

In This Issue . . .

Resistance to Change 1
By Peter de Jager

The 11th Hour 3
By Scott Romeo

The Idea Incubator 4
By Frank Helton

Kids Ask the Hardest Questions 6
By Thomas E. Ollerman, Ph.D.

Animal Whys? 8
By Jocelyn Little

Einstein's Refrigerator 8
By Steve Silverman

Resistance to Change

By Peter de Jager

Which is the bigger problem - change or resistance to change? Both cause conflicts in organizations, but, managed wisely, change need not be frightening or destructive.

There's a shortsighted belief in some upper-management boardrooms that those who resist change are a problem. Employees should always go with the flow, get with the program, and never resist change.

But acting on this common belief by either ignoring or firing the resisters can prove dangerous. If we try to eradicate all resistance to change in an organization, we are ignoring the legitimate function of resistance: to avoid unnecessary change.

Change is a simple process. At least, it's simple to describe. Change is about traveling from the old to the new, leaving yesterday behind in exchange for a new tomorrow.

But implementing change is incredibly difficult. Most people are reluctant to leave the familiar behind. We are all suspicious about the unfamiliar; we are naturally concerned about how we will get from the old to the new, especially if it involves learning something new and risking failure.

Resistance As Survival

Many corporate mergers fail because of cultural reasons rather than economic ones: the two corporate cultures resist merging into a single cohesive whole. Some people would rather continue to struggle with old, outdated tools than adopt some new technology, even if they know it would make life easier.

Managers need to understand why people resist change. Resistance is simply useful survival mechanism.

Executive Trivia Question...

What U.S. corporation discovered after 64 years that it had never registered its trademark?

Published monthly by:
Thomas E. Ollerman, Ph.D.
INNOVA, Inc.

**1749 S. Westwood
Mesa, AZ 85210**

480-838-4854 • Fax 480-897-6180
<http://www.innovainc.com>
email: tom@innovainc.com
\$21.95 Annual Subscription

Imagine that for the past five years you've done business in a particular manner, made money, and grown globally, expanding into new markets. When someone suggests a new way of doing business, you're being asked to stop doing something that worked well in the past. You're being offered a new, untested method of doing something you've never seen before. You have the right, even a responsibility to your management and to your stakeholders, to ask "Why?" Why should you stop doing something you've proven works and start doing something you've never done before?

The biggest obstacle to change is past success. Asking why changes should be made when things have gone so well is rational and reasonable. The idea that anyone who questions the need for change has an attitude problem is simply wrong, not only because it discounts past achievements, but also because it makes us vulnerable to indiscriminate and ill-advised change.

Selecting Changes

The problem today is not just that we have to change, but that there is so much change. If you really believed in adopting all change without resistance, you could create enough change projects to last a decade.

Instead of viewing resistance as an anchor tying your organization to the safety of a protected harbor, managers should see it as a rudder steering them through the rising winds and tides of change. Another way of looking at resistance is as a gateway or filter. Resistance to change helps us select from all possible changes

the one that is most appropriate to the current situation.

If you accept that some changes must be avoided, and other changes must be accepted, then you need a strategy to tell you which is which.

A first impulse is to create a set of guidelines for choosing between two or more changes. Proven techniques include cost benefit analysis, return-on-investment calculations, and risk analysis. You may even have a protocol for assigning different weights to different features and benefits.

This is all well and good, but this "scientific" strategy usually ignores the definition of change: the act of replacing the old with the new. This means that any process must compare every option with what it is replacing.

This brings four new questions to the table:

1. Why is the old status quo no longer sufficient?
2. What will it cost to go from the old way to the "new-fangled method"? . This includes the costs of acquisition, training, temporary low morale, new hires, people leaving, and the emotional cost of destroying "what once was."
3. Is this "cost of transition" justified?
4. Does the proposed change support existing core values?

Change does not occur in a vacuum. It takes place within an already well-defined, established, protected, and even revered context.

When you select the next change to adopt, you have convinced yourself that it is the cor-

rect change, and it is your only choice. But if you haven't involved anyone else in the process, it's no wonder you meet resistance and no wonder you're aggravated by that resistance.

Irrational Resistance

Rational resistance can be subdued with reasonable explanations for any proposed change. If the reasons to change are persuasive enough, then resisters will willingly adopt the change.

