

COUNTING THE FUTURE RATHER THAN DISCOUNTING IT:

An observation on a small piece of the ocean in which we swim
by

Dr. Charles Overby
Internationalist, Humanist, Engineering-Ecologist, Poet, Fun-Pilot, and --
Emeritus Professor and Registered Professional Engineer
Ohio University College of Engineering, Athens Ohio 45701
overby@ohio.edu, www.article9society.org

for the

International Philosophers For Peace Conference

On

Capitalism With A Human Face

Radford University, Virginia
May 25-28, 2004

Colleagues and friends, this capitalist ocean, in which almost all of Planet Earth (including China) now swims – is a sea of many dimensions. I look forward to learning more from you about this social invention (often without a human face) called “capitalism,” so that we might somehow connect in solidarity to give it a “facelift for humanity” and for our dear Planet Mother Earth herself. In part I join you here -- seeking new oil for my “lamp of hope” whose flickering flame but feebly lights the darkness of my angst, anguish, and anger.

I am one who sees the present hubristic, arrogant, militarist unilateralist imperialist behavior of my nation to be the greatest destabilizing force on Planet Earth. Please see my letter-to-the-editor, “A Recipe For An Armageddon Cocktail” at the end of this paper. In my 2001 St. Bonaventure paper¹ I coined a new word to describe this phenomenon – “testisocracy” or “testocracy.” I am also naïve enough to be profoundly attracted to the great words in our Declaration Of Independence – “all ‘men?’ are created equal.” I of course fault our founding fathers for their “white-male-edness” exclusion of all who were not “white-property-owning-males.” How sad that women had to fight our “white-male-dominated” government for a century and a half to be able to be considered equal enough to do a simple democratic thing like “vote.” How sad that black people for three centuries were “property” and that Native Americans did not count. My values suggest that we as a nation must begin, in policy and action, to demonstrate that these words “all persons are created equal” abundantly implies that all humans on Planet Earth be treated with dignity and respect rather than as “collateral damage” or as “third class-ed.” I also expand my vision to include the entire animal kingdom, not just the human animal – and most importantly I include “Mother Earth” herself as deserving of our profound respect rather than rape. (See the end of this paper for a sample of some experiential existential poetry on ‘consumption’ and ‘pollution’ -- “A Utopian Reyarp” and “Rape of Mother.”)

It is with these urges that I join with you to seek a facelift for that dominant economic philosophy, capitalism -- a facelift that gives it a smile of valuing and counting our future more often than a frown as it debases and discounts it. International capitalism needs a strong leash.

My paper, toward the end, will briefly deal with some business and governmental practices for choosing between alternative courses of action. It will demonstrate how these methods do in fact “discount the future” relative to resource consumption, environmental, and health and safety matters etc. -- and fail to address the spatial and temporal dimensions of justice, justice between generations etc. I will conclude with some thoughts about revisions to give this system a more human face – and a plea for your suggestions.

My contribution to this effort for humanizing the face of capitalism is but a tiny piece of this humongous pie -- one that has grown out of my fortuitous three-quarter century path. So that you will better understand, please allow me a brief digression with some highlights on that ‘path.’

A Brief Overby Bio

I was born in 1926 in Cascade Montana. With youthful innocence I fell in love with flying machines, and found myself in US Air Corps B-29 tail-gunnery training, destined for Japanese sky, when mushroom clouds ended World War II in a nuclear holocaust.

After WW-II, I earned a bachelor’s degree in mechanical engineering with high distinction (summa cum laude) from the University of Minnesota and an ROTC commission as a second lieutenant in the US Air Force. Early in the Korean War I was involuntarily recalled to active duty, volunteered for pilot training, and spent the last six months of that war as a B-29 copilot flying bombing missions from Okinawa’s Kadena Air Base to targets in North Korea. (See -- some experiential existential peace and war poetry, “Unfetteredness” and “Night Visions” at the end of this paper.)

After the Korean War and some years in industry, by this time recognizing how grossly ignorant I was about most everything in life other than engineering – I returned to graduate school at the University of Wisconsin, Madison where I earned a master’s degree in engineering, and an interdisciplinary Ph.D. This process of “collecting myself after Korea” equipped me for significantly more synergistic explorations of issues. I have been a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; Ohio State University, Columbus; and Ohio University, Athens where I am presently an emeritus professor. I have been a visiting professor at Chubu University, Kasugai (Nagoya) Japan (three months); The University of Washington, Seattle (three months) (See WISE below); Shanghai Institute of Mechanical Engineering, Shanghai China (six months) and; Montana State University, Bozeman (four months).

