December 2007 TRENDEVENTS

Subject: ***Re: The Scientists Speak*** *(Energy Resources)* -- http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/press-releases/pr-121007.pdf

From: Mark Knapp - November 27, 2007

Having studied meteorology, geology, and ecology, I have a considerable amount of respect for those who have devoted much of their lives to studying the theory of anthropogenic climate change. I also note that STUDYING nature is a much different venture than CONTROLLING nature through the application of science and technology. I suspect that climate scientists are generally not motivated by money or power… So when some 99 percent of the scientists conclude that human activity is the primary cause of the current rise in global temperature, that's far more than enough to satisfy me… Furthermore, from a political perspective, the message from these scientists is essentially about LIMITS and, therefore, interferes with the dominant Western paradigm of continual growth. So the argument by some "climate change skeptics" -- that the theory of human causation is a conspiracy of the powerful -- is illogical…

From: Lawrence B. Crowell -- November 28, 2007

As someone who is not educated in the field of meteorology and climate, but read more general articles on it and some professional ones in Science and Nature, I second this. The evidence is becoming clear that we are causing a malfunction with the life support system of spaceship Earth. We run the risk of a major failure if we do not change what we are doing; and people who want to point to some poor starving slob crossing the Rio Grande as the fount of all our ills and deny the problem of anthropic climate change simply don't know what they are talking about…

<><><><><><><><><><>

Scientists beg for climate action, By Seth Borenstein, AP Science Writer, Dec 5, 2007
[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20071205/ap_on_sc/climate_scientists]

For the first time, more than 200 of the world's leading climate scientists, losing their patience, urged government leaders to take radical action to slow global warming because "there is no time to lose."

A petition from at least 215 climate scientists calls for the world to cut in half greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. It is directed at a conference of diplomats meeting in Bali, Indonesia, to negotiate the next global warming treaty. The petition, obtained by The Associated Press, is to be announced at a press conference there Wednesday night… The appeal from scientists follows a petition last week from more than 150 global business leaders also demanding the 50 percent cut in greenhouse gases. That is the estimate that scientists calculate would hold future global warming to a little more than a 3-degree Fahrenheit increase and is in line with what the European Union has adopted… In the past, many of these scientists have avoided calls for action, leaving that to environmental advocacy groups. That dispassionate stance was taken during the release this year of four separate reports by the Nobel Prize-winning Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; but no more…"It's a grave crisis, and we need to do something real fast," said petition signer Jeff Severinghaus, a geosciences professor at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in La Jolla, Calif. "I think the stakes are way, way too high to be playing around."

The unprecedented petition includes scientists from more than 25 countries and shows that "the climate science community is essentially fed up," said signer Andrew Weaver of the University of Victoria in Canada. It includes many co-authors of the Intergovernmental Climate Change Panel reports, directors of major American

and European climate science research institutions, a Nobel winner for atmospheric chemistry and a winner of a MacArthur "genius" award.

"A lot of us scientists think the problem needs a lot more serious attention than it's getting, and the remedies have to be a lot more radical," said Richard Seager, a scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory… The organizers of the petition — two Australians, two Germans, and an American — would not comment about their efforts before their 11 p.m. EST press conference, but several scientists who signed on talked of losing patience… "Action needs to be taken and needs to be taken now," said Marika Holland, a scientist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research who signed on. "The longer we wait, the worse it's going to become."

Negotiators in Bali are working on the initial groundwork for a treaty that would take effect after 2012, the expiration date of the Kyoto Protocol, a climate treaty the United States didn't sign; however, no one expects concrete results at the closed-door sessions.

NASA scientist Gavin Schmidt, who signed the petition, said "the time for half-measures and the time for voluntary agreements and the time for arguing about 1 percent here and 1 percent there — those things are no longer relevant."… Schmidt noted while scientists have been dismissed by some as unrealistic, the call for a 50 percent emissions cut by business leaders "helps give credence to the idea that it's achievable."

Policy analysts, who weren't part of either petition, split on how meaningful the two petitions are.

