as any 'authority' that is constantly bombarding us that we should accept: 'diversity'.

It is my belief (as least, I imagine) that 'Diversity' is another (ploy) form of engineering. Social behaviours.

It is a deception *par excellence* of engineering human behaviours, much in the same way as engineering other human behaviours such as nutrition, disease, perceived racism or anything else that contradicts what controllers wish to denounce as part of 'ordinary' human behaviours, such as trying to survive in whatever is to us a 'natural' environment and working with each other to establish a mutual survival in particular environments that can establish such survival without conflicts with others and that might lead to a non-survival mechanism.

Note: All definitions are from the Oxford English dictionaries.

Definition:

diverse (adjective) Showing a great deal of variety; very different.

'a culturally diverse population'

'subjects as diverse as architecture, language teaching, and the physical sciences'

Origin Middle English: variant of divers.

divers (adjective) literary, archaic. Of varying types; several.

'in divers places'

Origin Middle English: via Old French from Latin diversus 'diverse', from divertere 'turn in separate ways' (see divert).

To paraphrase the above, we are all different. We therefore have different proclivities as to our (let's say), 'behaviours'.

We may (?) agree that we all have different ways of doing

things (behaviours).

The interesting notion (based on the definition below) follows:

DIVERT (capitals mine) *verb[with object] I Cause (someone or something) to change course or turn from one direction to another.*

The significant word is 'cause' and reflects the nature of this thread.

I submit, without prejudice, that the apparent present notion requiring the use of the word 'diversity' is yet another means of deceiving the populace into believing that diversity is a matter for human contemplation and acceptance that requires the beliefs that *all* diverse human behaviours are valid and should be acceptable.

Question: Should we accept any and every 'human' behaviour as acceptable?

What offends humanists is the fact that we are now supposed to accept what we consider (as caring people) is what we consider offensive behaviours such as the genital mutilation (e.g. circumcision, male and female) or stabbing (a surgical procedure requiring consent *in loco parentis* or otherwise of infant humans without their consent) with 'vaccines' or 'anti-biotics' as a 'normal' practice.

If certain people wish to become a trans-genderised person, then so be it. Why should I or you have to accept that except for our caring about their well-being?

If certain individuals wish to be 'homosexual', why should I

care but have to accept that it is some sort of 'norm' and may be ostracised because I do not accept that way of life. If that is their proclivity, why should I care or care less? Why do I need or want to know?

Conversely, if I wish to be 'heterosexual' why should I be ostracised because I cannot accept another way of life?

Diversity of human behaviours may or may not be accepted by others, *expected and legislated*, is control of behaviours that are not always acceptable to humans who disagree.

'Celebrate' diversity? Yes, but let those who are diverse (including myself, perhaps...oooo! the thought of chewing the end of that lit candle really turn me on...) just keep it to themselves, I do not have to know about it, or accept it. I don't make posters to claim my heterosexuality, why do others bother to proclaim their own proclivities? and why should I care? Do they care about me? When was my heterosexuality confirmed in some parade on the street?

ENGINEERING NUTRITION

Nutrition is described as:

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/nutrition>

I will take the first definition:

1. The process of providing or obtaining the food necessary for health and growth.

Nutrients are those elements that contribute to a sustained health (the ability to sustain life of some sort depending upon their ability to do so).

Thus, nutrients are (or are not) available to any 'species' that

has what one might call 'life'.

Life is the ability to continue an existence of which we are (as human animals) able to contemplate (and other flora and fauna do in their own way).

Thus, again, the nutrients for our personal existence depend upon that which we personally require for our personal existence.

Geographical locations of human existence rely upon the extent to which they can continue their life experiences with the nutrients they require to continue their life expectancy. Thus we all have different requirements.

Nutrients must determine our life experiences where-ever we live. If suitable nutrients are not available, then we experience life difficulties and we become what we call 'sick'.

At present we are assailed by the notion that Nature has provided 'germs' and 'viruses' to complicate the issue. However, the fact is, that we are not receiving the correct nutrients for our personal survival. Nature has no effect in/on the matter.

Thus the engineering of notions that nutrients are available in/by the methods that are proposed by the same persons who advocate nutrition for their own ends, not yours (to be political, which I decry).

We are constantly assailed by notions of 'vegan', 'vegetarian' and other stuff whose foundations are only in that of the minds of the progenitors. Whilst agreed they may be suitable for some/many persons, these notions often lead to silly arguments, labels and such-like that preclude what is important, which is getting the best nutrients available for our personal survival so far as they are available to us..

A diet is what you eat, whatever that may be. A diet should not be a set of rules set by a specific geographical group by which everyone should live because that diet may not be conducive to the health of an individual but is set by those who have no notion as to what nutrition is in the first place. Thus they are 'engineered' by/for those who may benefit of that engineering.

'Diets' (that which we eat to sustain ourselves) are absolutely geographical. That much should be pretty obvious, when we look at what other peoples consume for sustenance (wherever they come from). Have you ever eaten a Witchetty Grub?

What we call the 'West' insists that their diets (howsoever concocted and by the faceless whom) are suitable for human consumption when they consist of foods modified by various means and 'cooked' or 'heated' by various means, that they consider are 'nutritional'.

One might argue for a life-time the best methods of assimilating food into a biological organism but to what end?

One might well argue about the method of cooking/heating of foods (or not) but...

There is an old adage: 'You are what you eat'.

Peddling 'diets' and other spurious nonsense are not a viable proposition and any 'theory' that states otherwise must be an engineering problem that does not address it.

For what it's worth.

ENDNOTE

A 'theory' is just that. It must never be held as a final 'truth' and certainly never be held as sacrosanct and enforced as such. It is

everything about conjecture, supposition or anything else and must forever be held a theory.

I trust that any readers of this missive will respect my 'take' on the subjects I have raised and my views upon them, which, as always, are written in absolute good faith.

Be well.

Peter K. Sharpen

Produced (2020)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am impelled to thank the authors of the dozens of works that I have studied and that have contributed to my understanding that the World created by the human animal is one that needs considerable time and work to be able to see that we have been manipulated to conform to patterns of behaviours which are not of Nature but are created for the un-natural purposes of control.

It is essential for our well-being that we are vigilant in discussing what we are told to believe and to take note of the ever-changing world that Nature has 'provided' for us and not to listen to those who claim to be 'experts'. Of 'experts', there can be no such thing. We are all learners but there can never be 'the science is in', or some other trite remark.

'Nature' is why we are here without 'consent' but that which is by what we 'live'. It must not be manipulated or 'engineered' by others who do not hold the views of a general well-being and deem to take control of others.

Be well.

Peter Kenneth Sharpen (2020)