In the late 1970s on a sabbatical leave year with the US Congress, Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), I worked on resource conservation and environmental issues. In 1980 I was the first faculty-member-in-residence for a new and still continuing program on “Educating Engineers In Public Policy” called the “Washington Internships for Students of Engineering” (WISE). This program took place in Washington DC with fifteen top engineering students competitively selected from major universities across the USA. Students earned academic credit from the University of Washington, Seattle.

In 1982 I ran unsuccessfully for the US Congress as a peace candidate in the Ohio 10th District Democratic Party primary -- in opposition to the Reagan administration’s acceleration of the arms race. My department chairman and the engineering college dean significantly financially punished me for this patriotic exercise of my citizenship.

After the 1991 Persian Gulf “Oil Resource” War ended -- with the encouragement of several persons in the Athens Ohio Unitarian Fellowship, I founded the Article 9 Society (A9S).

A9S is an organization dedicated to the preservation of the Japanese Constitution's war-renouncing Article 9, and to the ultimate adoption of Article 9's principles by all nations on Planet Earth. These ideas and concerns are the subject of the book -- Overby, C., Kunihiro, M., & Momoi, K, *A Call For Peace: The Implications of Japan's War-Renouncing Constitution*,ⁱⁱ Kodansha International, Tokyo, 1997, Kodansha America, New York, May, 1998. (New paperback edition 2001) Distributed in America by Oxford University Press. This book is currently out of print but we are working on a revised and updated edition, which hopefully will be published in 2005. I have made many international lecture trips to Japan, covering all the five major islands of Japanⁱⁱⁱ, and other parts of the world, in support of Article 9's wisdom.

I also write on making peace with the environment as one of the multitude of activities in which nations might participate so as to prevent wars, and as non-violent means for resolving our inevitable human conflicts. My most recent publication in this domain is "Green Technology by Design: A New Paradigm for Engineering Education for Sustainable Development", a chapter in - Freeman, Puskas, & Olbina, *Cleaner Technologies and Cleaner Products for Sustainable Development*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

I consider myself a creative critic of my country, the USA, and its path as a world leader. Let me say at the outset, that I am deeply grateful for the many opportunities that have been mine as a US citizen, to fulfill some of my promise -- and yet I, along with millions of my fellow citizens, seek to improve this system that nurtured us. However, I am inclined to agree with Michael Sherry's in his 1995 book, *In The Shadow of War*,^{iv} when he characterizes the US, as a culture living in a state of "militarization" which he defines as -- "... the contradictory and tense social process in which civil society organizes itself for the production of violence."

I am a product of the culture that Sherry describes. I earned a bachelor's degree with financial help from the World War II GI-Bill, a master's degree with help from the Korean War GI Bill, and more financial help with part of my PhD expense, as a National Science Foundation Faculty Fellow, because the USSR launched Sputnik in 1957. Sputnik energized the US government into spending wildly on science and technology education at all levels for fear of being "out done" by the Russians. I am most grateful for all this governmental educational assistance. I do wonder, however, why it is so difficult for economically rich America to support any student with the brains to benefit from education -- without this support having to be so largely connected in some ways with military violence of one sort or another. I thus understand Sherry's commentary. This problem still exists in 2003. Many non-wealthy USA youth join the military or the national-guard in order for a chance to go to college. Soldier Jessica Lynch, of 2003 Gulf Oil Resource War fame, currently demonstrates this dismal picture. As a poor person from a poor West Virginia family, she "joined-up" so she could go to college.

My views arise out of 78 years of living, beginning in Montana as one of six children in the family of economically poor and formally uneducated Norwegian immigrant parents. My American citizenship included five years of active duty military service in World War II and Korea (B-29 combat pilot in Korea) -- plus four more years of reserve time. My perspective broadened and grew from having spent eight years at the great State University of Wisconsin in Madison collecting myself after Korea -- where I earned an engineering masters degree, and an interdisciplinary Ph.D. I am so profoundly grateful to have had these eight years at Wisconsin. This, my "less-traveled-path," enabled me to grow in not just engineering, but also from swimming in some economics, political science, psychology, philosophy, international relations, industrial relations, and law (in the Wisconsin Law School) -- and, the wholesomely rich intellectual and international culture of the University of Wisconsin.