What's happening is people are agreeing "that the cost of inaction is on the high side and the cost of action is affordable," said Joseph Romm, a policy analyst at the liberal think tank Center for American Progress, energy business consultant and trained physicist.

But Jerry Taylor, a senior fellow at the libertarian Cato Institute said "scientists are in no position to intelligently guide public policy on climate change." Scientists can lay out scenarios, but it is up to economists to weigh the costs and benefits, and many of them say the costs of cutting emissions are higher than the benefits, he said.

Granger Morgan, a professor of engineering and public policy at Carnegie Mellon University, said he sees "a growing realization among a wide variety of players that we've got to stop talking about this and start some action." But, he added, "I'm not going to hold my breath that we're going to get anything." On the Net: The declaration: http://www.climate.unsw.edu.au/bali/ http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/07336/838187-109.stm#

<><><><><><><><><><>

FORUM – It's time to face peak oil: Pittsburgh's Health Care Industry must face the fact that the end game game has come for its main source of energy, argues DAN BEDNARZ – December 2, 2007 [danbpgh@verizon.com]

Health care is Pittsburgh's economic anchor, employing thousands in hospitals, research units, clinics, and related facilities. As goes the medical industry, so goes Pittsburgh.

Medical executives center their attention on "cost, quality, and coverage" while considering rising energy prices, especially oil, a minor concern. This is a colossal misjudgment of medicine's dependence on fossil fuels and the fact that the "hydrocarbon era" is entering its final stages… Directly, petrochemicals are used to manufacture analgesics, antihistamines, antibiotics, antibacterials, rectal suppositories, cough syrups, lubricants, creams, ointments, salves, and many gels. Processed plastics made with oil are used in heart valves and other medical equipment. Petrochemicals are used in radiological dyes and films, intravenous tubing, syringes, and oxygen masks. In all but rare instances, fossil fuels heat and cool buildings and supply electricity.

Ambulances and helicopter "life flights" depend on gasoline, as do personnel who travel to and from medical workplaces in motor vehicles. Supplies and equipment are shipped in petroleum-powered carriers. In addition, there are the subtle consequences of fossil fuel reliance. A recently retired doctor informs me, "In orthopedics we used to set fractures mostly by feel and knowing the mechanics of how the fractures were created. I doubt that many of the present orthopedists could do a good job if you took away their [energy-powered] fluoroscope or X-ray."

Recently, oil tycoon T. Boone Pickens was asked when we will hit peak oil. "We have already peaked," he said, adding, "Everyone is going to have to come to grips with this in the next two or three years." Simply put, oil is the linchpin resource of modern economies, reaching far beyond gasoline prices… When production begins to decline, expect the following chain of economic consequences: price increases affecting a variety of products and goods, especially food and medical costs; reduced consumption, with lower income people facing "heat or eat" decisions; the economy slows or goes into recession, which leads to unemployment and less tax revenues for government…The health of the nation will be at risk as demand for health care from people unable to pay increases. The potential for a vicious circle ensues.

Medicine must overcome its conservatism, bureaucracy, and ethos of uniqueness to recognize and then respond to the challenge of peak oil. To illustrate this, a brilliant medical executive told me, "If things get tough, we can requisition oil and other resources because we're in the business of saving lives. Right along with the military, police, and fire we've got priority."… This is unrealistic. The current system of health care, which commands 16 percent of GDP and 70 percent of the public finds unsatisfactory, will not continue as is in the midst of economic distress. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency estimates that hospitals use twice as much energy per square foot as office buildings. Hospitals are Cathedrals of Consumption. Who is going to pay for -- and morally justify -- them as presently operated in an energy-constrained world? Something will have to give. I wish I had been quick-witted enough to tell this executive that the military, police, and fire are public goods run by government… Some medical institutions are nibbling at the margins of the energy issue with "environmentally sustainable" market-based solutions. The market will resolve oil scarcity, of that there is no doubt. It is the manner in which this will occur that is at issue.