Rational resistance includes resisting because we feel uninvolved. We believe the change is being forced upon us if we've had no involvement with the process. It is amazing how deeply people can dig in their heels and refuse to budge when they decide they don't want to do something. It becomes nothing more than a contest of wills. It is also an example of what happens when one of the basic rules of change is ignored: You must involve people in the change.

Another rational reason people resist change is that they fear having to learn something new. It's not that they disagree with the benefits of some new process; rather they simply fear the unknown future and doubt their ability to adapt to it.

There are ways to help such resisters overcome their fears. One way is to create an environment where learning is the norm, where the early failures of any learning endeavor are not frowned upon or punished, but are rewarded because failure is honored as evidence of failure.

However, irrational resistance does exist. There are rare people for whom no amount of evidence,

proof, demonstration, or persuasion will suffice to get them to willingly adopt the change. They simply don't want to change. How these folks are managed in an organization depends greatly upon the organizational culture.

Whatever else you do, fight the temptation to reject resistance. Resistance to change is normal and natural. If there's a reason for change, voice it. If there's no reason to change, avoid it. Instead of rejecting resistance, listen, learn, and lead.

Slow Cities Resist

A movement to slow down the pace of change has emerged that bears examination by pro-change advocates. The Slow City Movement is a conscious attempt by some 32 communities in Italy to adopt only those changes that

contribute to the quality of life for citizens and reinforce local values and culture.

According to the Slow City Manifesto, the "new international Slow City movement implements a program of civilized harmony and active peace founded on the serenity of everyday life to bring together towns and cities, large and small, which share common features and move in this direction."

The Slow Cities movement has emerged from the 1980s Slow Food movement, which represented a reaction to the fast-food restaurants invading Italian cities. The Slow Food movement advocates leisurely sit-down dinners with civilized conversation.

Slow Cities seek to create a future that savors life even in the

face of rapid change: "The national and international association promoted by the municipal administrations that have joined the Slow Food movement will be a continuous workshop for what, hopefully, will become the neohumanism of the early third millennium," the manifesto concludes.

For more information on Slow Cities, visit www.slowfood.com/principles/slowcity.html.

Peter de Jager is a consultant specializing in the management of technological change. His address is de Jager & Company Ltd., 22 Marchbank Crescent, Brampton, Ontario L6S 3B1, Canada. Telephone 1-905-792-8706; e-mail pdejager@technobility.com; Web site www.technobility.com.

From The Institute For Collaborative Alliances

by Scott Romeo

The 11th Hour...

France's ALCATEL and America's LUCENT broke off at the 11th hour merger talks that would have led to the creation of the world's largest telecommunications equipment maker. What Lucent had hoped might be a merger of equals, Alcatel saw as a takeover of the loss-making American company. Lucent's management could not counter the Alcatel-dominated leadership of their planned combined entity.

They had already booked the St. Regis Hotel in New York for a grand reception and press conference on May 30th. But Alcatel and Lucent called off their proposed merger at the last minute on the preceding day. Lucent's chairman and chief executive, *Henry Schacht*,

walked out of talks in Paris when he realized that *Serge Tchuruk*, his counterpart at Alcatel, was not proposing a merger of equals, but a French takeover of the ailing American telecommunications equipment group that was spun out of AT&T five years ago. More than a month of negotiations had resolved almost every detail but this, the most crucial of all.

Lucent wanted an equal split of the board, with both companies appointing eight members. But Mr Tchuruk insisted on having a say in at least nine of the 16 appointments. The full story, however, is more complicated than that. It was a classic case of cold feet, with Mr Schacht afraid that Lucent's shareholders would balk at the conditions he had negotiated.

The deal would have offered

Lucent shareholders no premium over the current share price, valuing the American company at \$22.8 billion, excluding its remaining 58% stake in Agere Systems, an optical-components business that Lucent floated in March. This valuation would have left Alcatel with a 58% share in the combined company, to Lucent's 42%.

Given this ratio, Mr Tchuruk was never likely to accept equal representation on the board—even though, in some respects, Lucent was a perfect partner for him. The French company's American sales accounted for only 22% of its revenues of \$29 billion in 2000 - a weakness that Lucent, with its long-established relationships with almost all the American carriers, should have been able to remedy.

(Continued on page 7)

The Idea Incubator

by Frank Helton

How can women increase breast size without surgery?