Back from the Bio digression

In some of this paper I draw from a quarter century old paper of mine titled, “Product Design For a Sustainable Future: A Matter Of Ethics?”^v -- and another nine year old paper titled, “Green Technology by Design: A New Paradigm for Engineering Education for Sustainable Development,”^{vi}

In a long time of thinking about these matters I have explored some of the fundamental political, economic and ethical philosophical foundation stones of our republican and capitalist culture. Let me say a little about just three men who have made an impact -- John Locke, Adam Smith, and Jeremy Bentham. Bentham will be my “jumping-off-place” for the title of my paper, “Counting The Future Rather Than Discounting It.”

These 17th and 18th century men’s ideas and philosophies, set in a virgin North American continent, abundant with untapped natural resources, have combined with the emergence of science, engineering, and technology to produce our tremendously high material standard of living. Paradoxically this same science and engineering has helped to make us aware of some of the negative consequences (external diseconomies) of our high material standard of living. The late 20th and early 21st centuries are quite different from that of our forefathers. In the words of Thomas Wolfe, “we can’t go home again.”

John Locke

The views of John Locke (1632-1704), an English political philosopher, are deeply imbedded in our American political-economic ideology. Reacting to the tyranny of kings and autocratic rulers, Locke conceived of a social contract between the people of a society in which a limited government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. In Locke’s theory, men are by nature free, independent, and equal in the enjoyment of inalienable rights such as life, liberty, and property.

Locke gives much attention to property and its protection as being one of the important functions of government. Writing on “property” in his *Second Treatise of Government*, (and I think from a Biblical view of man’s role in nature as one of God-given dominion over all nature)¹ he says –

Though the earth and all inferior creatures be common to all men, yet every man, has a property in his own person: this nobody has any right to but himself. The labor of his body and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the state that nature has provided and left it in, he has mixed his labor with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature has placed it in; it has by this labor something annexed to it that excludes the common right of other men. For this labor being the unquestionable property of the laborer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to, at least where there is enough and as good left in common for others.^{vii} (Underlining is mine, Overby)

Locke’s caveat, “... *at least where there is enough and as good left in common for others*” is relevant to the content of this paper. As we know from two Gulf Oil Resource Wars

¹ Locke was also heavily influenced by the emerging science of his time such as the work of Newton. He was a close friend of the chemist, Boyle whom he assisted in experiments.

(1991 & 2003) there may not be enough and as good resources left in common for others, therefore one response that we might make, from a public policy and engineering and science perspective, is that we as a culture might find ways to create a healthy life style that minimizes the consumption of Earth's resources, that does not pollute our Mother's essence and does not take us back to the caves. We must add two new "design criteria" at the very beginning of the engineering design process – in addition to all the other "design requirements" by which we create our "goods." Our systems must be created so as to [1] minimize the consumption of Earth's resources and [2] not pollute the ecosphere. This is not the way things are today. I have devoted a significant portion of the last 35 years of my professional engineering life, including "engineering and public policy" – to these ends, thus far with but minimal results. In my view this is in part because we, Mother-Earth's people, have allowed unleashed capitalism to dominate the globe in ways that discount our future. The USA leads the way in this discounting game. (Dean's comments at meeting in Toronto 1991.)

Should we be unsuccessful in addressing Locke's caveat we might find ourselves forced into a societal mold quite different from that of individualism and liberty outlined by Locke. A contemporary of Locke's, Thomas Hobbes, (1588-1679), outlined such a society in his book, *Leviathan*, published in 1651^{viii} Indeed, Locke's *Second Treatise* can be seen as an attempt by Locke to present a happier societal model opposed to the totalitarian one presented by Hobbes, 39 years earlier.

Thomas Hobbes

Hobbes, also influenced by emerging science and technology of his period, took a different view of the nature of man than did Locke. Hobbes argued that man is by nature a selfishly individualistic animal at constant war with all other men. Men are machines moved by two basic forces – the desire for power, and the fear of death at the hands of others. In this "state of nature," men in their self-seeking, live out lives that are nasty and brutish. Fear is what causes men to create a state through a different kind of social contact, whereby they surrender their natural rights and submit to an absolute authority. This dictator in return provides stability and guarantees a semblance of peace between greedy men – a "testocracy?"

Which model drives Bush and his chosen neocon colleagues – the Locheian or the Hobbesian model?