With rare exceptions, health-care professionals consider only two of the market's three solutions. For oil, these are one, discovery, and two, developing alternatives. The third solution, the one society faces at this late date, is demand destruction -- price rises pushing buyers out of the market…Health-care leaders are surprised when I inform them that in testimony to the Senate in 2006 Alan Greenspan said we should not explore for more oil, a view consistent with peak oil. When I go on to note he suggested developing substitutes, they smile in contented relief. Mr. Greenspan, rarely a bearer of bad news, was silent on the possibility of demand destruction… Nonetheless his advice to forgo exploration in lieu of substitutes is sound economics. Unfortunately, by "doing the math" we find that present substitutes are of little avail. Tar sands, ethanol, and biofuels, among others, are not providing adequate liquid fuels for economic growth. In addition, each is fraught with environmental, economic, and health concerns.

The stark truth is that medicine -- along with government and society -- has no Plan B for peak oil. It looks as though socioeconomic and related hardships -- caused by demand destruction -- will force a transition to, one hopes, environmentally sustainable energy sources… Despite this gloom, there are options open to Pittsburgh's health-care leaders. For example, medical administrators admit to substantial "fat" in the system. Massive conservation and efficiency could lower consumption, especially in hospitals. This is an orderly option that can save jobs -- and lives… Further, medical leaders should highlight the connection between fossil fuels and climate change, and also speak authoritatively about the health consequences of various alternative fuels. They could point out that tar sands, biofuels, and ethanol are dead ends and also use their enormous lobbying powers to pressure government to get serious about alternatives and public transportation. A health care perspective on conservation and sustainable energy is, paradoxically, ripe for job growth… Currently, Pittsburgh health-care executives have extensive infrastructure, human capital, and fiscal resources at their disposal. They face a choice: draw down these advantages to prop up a status quo that cannot hold or innovate to deal with peak oil.

Dan Bednarz is a health-care consultant building a national collaboration on energy, climate and the future of health)

Electric cars could act as batteries for the energy grid, By Tom Simonite, December 4, 2007 – NewScientist.com news service [http://technology.newscientist.com/article/dn13000-electric-cars-could-act-as-batteries-for-the-energy-grid-.html]

This electric car uses its battery to supply or store grid electricity when in the garage and smooth out peaks in demand -- just 100 of the vehicles could provide 1 megawatt of storage… Electric and hybrid cars could act as energy stores for the power grid while not being driven, say US researchers… Scientists from the University of Delaware are using a new prototype made by US company AC Propulsion to store or supply grid electricity when required… On its own, one such battery might make little difference to the energy supply system, but, if hundreds or thousands more car owners adopted the system, it could significantly improve the efficiency of power distribution, the scientists say.

The average US car is only driven for one hour out of every 24, says Willet Kempton, who led the research… Combustion-powered cars are useless while off the road, but all-electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles could act as backups to the grid while idle, using a system developed by Kempton and colleagues called V2G (vehicle-to-grid).

"Storage is golden for power companies because it is hard to do," Kempton told New Scientist, which notes that the cost of storing excess electricity means that there is only capacity for around 1% of yield in the US and UK… As energy companies try to match demand with supply, extra storage facilities can help ensure capacity is not wasted. Storage is particularly important for renewable energy because power supplied by the sun, the oceans, or the wind is often irregular…Energy is usually stored by pumping water uphill and using its downhill flow to drive turbines later on…The V2G system developed by Kempton and colleagues could be a great help in the early morning, he says. Between 4:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. demand spikes as people, factories, and businesses start drawing power from the grid. Normally, power plants have to up their output to cope… When plugged in at Kempton's house, an onboard computer uses "broadband-over-power lines," a system for sending computer data down pre-existing power cables to make a secure connection with a computer owned by grid operator PJM.

Megawatt back-up: PJM's computer asks the car to charge up and store excess power when demand is low; for example, at night. Then, when demand suddenly spikes, the car can supply extra electricity to help smooth supply, providing it is still connected to the grid… "One car cannot make the overall needle move," says Kempton, but 100 vehicles available for a third of the time could provide a megawatt of storage power. To ensure no one is stranded as a result of taking part, users would need to specify how much charge they would need at any particular time… The researchers estimate each car can provide $4,000 (2,000) worth of storage to an energy company per year. It would cost roughly $600 (300) to install the high-power connection system required. To encourage drivers to help out, power companies would need to pass on some of their savings, says Kempton.