Here are the facts about Brava, the breakthrough new vacuum-powered bra that permanently boosts a woman's breast size. It enables women to avoid the dangers and side effects of surgery - but it must be worn 10 hours straight every day for 10 weeks. It is not painful but can be uncomfortable and occasionally cause a rash. It can't transform you into Dolly Parton, but can permanently increase breast size by about one cup. It improves the appearance by making breasts more upright, but it cannot alter the shape of your breasts the way surgery can. It costs about \$2,500 - but this is at least a thousand less than implant surgery.

The best candidates are mature women who do not want to undergo surgery. Women with a history of breast cancer or chronic mastitis should not use Brava.

According to **Dr. Phillip T. George**, a plastic and reconstructive surgeon and head of Brava LLC, the Miami-based company that makes the device.

"Women have been looking for a natural alternative to breast implant surgery and this is it. It's the only clinically proven non-surgical method for breast enhancement. It's been tested on over 200 women and all had increases in breast size of at least one cup size."

The only side effect is an

occasional skin rash where the bra comes in contact with the skin but this is easily treated with topical ointment."

Dr. Darrick Antell, a spokesperson for the American Society of Plastic Surgeons, said: "I definitely think this is a step in the right direction, but it can't add more than a cup size."

Brava, which looks like a sports bra, must be custom fitted to the patient by the doctor. It holds two semi-rigid domes that cover the breasts and a small microprocessor that produces a vacuum in the domes.

To get Brava, you must go to a physician trained in its use. For information visit the Web site at www.mybrava.com or call toll-free: 800-407-5304.

How can we improve scanning machines for cancer?

A new technique to seek out deadly lung cancer can spot tumors so early that patients now have an 80 percent chance of surviving. That's a dramatic increase over the usual survival rate of under 15 percent.

This giant leap forward is thanks to a spiral CT scan. "There is absolutely no question whatsoever that this new technology saves lives," **Dr. Craig Bittner**, a radiologist in Scottsdale, Ariz

Dr. Claudia Henschke, chief of chest imaging at Weil Cornell Medical Center in New York, a leading advocate of the new

approach, explained: "With spiral CT screening, you find over 80 percent of tumors in the early, most curable stage. Currently, less than 10 percent are found in that earliest, most curable stage."

Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death in the United States, killing more than 160,000 persons a year. Cancerous tumors that form in the lung produce no symptoms in their early stage. And by the time conventional chest X-rays can spot them, they are usually so far advanced - in 85 percent of cases - that little can be done. But now, specialists are turning to the spiral CT scan, which takes less than a half-hour, and is far more sensitive than ordinary X-rays. **Dr. Henschke** tested 1,000 smokers and ex-smokers using both the new spiral CT scanners and conventional X-rays. The new approach picked up tumors as small as the diameter of a soda straw, compared to quarter-size tumors seen in regular chest X-rays.

She recommends smokers, and smokers who recently quit, be tested once a year. Others who quit years ago should also be tested but the frequency has not yet been determined.

How can we make diesel engines more efficient?

While diesel engines are already as much as 60% more efficient than gas engines, there are tens of millions of diesels, so any small increase in fuel economy means huge savings in the big picture.

Enter the Rotating Liner Engine (RLE), a new application of an old technology that could increase overall fuel efficiency by about 5% and engine longevity tenfold. Taking a cue from World War II-era plane engines, University of Texas (Austin) graduate student *Dimitrios Dardalis*, found that the friction between the piston and the cylinder in which it rises and falls diminishes by about 100 times when a thin sleeve between the two is rotated at several hundred rpm. The sleeve distributes oil more evenly and keeps wear and tear from grinding down a single spot.

Dardalis expects his technology to add about 20% to the cost of a diesel engine, but in an industry where lifetime fuel costs far outstrip the price of the engine, that's a good trade-off. A 500 horsepower diesel generator might cost \$17,000, but if it works 24/7, calculates Dardalis, the 5% of fuel saved by the RLE adds up to more than \$7,500 a year. And those savings rise to 27% when the engine is idling. That's significant in the transportation sector, where napping truckers often leave their engines running overnight.

How can we cure "Mad Cow disease"?