Adam Smith

If we consider John Locke as one of the significant political philosophers of our American republic, perhaps its economic philosopher more than any other, was Adam Smith (1723-1790) – the famed laissez-faire Scottish economist whose book *The Wealth of Nations*, was published in 1776^{ix}.

Smith also wrote at the dawn of emerging science, engineering, and technology – and as a reaction to old feudal institutions and vested interests that resisted adaptations and changes, as is the case with human institutions when new reality threatens the old. Smith assumed individual self interest to be one of the prime psychological drives in man – and as a matter of faith, that a natural order existed in the universe, such that were all men free to pursue their own self interest in an unhindered fashion – the sum total of all these individual strivings would produce social good – the "invisible hand" idea. From these premises he concluded that this economic process was best when governmental interaction was kept to an absolute minimum – laissez-faire.

John Locke's and Adam Smith's 17th and 18th century milieu was one of small world populations; enterprises were small and not deeply interconnected. The growing science, engineering, and technology of their time influenced both men. They undoubtedly had visions of an entire virgin American continent just lying there waiting to be tapped. In Locke's view, these dormant and bountiful resources of the new world could be mixed with labor and science and technology of the day to become someone's property. To be sure, the American continent was thinly populated by "savages" who were not exercising proper dominion over nature as God had ordained. In any case there appeared to be plenty and as good left in common for others. Ecological consequences of technological applications could be ignored because scale and magnitude of implementation was small and nature's resiliency was not seriously disturbed. Is it slightly different today?

Jeremy Bentham

In harmony with the ideas of Locke and Smith, a new ethical theory was born by another English philosopher, jurist, and political theorist, Jeremy Bentham, (1748-1832). Bentham, in part arising out of the need to deal with legislative issues in the British Parliament, developed the normative ethical theory called "Utilitarianism,"^x which was much fleshed out by John Stuart Mill. In utilitarianism Bentham saw the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" as the fundamental and self-evident principle of morality. He associated happiness with pleasure and unhappiness with pain – and developed a moral arithmetic that has come to be called the "calculus of pleasure and pain."

Bentham assumed that in theory, one could assign numerical values to the amounts of pleasure and pain to be caused by different "acts" or "actions." These values could then be summed over all persons affected and the morally correct act would be the one that maximized the difference between pleasure and pain.

This utilitarianism "calculus of pleasure and pain" sounds amazingly like what we attempt to do today in justifying legislation, or a particular governmental regulatory action. We convert all "pleasures and pains" to dollars and call it a "Benefit/Cost": analysis. So long as the benefit/cost ratio for a particular act or action is greater than one, the act or action is justified. This utilitarianism "calculus of pleasure and pain" sounds like that which we teach our engineering students in courses on "engineering economy." Indeed the root foundation of benefit/cost and engineering economy calculus lies in utilitarian ethical theory founded by Bentham over 200 years ago – and practiced everywhere (including China, thanks to some infinitesimal help from Dr. Overby in 1981 & 1986).

The quantification of morality with a "calculus of pleasure and pain" readily lends itself to a society in which economic values reign supreme. Thus we find as our roots a political theory of individual liberty (Locke), a laissez-faire economic theory (Adam Smith) and a utilitarian ethical theory (Jeremy Bentham) compatibly merged as our dominant value system.

Moral philosophers have raised many questions as to the adequacy of utilitarianism as an ethical theory. Some are concerned at the clarity of the notion of "utility." Others wonder at the reality of quantifying all pleasures (happiness) and pains (unhappiness) in terms of one commensurable unit – money. Issues of justice and utilitarianism appear. Some ask whether it might not be possible in the summing of pleasures and pains, that the happiness of some groups gets more weight than that of other groups. In this sense it has been suggested that utilitarianism, could in theory, be compatible with unjust institutions such as slavery.

The question of how well utilitarianism deals with temporal issues of justice between generations, is of considerable concern – especially with respect to resource, environmental, and health issues – issues that have a considerable time dimension. In benefit/cost and engineering economy calculations we discount the future by using compound interest methods in which we choose a “discount rate” (interest rate) The higher the interest rate chosen, the less will be the present worth of some future benefit (pleasure) or cost (pain). For example, a deposit of virgin ore (a pleasure) (or an environmental or health cost (pain) with a dollar value of \$1 million, 30 years in the future, has a discounted present worth of \$57,300 if we choose a discount rate of 10 %. If we use an interest rate of 25%, its present value is only \$1,200. For an interest rate of 35%, the present value is \$123. High interest rates are very often used because of the uncertainties and risks associated with investment opportunities.