Over the next 18 months the researchers plan to build up four more cars and to fine-tune the software that controls the recharging… Cars and Motoring -- Learn more about the latest technologies in our comprehensive special report… Energy and Fuels -- Learn more about the looming energy crisis in our comprehensive special report.

<><><><><><><><><><><>

The Shortage Myth -- The Lies at the End of the American Dream, by Paul Craig Roberts – Nov. 4, 2007 December 4, 2007

Last June a revealing marketing video from the law firm Cohen & Grigsby appeared on the Internet. The video demonstrated the law firm's techniques for getting around U.S. law governing work visas in order to enable corporate clients to replace their American employees with foreigners who work for less. The law firm's marketing manager, Lawrence Lebowitz, is upfront with interested clients: "our goal is clearly not to find a qualified and interested US worker." … If an American somehow survives the weeding out process, "have the manager of that specific position step in and go through the whole process to find a legal basis to disqualify them for this position -- in most cases there doesn't seem to be a problem… No problem for the employer, he

means -- only for the expensively educated American university graduate who is displaced by a foreigner imported on a work visa justified by a nonexistent shortage of trained and qualified Americans.

University of California computer science professor Norm Matloff, who watches this issue closely, said that Cohen & Grigsby's practices are the standard ones used by hordes of attorneys, who are cleaning up by putting Americans out of work… The Cohen & Grigsby video was a short-term sensation, as it undermined the business propaganda that no American employee was being displaced by foreigners on H-1b or L-1 work visas. Soon, however, business organizations and their shills were back in gear lying to Congress and the public about the amazing shortage of qualified Americans for literally every technical and professional occupation, especially IT and software engineering… Everywhere we hear the same droning lie from business interests that there are not enough American engineers and scientists. For mysterious reasons, Americans prefer to be waitresses and bartenders, hospital orderlies, and retail clerks.

As one of the few who writes about this short-sighted policy of American managers endeavoring to maximize their "performance bonuses," I receive much feedback from affected Americans. Many responses come from recent university graduates, such as the one who "graduated nearly at the top of my class in 2002" with degrees in both electrical and computer engineering and who "hasn't been able to find a job."… A college roommate of a family member graduated from a good engineering school last year with a degree in software engineering. He had one job interview. Jobless, he is back at home living with his parents and burdened with student loans that bought an education that offshoring and work visas have made useless to Americans.

The hundreds of individual cases that have been brought to my attention are dismissed as "anecdotal" by my fellow economists. So little do they know…! I also receive numerous responses from American engineers and IT workers who have managed to hold on to jobs or to find new ones after long intervals when they have been displaced by foreign hires. Their descriptions of their work environments are fascinating… For example, Dayton, Ohio, was once home to numerous American engineers. Today, writes one surviving American, "I feel like an alien in my own country -- as if Dayton had been colonized by India. NCR and other local employers have either offshored most of their IT work or rely heavily on Indian guest workers. The IT department of National City Bank across the street from LexisNexis is entirely Indian. The nearby apartment complexes house large numbers of Indian guest workers filling the engineering needs of many area businesses."… I have learned that Reed Elsevier, which owns LexisNexis, has hired a new Indian vice president for offshoring and that now the jobs of the Indian guest workers may be on the verge of being offshored to another country. The relentless drive for cheap labor now threatens the foreign guest workers who displaced America's own engineers.

One software engineer wrote to me protesting the ignorance of Thomas Friedman for creating a false picture of American engineers being outdated and for "denouncing American engineers and other workers as 'xenophobes' for opposing their displacement by foreign guest workers." The engineer also took exception to the "willful ignorance or cynicism of Bruce Bartlett and George Will" who he described as "bootlicks for pro-outsourcing lobbies."