Some of the most horrifying degenerative maladies, including Mad Cow, Alzheimer's, and Lou Gehrig's disease, share a similar underlying cause. These fatal scourges all work by smothering cells in agglomerations of misshapen proteins so tough that neither drugs nor the body's defenses can break them down. But two

research teams say they have figured out how to do just that, paving the way toward treatments or even cures.

Biochemist *Yair Argon* of the University of Chicago has focused on a rare disorder called light-chain amyloidosis, in which malformed bits of antibodies -protein molecules that normally fight disease - form deadly plaques in the liver, heart, and kidneys. Argon found he could prevent the clumping by adding a second protein called a chaperone, which shepherds the misshapen antibodies to cellular garbage grinders. He and his colleagues then designed a small molecule that mimics the chaperone and showed that it can stop protein gobs from forming in the first place. Soon Argon hopes to begin trials to see if the mimic can prevent disease in mice.

Antonio Villaverde, a microbiologist at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, has achieved similar results with microbes. Engineered bacteria, commonly used to produce insulin and other drugs, often go into genetic overdrive and create clumps of tangled protein like those associated with Alzheimer's. Villaverde found that chaperone proteins can pull apart those clumps as well, suggesting the chaperones may be effective against a wide range of protein-misfolding diseases. They could also squeeze more of the valuable drugs out of the bacteria. "We can apply chaperone-containing cell extracts to improve lire production of whatever protein is wanted". Villaverde has already patented the process.

What causes us to itch?

Dentist-turned-scientist *David Andrew* of the Barrow Neurological Institute in Phoenix, Arizona, has just filled in a big part of the answer. By inserting electrodes into the spinal cords of anesthetized cats, he has identified nerves that fire in response only to histamine, the molecule that makes us want to scratch. Running up the outer edge of the spinal cord to the thalamus, the brain's relay-station for sensation, the delicately flattened itch neurons make up just 5 percent of the nerves in the spine. Their scarcity probably explains why nobody located them before.

Studying these itch-signaling cells could lead to new treatments for chronic itching from dermatitis, kidney disease, or liver disease. "Once you figure out which cells are which, you can look at the genes that are in the cells and then design drugs that target these genes. Or you could block the production or the action of particular chemicals, thereby turning them off," says Andrew. Such treatments would probably be too expensive and disruptive for everyday annoyances. But for serious medical conditions, "this gives the first hope that there will be specific drugs available to treat chronic itching."

Thought to Ponder...

The essence of science: Ask an impertinent question, and you are on your way to a pertinent answer.

Jacob Bronowski

Kids Ask the Hardest Questions

by Thomas E. Ollerman, Ph.D.

Do insects sleep and do they dream?

Let's put it this way. They get quiet and curl up and look like they're sleeping. But what's really going on inside those molecule-sized brains nobody knows.

The one sure way to know if an animal is sleeping is to hook it up to a machine that measures electrical patterns in the brain. That's how we know that birds and mammals animals like dogs, cats, cows, and pigs – actually sleep.

The problem with bugs is they don't have enough brains to hook the wires to. So we don't really know what they're doing.

The same goes for dreaming. In humans, dreams often occur during what's called "rapid eye movement" sleep - REM sleep for short. Rapid eye movement means your eyes dart around under your closed lids. REM sleep occurs for several hours a night in most humans.

As with brain waves, though, you need a special machine to detect REM sleep. We know it occurs in cats and dogs, and some people take that as a sign that cats and dogs dream. But insects are too small to hook the machine up to.

The general feeling among scientists is that bug brains are so crude insects barely think, much less dream. The bugs aren't saying, so we'll just have to leave it at that.

Why don't we ever see baby pigeons?

A lot of students ask this question. It's never baby squirrels or baby sparrows or baby ants, just baby pigeons.

Not that there's any big mystery. Pigeons build nests just like other birds. But they don't put them in trees if they can avoid it. Pigeons originally came from North Africa, where they built their nests on cliff ledges so they could stay out of sight of their enemies on the ground.

In cities, where many pigeons live, the nearest thing they can find to a cliff ledge is a ledge or windowsill on the side of a tall building. Another place they like to hide their young is the ironwork under bridges – anywhere that's out of sight. Scout around in a few such locations and chances are you'll turn up a pigeon nest or two.

Does one dog year really equal seven human years?