The compound interest equations for the above calculations are as follows:

$$\text{Present Worth (PW)} = \text{Future Worth (FW)} [1/(i + 1)^n]$$

where: $[1/(i + 1)^n]$ = PWF (Present Worth Factor)

where: i = interest rate in decimals; and n = years

Let us phrase the issue in a different way. An engineer or manager working in a private company learns that there is a health and safety issue in one department, which if not addressed now with an investment to correct the problem (new ventilating system etc.) – will result in one million dollars of health and employee death costs in 30 years. This engineer asks her or himself, how much should the company spend today to eliminate this potential one million-dollar expense 30 years in the future. If he is instructed to use a low interest rate (discount rate) of 10% -- the company can afford to spend \$57,300 to correct the problem. If the engineer is told to use a 25% discount rate, he will be allowed to spend only \$1,200. If the interest rate for this kind of decision-making is 35% the engineer will be authorized to spend only \$123.

Some suggest that negative interest rates be used for environmental and health decisions. If I use a negative interest rate for the above example, we get a very different PW. To avoid a million dollar health expense 30 years in the future, we will spend now --

Discount (Interest) rate	Amount of expenditure to be authorized now
- 5%	\$4.7 million
- 10%	\$23.9 million
- 25%	\$5,600 million

Unfortunately, I am not quite sure how we might implement such a “negative interest rate” idea.

John Rawls

A more recent theory of justice developed by John Rawls questions the justice dimension of utilitarian ethical calculus. Gorovitz^{xi} suggests that the basic objective of Rawls’ *Theory Of Justice*^{xii} “... is to provide a coherent theoretical foundation for a conception of justice that can be offered in opposition to the utilitarian point of view that has been dominant since Jeremy Bentham.”

Comment on Rawls’ “initial position,” “the veil of ignorance,” and the problem of “justice between generations (Rawls page 284 ff), and the morality of utilitarian approaches for discounting the future.

G-7 commentary. *A Call For Peace*, pg 27 ff.

My China experience 1981 & 1986

Some B/C limitations – externalities not included, full costs ignored, oil resource wars, my *Call for Peace* book pg. 65, Half-Life of Earth calculation pg. 175, environmental racism, Chauncy garbage dump case, Coolville incinerator case, Ford Pinto example, Dean’s comments at engineering meeting in Toronto 1991, Age-Adjusted “Life Years Saved,” telephone answering machine number punching – your time counts for nothing, Etc. Etc. Etc.

May I have your suggestions for how we can give a “face-lift” to this dimension of our “Sea-Of-Capitalism?”

Peace !!!!

Some Experiential Existential Poetry

<p>A UTOPIAN REYARP*</p> <p>Our father which art in things, / Hallowed be thy lucre. / Thy products come/ As it is in thy consumptiondum. / Gorge us this day with our daily bread, / big mac’s, / and artichoke delicacies --/ while other bellies bloat/ as starvation raves. / Dry our tears --/ rivers of pollution. / Forgive us our lagging g n p. / As we forgive those who would/ change its distribution. / Advertise us into temptation/ so that our bellies swell/ armpits smell sweet/ constipation melts gently --/ and sominex nightly gives us/ peace. / Deliver us from heresy/, which strangely gnaws at our bones --/ Could thou be a false god? / But no --/ For thine is the kingdom of consumption, / The power and glory in things, / For ever and ever/ ah-man and wo-man --/ Have we arrived lost?</p> <p>* prayer spelled backwards -- © chuck overby, Athens, Ohio, 9/77, & 95</p>	<p>RAPE OF MOTHER ---</p> <p>earth – blue, green, brown, and white/ living jewel in space/ from whose womb we crawl/ her breasts to suckle/ and then return --/ voracious, rapacious, deluded appetites/ have we – driving us to/ defile her essences and beauties --/ air, water, and soil/ with leavings in pursuit/ of the “goods” life --/ visible and shallow rapes now forbid/ we seek deep penetrations – and/ thrust our technological phalli/ deep into her fragile belly/ ejaculating poisonous excrement/ seeds of future pus. / deep-well injections/ doublethink speaks --/ wells from which our children/ and children’s children will not quench their thirst.</p> <p>Jackson Ohio flirtation with “deep-well-Injection” hazardous waste disposal. © chuck overby, October ‘79</p>
---	--