On November 6, 2006, Michael S. Teitelbaum, vice president of the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, explained to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Technology the difference between the conventional or false portrait that there is a shortage of US scientists and engineers and the reality on the ground, which is that offshoring, foreign guest workers, and educational subsidies have produced a surplus of US engineers and scientists that leaves many facing unstable and failed careers.

As two examples of the false portrait, Teitelbaum cited the 2005 report, *Tapping America's Potential*, led by the Business Roundtable and signed onto by 14 other business associations, and the 2006 National Academies report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*," which was the basis for substantial parts of what eventually evolved into the American COMPETES Act."

Teitelbaum posed the question to the US Representatives: "Why do you continue to hear energetic re-assertions of the Conventional Portrait of 'shortages,' shortfalls, failures of K-12 science and math teaching, declining interest among US students, and the necessity of importing more foreign scientists and

engineers?"… Teitelbaum's answer: "In my judgment, what you are hearing is simply the expressions of interests by interest groups and their lobbyists. This phenomenon is, of course, very familiar to everyone on the Hill. Interest groups that are well organized and funded have the capacity to make their claims heard by you, either directly or via echoes in the mass press. Meanwhile, those who are not well-organized and funded can express their views, but only as individuals."

Among the interest groups that benefit from the false portrait are universities, which gain graduate student enrollments and inexpensive postdocs to conduct funded lab research. Employers gain larger profits from lower paid scientists and engineers, and immigration lawyers gain fees by leading employers around the work visa rules.

Using the biomedical research sector as an example, Teitelbaum explained to the congressmen how research funding creates an oversupply of scientists that requires ever larger funding to keep employed. Teitelbaum made it clear that it is nonsensical to simultaneously increase the supply of American scientists while forestalling their employment with a shortage myth that is used to import foreigners on work visas… Teitelbaum recommends that American students considering majors in science and engineering first investigate the career prospects of recent graduates.

Integrity is so lacking in America that the shortage myth serves the interests of universities, funding agencies, employers, and immigration attorneys at the expense of American students who naively pursue professions in which their prospects are dim. Initially it was blue-collar factory workers who were abandoned by US corporations and politicians. Now it is white-collar employees and Americans trained in science and technology. Princeton University economist Alan Blinder estimates that there are 30 to 40 million American high end service jobs that ultimately face offshoring… As I predict, and as BLS payroll jobs data indicate, in 20 years the US will have a third world work force engaged in domestic non-tradable services.

Paul Craig Roberts was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan administration. He was Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal editorial page and Contributing Editor of National Review. He is coauthor of The Tyranny of Good Intentions . He can be reached at: PaulCraigRoberts@yahoo.com

<><><><><><><><><><>

Endangered Truth: Exposing the Administration's Lies on Science, by Clay Evans December 2, 2007 – *The Daily Camera* (Boulder, Colorado)

It's long been a right-wing canard that the federal Endangered Species Act is, if you'll pardon the term, a political animal. Wacko environmentalists, the theory goes, just want to steal land out from under honest, hard-working Americans, and they use the existence of, say, the piebald socialist toad (*Namus madeupicus*) to accomplish their nefarious purpose.

Well, everything is political -- just not always in the way you might expect.

On Tuesday, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reversed a handful of rulings that denied endangered species protection after an investigation found that a former Bush administration official, Julie McDonald, pressured scientists to change their conclusions for political reasons… McDonald, who served as the deputy assistant secretary overseeing the agency, resigned in May. Without naming McDonald, the investigation found that the decisions had been "inappropriately influenced … revising the seven identified decisions is supported by scientific evidence and the proper legal standards."… The reversal could affect protected status of several species, including the white-tailed prairie dog, Canada lynx and Preble's meadow jumping mouse, found in Boulder County… But there are three times as many cases in which "we have evidence of (political) interference," said Francesca Grifo of the Union of Concerned Scientists. Tuesday's ruling, while welcome, "does not begin to plumb the depths of what's wrong" at the Fish and Wildlife Service when it comes to protecting endangered species, Grifo said.