Not exactly. Several improved formulas have been suggested. Here's one of the simpler ones: First dog year = 21 human years
Each later dog year = 4 human years

If you've got a 7-year-old dog, it's $21 + (6 \times 4) = 45$ in human years. A 10-year-old dog is 57 in human years, and a 15-year-old dog is 77.

That makes a lot more sense than

the old 7-to-1 rule, which would make a 15-year-old dog 105 - in other words, unbelievably ancient. Saying the dog is the equivalent of 77 is a lot more reasonable.

Is it true that elephants never forget?

Yes. We know this because of an experiment many years ago by a professor in Germany. He taught an elephant to choose between two wooden boxes, one marked with a square, the other with a circle. The box with a square had food in it, the other didn't.

This elephant was no Einstein. It took 330 tries before it figured out that "square" meant "food." Once it got the idea, though, things went a lot quicker. Soon the professor could put any two markings on the boxes. The elephant would experiment a few times, figure out which sign meant "food," then pick the right box from then on.

Big deal, you say. Ah, but there's more. The professor came back a year later and tested the elephant again using the old markings - circles, squares, and so on. Amazingly enough, the elephant still remembered which markings were the signs for food.

That's why elephants are so popular in circuses. It may take them a while to learn the act, but once they've got it, They've got it for good.

(From page 3)

Yet the deal could have turned into one of those deeply disturbed transatlantic alliances, all too reminiscent of the DaimlerChrysler “merger”. That too began with the gloss of a marriage between equals, but turned out to have one party uncomfortably more equal than the other. In the longer term, Alcatel and Lucent may be relieved to have pricked the pretence of equality before they reached the altar.

Working against an Alcatel-Lucent link later on would have been the sheer size of the undertaking, a colossus with more than 230,000 employees - over 100,000 from Lucent and 130,000 from Alcatel. Overcoming the cultural differences between them would have been difficult, especially in the face of the lay-offs required to deliver the merger’s projected cost savings of \$4 billion a year. Industry analysts reckoned that between 20,000 and 30,000 jobs would have had to go.

Neither party to the failed deal can afford to sit tight. The French firm remains the more attractive of the nearly-weds, but on the same clay that the merger collapsed it announced that it expects losses of \$2.6 billion in the current quarter, mainly due to writing off bad investments in start-up communications carriers such as Canada’s 360networks.

Since he took over in 1995, Mr Tchuruk has transformed Alcatel from a cumbersome conglomerate with low morale and lower profits into a focused telecom business, betting successfully on broadband Internet access, optical networks and big telecom data switches. His success there, and in previously turning round the oil company, Total, have put him among France’s industrial elite. Last year he was

voted “Manager of the Year” by a French business magazine, *Le Nouvel Economiste*. He sits among the great and the good on the board of Vivendi, whose \$34 billion purchase of Seagram’s Universal business a year ago was the apogee of Franco-North American deals.

A deal with Lucent would not only have enlarged Alcatel’s merger footprint in America; it could also have been the crowning glory of Mr Tchuruk’s career, if he had made it the ultimate turnaround. An active 63-year-old and a driven outsider - the son of Armenian immigrants, born Serge Tchurukdichian in Marseilles - he needs only to prove himself on the global stage. And he is geared up for it. He worked for Mobil for 15 years and speaks excellent English, albeit with ample Gallic gesticulation; he has made English the official language of Alcatel; he was even prepared to move to Lucent’s New Jersey headquarters to run the merged entity. Now, for a while at least, he needs to look elsewhere for a defining deal.

Lucent, meanwhile, is in more urgent need of drastic action. In the first half of its current fiscal year, the firm posted a loss of \$4.2 billion. To survive, it had to borrow billions and to take Agere Systems public. It is also trying to sell its fiber-optics business, which could raise \$5 billion - but is having problems finding a buyer.

Like its competitors, the company has been hit hard by the steep fall in demand for telecommunications gear in recent months. But many of its problems are of its own making. In trying to take on rivals such as Cisco and Nortel Networks, it overstretched itself. To meet its growth target of 20% last year, Lucent borrowed from the future, mainly by using creative accounting

and aggressive lending (“vendor finance”) to upstart carriers like One. Tel, which this week went into administration. The man held responsible for this disastrous strategy, **Richard McGinn**, was sacked in October. Mr Schacht, the company’s first chief executive, was brought out of retirement to restore Lucent’s fortunes. It was he who approached Alcatel.

