



## **rRemarks Data for December 20th, 2022 Village Council Meeting**

**Agenda Section:** Consent

**Agenda Item:** D. MOT 2022-9713 A motion authorizing annual 2023 funding to the Downers Grove Economic Corporation (EDC).

**Commenter:** David Rose

**Comment:** A boondoggle.

Should be called “Hand out tax breaks” Corporation.

Who defends the ‘public interest’ of DG in an entity whose board of directors is populated by representatives rife with conflicts of interest?

And since VC prefers the public NOT comment or question the existence and operation of the EDC, VC pushes the vote NOT to the Active agenda but directly to the Consent agenda.

---

**Agenda Section:** Comments of a General Nature

**Agenda Item:** Comments of a General Nature

**Commenter:** David Rose

**Comment:** When we live in a sea of lies, how do we keep our sanity?

Big Lies just in the last week affecting us all:

i) War in Ukraine is about defending democracy.

Be grateful for every day you wake up and are still here rather than incinerated by the 21st century rendition of Dr Strangelove. That’s what it means when a conflict is existential and neither side is prepared to negotiate an end to the fighting. With few exceptions, US media reporting is completely devoid of historical context and understanding, and information of any value. More marketing than reporting, relying on

Americans' recollection of US military actions since WWII to be either absent or rose-colored.

The conflict reflects the refusal of world leaders to take seriously the need to live within environmental limits.

What outcome in the fighting is most likely to negate that refusal?

ii) Fusion energy.

The military identifies a new version of its old rationale for more money for weapons research — 'energy too cheap to meter.' Riiiiiiight.

The big announcement about a net energy gain in an experiment by a weapons research facility was literally a tempest in a teapot.

Promoted as the solution to the search for virtually unlimited 'clean energy', i.e., energy that doesn't produce CO<sub>2</sub>.

As long as one doesn't look too closely at the details.

Such as: how the device producing the fusion energy was itself produced. Or the availability of the materials used to produce the microsecond burst of energy gain.

Or the fact that the purported net energy gain in the experiment was calculated solely against the laser energy used to produce the reaction, NOT against the 300 megajoules of electricity required to produce the 2 megajoules of laser energy.

The media coverage encouraged suspending disbelief, the hopium that this 'result' will scale up to commercial size in the not too distant future. As in "twenty years from now" (on a rolling, never-ending basis) is the joke within the physics profession.

Why are we tempted by such "dreams?" Because we so want to believe science and technology will "save us," i.e., will allow the US and other rich nations to maintain and increase current levels of energy usage and thereby lifestyles. And because we so want to believe the US remains an economic and technological powerhouse, the world leader, the exceptional nation.

"Energy too cheap to meter" = the contemporary version of the story of King Midas.

Media playing the role of fourth estate would be embarrassed by such breathless and uncritical reporting. Oh, well.

In short, a beautiful example of “politicization of science.” Speaking of which,

iii) Covid, the pandemic, mRNA jabs, Big Pharma, Fauci. And the ‘politicization’ of medical science, and thereby of medical care itself.

A central element of the polarization of American life and politics.

The pandemic exposed for everyone to see how neoliberalism has led to levels of inequality that directly affect medical care and lifespan for the 60% (or more) of the population living paycheck to paycheck.

Perhaps no domain of contemporary life has been more affected by science and technology to affect human life directly than medicine.

But as implied above, therein lies the King Midas danger. The reliance on medicine to solve problems as if there is no other option.

The primary theme of the pandemic has never been to encourage people to become healthier, never to examine the literally harmful effects of a capitalist society on the majority of the population.

No, the focus is simply to promote reliance on the jabs.

Claims about both the efficacy and safety of the jabs remain disputed. Essentially, those leaning liberal are believers, those leaning conservative are not.

The country continues to be divided on all of it.

One byproduct suggesting rising distrust of the ‘medical community’ — lower rates of uptake of flu vaccines this year. In spite of the tripledemic. The tripledemic being ANOTHER instance of media hysteria largely lacking in accurate reporting.

Covid is still with us; the question is, what is the best way to deal with it? And with the possibility of future pandemics?

How do we resolve the dispute between the polar positions?

How do we disprove for example the hypothesis among conservatives that covid is the result of a devious plot by nefarious elites to depopulate the world? That the jabs themselves are in fact part of the effort to depopulate thanks to the harmful (side?) effects the jabs have (by injecting the spike protein into the body for it to spread throughout).

[The pertinent larger question: WHO's trying to kill who? The left the right? the right the left? the rich the poor? the poor the rich? the whites the non-whites? the non-whites the whites? the globalists the nationalists? the nationalists the globalists? the educated the uneducated? the uneducated the educated? the straights the bents? the bents the straights? and so on.]

Are such ideas just wild conspiracy thinking not worth serious attention? Serious people are out there risking/promoting careers because of evidence they say others are unwilling to see or are hiding.

For example, is 'conspiracy' too strong a word to use to characterize the account Nancy MacLean provides in her book "Democracy in Chains: the deep history of the radical right's stealth plan for America"? By my reading she captures quite well the battle over policy in which the US has been embroiled for these past many decades. And as her chapter "Get Ready" suggests, the right is not done yet.

I contend the basic question is: Who wins the battle of world-views — between the zero-sum and non-zero sum way of thinking — when the supply of energy-slaves is shrinking and current ways and standards of living cannot be maintained without them?

Whose side are you on?

Speaking of conspiracies ...

iv) Big release by government of files about JFK's assassination.

Another case in which the government and media promoted something as a big deal that is really a nothing burger.

Files released to comply with a law passed years ago, hence the fanfare. But ...

JFK assassination scholars point out the big release of files is in fact NOTHING of the sort. Specifically, in terms of releasing files previously kept secret (that is, completely out of public view), the number of such files released is around 100, a small fraction of the

13,000 figure the media bandied. And those 100 do not include files the intelligence agencies continue to withhold because they are too embarrassing.

Err, excuse me, withheld on usual grounds of “national security” ... to avoid exposing the sad truth of their skullduggery in how our democracy really works. See for contrast Lamar Waldron’s book “The hidden history of the JFK Assassination.”

Speaking of US presidents ...

v) Democrats claim Biden is one of the greatest presidents in US history.

Matches the absurdity of a similar claim from Republicans about Trump.

As the Chinese might say, far too early to tell.

The explanation for all of the above:

How else does one maintain the childlike [childish?] illusions the populace of the world’s exceptional nation want to believe about themselves? When their lying eyes tell them things just don’t feel right.

What’s needed to stop the lying?

Or have we become so accustomed to/overwhelmed by/purveyors of it, we no longer care ... so long as its adverse impact does not hit us directly or hard?

---

**Agenda Section:** Comments of a General Nature

**Agenda Item:** Comments of a General Nature

**Commenter:** David Rose

**Comment:** I said it earlier in 2022, but I will say it again at this time of the year when people are purportedly voicing a shared desire for peace on earth:

If you genuinely want peace on earth, take seriously the objective of moving society toward a way of living that is environmentally sustainable. That is, one that uses resources at a sustainable rate.

Anything else is simply self-deluding hypocrisy.