McDonald shamefully illustrates the baldly political Bush administration approach to science. Trained as a civil engineer, she had no expertise in biology or species protection, and when the science pointed to conclusions not to her bosses' liking, she simply put the screws to those working under her to "fix" the findings. She told them to lie, in other words.

The episode recalls any number of similar efforts by the administration to subordinate science to politics, as when federal scientists were prohibited from talking about the effects of climate change on declining polar bear numbers, and when former White House official Philip Cooney (previously an oil-industry lobbyist) single-handedly redacted and altered scientific conclusions in a key report on climate change… Whatever one thinks about the validity of the (sorry, overwhelming) conclusions of climate scientists or the efficacy of the Endangered Species Act, surely we can agree that untrained political hacks should not be the arbiters of "truth" in science… One of the most disturbing developments in the past seven years has been the growing currency of the notion that science is just another political philosophy, based on the opinions of scheming scientists (though what, exactly, they're scheming for is never made clear)…The McDonald decision is a welcome reversal of that trend -- which never would have happened if both Congress and the White House had remained in GOP hands.

<><><><><><><><><><>

The First interview of Technocracy's founder Given by Charles H. Wood, Associate Editor, The NEW YORK WORLD, February 20, 1921

(H. Scott): "There is no insurmountable problem ahead of the American people. We can have prosperity just as soon as we are willing to go after it. It isn't necessary to wait a single month for Europe. Forget the German indemnity. Never mind what the League of Nations does or doesn't do. As for Congress, let Congress go ahead and talk; it doesn't matter. All that we need in order to get prosperity is sufficient natural wealth, sufficient skill, sufficient industrial equipment, sufficient labor power, and intelligent direction. We have all of these things except the last, and there is no reason under the sun why we can't have that as soon as the technicians decide to get together."

Howard Scott is Chief engineer of the Technical Alliance, a new organization, with very modest headquarters at No. 23 West 35th Street. (New York City) It is not a business or commercial organization. It does not intend to direct any special enterprise. It is exactly what its name implies: an attempt to get the technical men of all branches of American industry together.

"What for? I asked Scott.

"To find out what the American people want," he answered**, "and get it for them."**

The answer was simple and inclusive but why the technical men? Are there no other interests to be consulted**?**

"The technicians, Mr. Scott explained, **are the only group who know how people get things done. They are not the only producers, but they are the only ones who know how production is accomplished. Bankers don't know. Politicians and diplomats don't know. If these fellows did know, they would have gotten the wheels started before this. They all want production − everybody does; but those who have been running things don't know how to run them, while those who do know how have not so far considered it their business."**

It took a long time to get even that much from Howard Scott. It is evident that newspapermen rank in his eyes somewhere along with financiers and diplomats. He is an engineer and wouldn't argue. He would answer a question if he had an answer, but if he didn't have it, he would express no views. There are no two "sides" to any questions in the minds of engineers like this. If they have the answer, there it is. If they haven't, the only thing to do is go and get it. The fact that the answer is still unknown doesn't permit the assumption that there is

more than one.

Although The Technical Alliance has just been formed, Mr. Scott has been working at the project for several years. Not trying to get the engineers together − that is not an engineer's method of forming an organization. He has been gathering data and making charts showing just how industry has been carried on today; and so far as he could, he has been calculating the percentage of waste.

"The whole problem may be stated," he said, **"as the problem of elimination of waste, but waste to an engineer has a different meaning than it does to the general public. People generally think of waste only in terms of potato peelings or of spending money for what they hanker for, instead of for what they think they ought to buy. If the elimination of that kind of waste could solve the problem, China should be the richest country on earth today; but the engineer recognizes exhaustion of any natural resource is a waste."**

"If we could eliminate idleness and duplication of effort," he said, **"we may have immediate prosperity − such prosperity as the world has never known. If we could find a way then to husband our natural resources, we may make that prosperity permanent."**

"Can the engineers and technical men do this?" I asked.

