

# Re: Barack Obama Pits Space Explorers Against School Children

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-12/msg00057.html>

---

- *From:* Ian Parker <[ianparker2@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ianparker2@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 4 Dec 2007 01:36:21 -0800 (PST)
- 

On 3 Dec, 18:26, Quadibloc <[jsav...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:jsav...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Dec 3, 9:42 am, Ian Parker <[ianpark...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:ianpark...@xxxxxxxx)> 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.

The first thing you do to control Al Qaeda is to stop feeding it. There is abundant evidence that the US supported OBL during the Afghan - Soviet war. There is also disquieting evidence of support for the KLA Kosovo Liberation Army which was supported by OBL.

I have mentioned ad nauseum the lies associated with Iraq and the Middle East generally. There are lies associated with terror too. If an existentially dangerous weapon is built it will be built by the United States or some other major power. The US with 50% of global defense expenditure is very much setting the pace. People like the Russians and Chinese are followers.

Hydrogen Peroxide is unstable. People in this group have in fact suggested using it as rocket fuel. Can anyone explain to me how anyone

## Re: Barack Obama Pits Space Explorers Against School Children

with any pretensions of building an existentially dangerous weapon can possibly go into their kitchen and distill H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in an ordinary pan. Lies, lies, lies. Saddam Hussein had WMD, Syria is danderous. Now the CIA realises that the Straights of Hormuz would be blocked in the event of a war with Iran and they are chaging their tune. You see a \$200 barrel + petrol rationing would be even more difficult to sell than space colonies. They are now changing their lie accordingly.

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.

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.

They have no real power. The US does. The way ti stop China is by international agreement. GWB is the prime problem. He lied his way into office by smearing his opponents and has consistently lied and mismanaged the situation.

My friend. A space colony is going to be impossible to sell. Would you prefer to listen to someone who advocatred space colonies or to someone with a deep understanding of the Middle East who offered constructive solutions.

In the Moiddle East as I see it religion is the main problem. The US should be building its relations with secular rulers like Assad, not supporting Saudi Arabia. GWB ddoes not understand the ME. He has a propaganist position that he half believes himself. No, he is simply drifting from crisis to crisis.

Space colonies will require the resources of space in any case. If I

Re: Barack Obama Pits Space Explorers Against School Children

had these resources at my disposal a colony would NOT be the first thing I would do. I would go for solar power, build a sunshield to protect against global warming and I would do research on weather control. Can the formation and path of hurricanes and typhons be controlled?

– Ian Parker