<p>UNFETTEREDNESS</p> <p>Eagles soaring on winds/ swept up treeless hills/ of brown summer grass/ Or, climbing in thermal drafts/ over broiling prairies --/ To be one with the wind, / freed from tugs of earth/ to wheel and swing/ In wild abandon/ and with spontaneity/ through mansions of air --/ Eyes of a ten year old see/ childhood dreams of/ eagles' views of earth.</p> <p>© chuck overby, 6/25/78 -- reflections on childhood urges to fly, growing up in northeastern Montana in the 1930's</p>	<p>NIGHT VISIONS</p> <p>Penetrating black voids/ in night ahead/ brightened with/ july fourth-like/ works of fire --/ Steady on course/ into colored holocausts/ become hard metal/ with rockets red glare --/ While below/ bombs burst everywhere --/ our gifts to "gooks"/ and our flag was still there.</p> <p>© chuck overby; 6/7/78, Korean War B-29 pilot, Founder The Article 9 Society; 3/18/91.</p> <p>--- transferring technology to serve the needs of humans everywhere -- killing at each other -- B-29 night bombing in Korea</p> <p>--- anti-aircraft fire at night looks like 4th of July fireworks. some US national anthem violence words find their way into this poem. the term "gooks" was a common "term of endearment" used in the US military in the Korean war for North Korean and Chinese people who happened to be the "enemy" of the day</p>
--	--

A Recipe For An Armageddon Cocktail

Take two half-pints of Wolfowitz's, Perle's, Feith's, Libby's, and Abrams', and Rove's right wing unilateralist arrogance – add a few ounces of Rumsfeldian megalomania, and Cheney's Haliburted "oil liqueur" along with a touch of that sweet rose Sharon. Flavor with a half-ounce of Blair's "lackey essence." Add a few Rice seeds along with the National Security Strategy of the United States of America, and our Ashcrofted "Act of Patriots." Pour this mixture into the empty warhead in the White House and shake well. Savor this brew while waiting for "The Rapture" listening to refrains from the "chicken hawk" waltz.

A "letter-to-the-editor" by Chuck Overby, 27 March 2003
 -- a disillusioned World War-II and Korean War (combat pilot) veteran

ⁱ Overby, Charles, "The End Of Japan's War-Renouncing Article 9?," a paper for the 14th annual conference of the Concerned Philosophers for Peace, St. Bonaventure, October 25-28, 2001.

ⁱⁱ Overby, C., Kunihiro, M., & Momoi, K, *A Call For Peace: The Implications of Japan's War-Renouncing Constitution*,ⁱⁱ Kodansha International, Tokyo, 1997, Kodansha America, New York, May, 1998. (New paperback edition 2001) Currently out of print – an updated edition is in the works.

-
- ⁱⁱⁱ Latest paper on Article 9 -- Overby, Charles, "Article 9: Humanity's Plea For 'Rules-Of-Law' Rather Than 'Rules-Of-War' – Menaced By A Rogue State, The USA," paper presented on a five and a half week lecture journey in Japan October-November 2003. Available on our web-site www.article9society.org
- ^{iv} Sherry, Michael, *In The Shadow of War: The United States Since The 1930s*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1995.
- ^v Overby, Charles, "Product Design For A Sustainable Future: A Matter Of Ethics?", American Society for Engineering Education (ASSE) 1980 Annual Conference Proceedings
- ^{vi} Overby, Charles, "Green Technology by Design: A New Paradigm for Engineering Education for Sustainable Development," chapter in *Cleaner Technologies and Cleaner Products for Sustainable Development*, Springer, 1995 – From a 1994 NATO conference on Technology and the Environment, Budapest, Hungary.
- ^{vii} Locke, John, *The Second Treatise of Government*, originally published in 1690, Bobbs-Merrill, 1975.
- ^{viii} Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan: On the Matter Forme, and Power of a Commonwealth*, originally published in 1651, Collier Books, 1967.
- ^{ix} Smith, Adam, *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Modern Library ed. 1937.
- ^x Taylor, Paul, *Principles of Ethics*, Dickenson Publishing, 1975.
- ^{xi} Gorovitz, Samuel, "John Rawls: A Theory of Justice," a chapter in the book, Mindoue and de Crespieny (editors) *Contemporary Political Philosophers*, Dodd-Mead, 1975.
- ^{xii} Rawls, John, *A Theory Of Justice*, Harvard University Press, 1971.