"If they can't," he answered, **"nobody can. Inasmuch, however, as that is only one thing they are trained to do, the problem doesn't seem difficult. The simple fact is that they have not tackled the problem up-to-date. They have been trying, with gratifying success, to eliminate idleness and**

duplication of effort within the various industries in which they have been employed, but so far they have not thought of American industry, which means, practically, that they haven't thought as engineers."

"The time has come, however, when the engineer must do exactly that. We are reaching a crisis, and the technicians are the only people who can find out what to do. They must survey the country, tabulate its resources, discover its possibilities in natural and human power, uncover the present wastes and leakages, and work out a tentative design of coordinated production and distribution."

"And suppose you draw up a seemingly workable plan," I asked. "What are you going to do with public opinion?"

"It is all a technical matter," he said. **"It makes not the slightest difference whether the public knows about it or not. The steam engine didn't need a press agent. The Einstein Theory doesn't require any special legislative enactment. If the only people who can bring order to our present industrial chaos find out exactly how to do the job, we needn't worry about the next step."**

"Won't you run against some political difficulties?" I asked.

"Yes," he said, **"in the same way the well-known tide ran against political difficulties in the person of His Majesty King Canute. Politics is our natural approach to matters that we don't understand. When we know exactly what we want, and exactly how to get it, we get it. If we don't know what we want, we vote for it with a superstitious hope that a change − any sort of change − will bring it out of its hiding place. Mr. Harding** (29th President of the U.S.) **was elected by an overwhelming majority because we wanted something badly, and we thought that 'normalcy' might be it. Had we been in a little more pain, we should have probably elected Debs,** (Eugene Debs, candidate for president) **hoping that a change in ownership would somehow work a miracle."**

"Isn't the question of ownership a vital one?" I asked.

"No," he answered. **"It makes no difference who owns the sun. What concerns us vitally is whether we use it properly or not. No lovers ever quarreled about who owns the moon. Neither does it make any difference who owns the earth if we can only discover how to use it. Ownership is a myth. If we once get to using our coal and iron and our industrial and transportation systems to their full capacity, nobody will be fool enough to care if they are owned or not."**

"The engineer especially is not concerned with ownership. Technicians, as such, cannot function in politics. Their training has placed them in a position where decisions are the results of intrinsic fact and not of personal opinion, whether autocratic or democratic. They cannot function in finance because their science is one of production and utilization, not one of title or credit. They cannot function in labor unions as presently organized because these unions are mere political groups in which the individual member functions not as an individual responsible for a certain detail of the industrial process, but as a voter expressing some − usually borrowed − opinion."

"The Technical Alliance is simply an attempt to organize the technical workers on their jobs instead of organizing them as an academic group outside. In one sense of the word, this may be called the first genuine labor organization in America, for every technician is engaged in strategically important labor and is concerned primarily with the organization, that is, the coordination of industry."

"Technical men must necessarily look on industry as industry. The central purpose of industry − and the only purpose which the engineer, as such, can pay attention to − is to serve humanity. Mr. Gantt, (Henry L. Gantt − engineer and social scientist**) in his very conservative estimates, proved that our present industrial machine is not giving more that 20 percent of the service it is capable of giving, primarily because the machine is controlled by business groups for business ends rather than industrialists for industrial ends. His figures were actually far too high, because with the elimination of the business motive would come the elimination of thousands of industries now engaged in making things which only business organizations need; and because with the machine once operating at its full capacity, there would be such an abundance produced for everybody that we would not need to protect private property as it is protected today."**

Mr. Scott is anything but an enthusiast, yet I have never heard an irresponsible soapboxer make more staggering statements. To multiply the nation's wealth by ten − without waiting for new inventions and without considering a political move − seemed to him a simple problem for the engineers when they organize as engineers.

For lack of anything better to say, I asked him a question which every advocate of a new order will recognize as an old acquaintance: "Won't you have to change human nature first?" Mr. Scott smiled dryly**.**

"Did you have to change human nature," he asked, **"in order to keep passengers from standing on car platforms?"**

"Go on," I said, "I'm listening."