The two companies have at least one challenge in common. The days of telecom equipment giants, which offer an entire range of products and services, may be numbered. They could soon be replaced by the more focused vendors that have already appeared in strength in some sectors by forming collaborative alliances. Particularly in the fast growing markets for optical and Internet gear, telecom service providers increasingly prefer to buy the best products they can find - from firms such as Ciena and Juniper Networks, for example - and then to integrate them in-house. Indeed, the failed merger this week may have spared the world the spectacle of two dinosaurs threatened with extinction vainly attempting to mate.

It may also have been a missed opportunity for America. For all the cries from Washington politicians about European plundering of an American treasure, in particular of Lucent’s Bell Laboratories, a legendary research lab that invented the transistor. The merger, if consummated, could have been just the latest in a string of American triumphs at offloading industrial has-beens into foreign hands.

Don’t Quote Me!

“Tone deaf and couldn’t sing” were reasons a local cathedral choir cited for rejecting a young Paul McCarthy.

Animal Whys?

by Jocelyn Little

- The black-necked swan carries its young on its back like a true Mother Goose.
- The jacana is a bird that flies with its babies tucked under its wings, their large toes dangling.
- The Abyssinian blue goose can fly backwards.
- Tropical jumping vipers, African carpet vipers, and East Asian tree snakes spring through the air like real live jack-in-the-boxes. They coil like a spring and then straighten explosively. Tree snakes can also flatten their rib cages and glide gracefully from branch to branch and from tree to ground like paper airplanes.
- Some animals are born with two heads, both of which function. Dudley-Duplex, a two-headed king snake of the San Diego Zoo, was one such beast. One night one head got hungry and tried to eat the other. Zookeepers separated the two, but the following night the two heads fought again, and this time the snake killed itself.
- The springtail, a kind of insect, hops on a pogo-stick-like appendage on its underside. It can leap many hundreds of times the height of its body.

Einstein's Refrigerator

By Steve Silverman

- The weirdest weapon of World War II was the Fu-Go, a huge paper balloon designed to carry bombs from Japan to the United States. More than 1,000 were launched but only 285 made it and most wound up in the wilderness, But the Fu-Go did cause the only deaths from enemy action on the mainland U.S. during World War II. It happened on May 5, 1945 - after the Fu-Go project was abandoned. A preacher, Archie Mitchell, and his wife, Elsie, took a group of children on a nature walk on Gearhart Mountain near Bly, OR. One of the children found a metallic object that exploded, killing Elsie and five kids, ages 11 to 13.
- The stickiest disaster in history occurred on Jan. 15, 1919, when a giant tank collapsed and flooded the streets of Boston with molasses. A wall of thick, brown goo 15 to 30 feet high careened down city streets at speeds of 25 to 30 m.p.h. The flood killed 21, injured 150 and wiped out millions of dollars in property. It took six months to clean up and 40 years later, the stuff still leaked out of cracks during heat waves.
- One inventor gave Thomas Edison a run for the money — but most people know nothing about him. He was Nikola Tesla, who made serious contributions to inventions such as the radio, the X-ray, neon lights, fluorescent bulbs, the speedometer, the principles of radar and the microwave oven. But he feuded with Edison and many other important figures of his day, and got little of the credit he deserved. While others grabbed the glory, he died penniless and forgotten.
- Einstein really did invent a refrigerator. In the early 1920s, the legendary genius was alarmed that cooling compounds in fridges of the day were poisonous and killing people when they leaked. Einstein came up with an induction pump cooling system that worked great and was safe. But no company ever built his refrigerator for the market. The invention of freon, a nontoxic refrigerant, stopped that. But Einstein's induction pump was later incorporated into the cooling systems of nuclear breeder reactors.
- Joseph Pujol was the highest paid entertainer in France 100 years ago. His stage name was "Le Petomane" and his claim to fame was passing gas! Through controlled farting, he could do imitations, create dramatic scenes and play music! His nightly sellout stage act lasted an hour and a half - and adoring audiences howled with laughter!

From: EINSTEIN'S REFRIGERATOR: And Other Stories From the Flip Side of History. By Steve Silverman. Andrew McMeel Publishing.© 2001.

Executive Trivia Answer...
AT&T.

Thought to Ponder...

It is the theory that decides what we can observe.

Albert Einstein