

Re: Barack Obama Pits Space Explorers Against School Children

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-12/msg00049.html>

- *From:* Quadibloc <jsavard@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 3 Dec 2007 10:26:51 -0800 (PST)
-

On Dec 3, 9:42 am, Ian Parker <ianpark...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I think I have dealt with that in another thread. I think personally there is something to be said for a spike in the steering wheel. Politicians and generals would take bigger risks if they felt they had a bolt hole.

Most of the existential risks are man made and the way to combat them is to put in place the appropriate controls, including controls on the military.

But that idea makes no sense. How do you put in place controls that control Iran and control al-Qaeda? What this sort of proposal means in practice is that the world's democracies place one-sided controls on their own militaries, which leads to an **increased** risk of a nightmare world where the other side wins, and freedom is destroyed.

Yes, the risks are "man-made". But we're not prepared to control the growth of world population. Terrorists and foreign governments aren't under our control. So, limiting the options available to the people trying to solve the problems, when you can't control the people causing them, doesn't help matters.

If you are not careful you will find that space colonies actually increase the existential risk, not reduce it.

They may increase the risk to Earth slightly, but the overall risk to humanity as a whole, once the colonies are independent of Earth, is clearly lowered. But my expectation is, instead, that once the enemies of freedom are faced with the reality that the total destruction of freedom is beyond their power, they will be demoralized, rather than redoubling their efforts. And because all our eggs are not in one basket, the West's leaders can take a calmer and more determined approach to threats.

Re: Barack Obama Pits Space Explorers Against School Children

Since I see al-Qaeda, Sudan, China, and so on as being *all* the problem, and George W. Bush as part of the solution, not the problem, naturally I don't find that sort of option as likely to be helpful.

John Savard

.