"They put up signs first," he continued, **"prohibiting the dangerous practice, but the passengers still crowded the platform. Then they got ordinances passed, and the platform remained as crowded as before. Policemen, legislators, public service commissions all took a hand but to no effect; then the problem was put up to an engineer."**

"The engineers solved it easily. They built cars that didn't have platforms."

According to Mr. Scott, the same course will have to be followed in the matter of a still more familiar prohibition. THOU SHALL NOT STEAL. Church and state, he says, have united unanimously throughout all history behind this law, but it has never been enforced. Technical administration alone, he maintains, can enforce it. How? Let him answer in his own words.

"By coordinating the industrial process; by operating all industries as one agency for one definite purpose; producing and distributing the things that people want so that an abundance of everything shall be accessible to all."

"Private property," he said, **"is generally recognized as a burden even today, and few people would want to carry it if they could be rich without having to do so. For the first time in history, though, humanity has a machine at hand which is productive enough to make everybody rich, and it has the technical knowledge at its disposal to run such a machine."**

"But do you expect the engineers to agree upon a program?" I asked. "They have prejudices and differences, don't they, just like the rest of us?"

"They disagree as politicians," he said, **"but not as engineers. We are not trying to organize them, however, into a society to debate something, but into an alliance which will discover the facts. Engineers do not disagree on facts. They all know what direction a stone will drop. They all know that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. If there is anything else they want to know as engineers, they find out; and when they find out, there isn't the slightest disagreement. Engineers are not radical or conservative. As engineers, they are no more radical than a yardstick and no more conservative than so many degrees Fahrenheit."**

<><><><><><><><><>

Report Says that the Rich are Getting Richer Faster, Much Faster, by David Cay Johnson, from a new Congressional Budget Office report

The increase in incomes of the top 2003 to 2005 exceeded the total income of the poorest 20 percent of Americans, data in a new report by the Congressional Budget Office shows… The poorest fifth of households had total income of $383.4 billion in 2005, while just the increase in income for the top 1 percent came to $524.8 billion, a figure 37 percent higher.

The total income of the top 1.1 million households was $1.8 trillion, or 18.1 percent of the total income of all Americans, up from 14.3 percent of all income in 2003. The total 2005 income of the three million individual Americans at the top was roughly equal to that of the bottom 166 million Americans, analysis of the report showed.

The report is the latest to document the growing concentration of income at the top, a trend that President Bush said last January had been underway for more than 25 years… Earlier reports, based on tax returns, showed that in 2005 the top 10 percent, top 1 percent, and fractions of the top 1 percent enjoyed their greatest share of income since 1928 and 1929… Much of the increase at the top reflected the rebound of the stock market after its sharp drop in 2000, economists from across the political spectrum said. About half of the income going to the top 1 percent comes from investments and business… In addition, Congress in 2003 cut taxes on long-term capital gains and most dividends, which advocates said would encourage people to turn untaxed wealth into taxable income. Some economists have said that the increase in incomes at the top is illusory and is in good part simply converting untaxed assets into taxed income to take advantage of reduced tax rates.

Asked how much of the increase at the top was from the tax cuts rather than market gains, Peter R. Orszag, the budget office director, said, “I can’t give you an answer to that because we just don’t know.” Jared Bernstein, an economist at the Economic Policy Institute in Washington who characterizes the Bush administration’s policies as YOYO economics, based on **Y**ou (Are) **O**n **Y**our **O**wn, said the differences in incomer growth explained why so many Americans have told pollsters that they are feeling squeezed.

At every income level Americans had more income, after adjusting for inflation in 2005 than in 2003, but the increases ranged from almost imperceptible for the poor to modest for the middle class and largest for those at the top… On average, incomes for the top 1 percent of households rose by $465,700 each, or 42.6 percent after adjusting for inflation. The incomes of the poorest fifth rose by $200, or 1.2 percent, and the middle fifth increased by $2,400, or 4.3 percent.

<><><><><><><><><>

Compiled by Paul Cordsmeyer
Continental Headquarters
Technocracy Inc. [technocracyinc.org]
Ferndale, WA 98248-9764

Edited by Margaret Mathers
Member-at-Large
Technocracy Inc.
Cleveland, OH