

# Space travel not war

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-03/msg00418.html>

---

- *From:* [Willie.Mookie@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Willie.Mookie@xxxxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Mon, 24 Mar 2008 02:35:40 -0700 (PDT)
- 

The United States since the end of world war two has aranged things to avoid the possibility of another surprise attack in the nuclear age. We have been largely successful in this regard.

This success has been achieved by exploiting the retail and banking functions within the economy to maintain a large disparity of income between the United States and the rest of the world. This derives from the fact that shop owners and bankers make a lot more money than tinkers, tailors bakers or craftsmen. And, all these fellows make more money than famers and miners.

That is, its common knowledge that the US controls most of the trade retailing and branding in the world, while US farming and manufacturing have been sent overseas. Our allies control most of the manufacturing, and everyone else supplies raw materials and food for those allies to process into goods that are then marketed to the rest of the world by the United States.

Not well understood is that the banking and trading systems set up as extensions to the Marshall Plan were designed to enforce a trading regime that was permanently favorable to the United States. It has been known since the beginning that this advantage would be temporary. George Kennan and others who authored these plans to maintain peace in the nuclear age that they would one day fail. So, alternatives would have to be developed. These alternatives include 'direct military action to maintain US superiority' or 'alternatives to the present control regime'.

Unfortunately the United States cannot maintain a disparity of income through trade if it is at war with those it is trading with – so this direct military action angle wasn't well thought out. Also unfortunate, is there appears that no alternative to the present control regime has been seriously considered or pursued.

This leaves us in a bit of a sticky wicket.

I believe the development of industrial scale space travel would have opened the Earth to off-world resources and allowed the United States to maintain a disparity of income not by appropriating through trading

## Space travel not war

arrangements the bulk of the world's wealth, but by vastly expanding the wealth of the world by augmenting it with off-world resources. Furthermore, by using advanced technology to maintain ourselves as the lowest cost producer of raw materials off-world, and off-shore, we could easily maintain a more positive hegemonic control by supplying the opposite end of the economic spectrum – by controlling nearly 100% of the raw materials of the world, even while our 4% of the world's population finally took only 4% or so of the world's wealth.

That is, rather than maintain an untenable dominance in the world, we could maintain necessary control by shifting our roles as we achieved our goals of nuclear peace and developed off world resources..

This disparity of income has been used to support a continuous war footing in the nuclear age.necessary to maintain global hegemony. The money was used to support our military and intelligence operations throughout the world which in turn was used to maintain our favored trading position.

The world response to this situation has been rational and irrational. On the rational side, we have the emergence of markets and trading regimes that are fairer to those we seek to exploit. The rise of the European Union, the rise of the Chinese stock market, the power of the Yuan and Euro are all challenges to the power of the US markets and US dollar. Also, the first allies to benefit from US transfer of manufacturing capital and know-how have given rise to German and Japanese marques and brands that have challenged the dominance of US branding and marketing. Nixon's opening to China not only sought to divide the then monolithic Communist powers, but also sought to extend our manufacturing base beyond Japan and Germany and thereby undercut both as they built their brands in the US. On the irrational side you have extremists who view the United States as undeserving of its role, and who seek to destroy it by direct military action. Despite the abject lack of power and capabilities when compared to the United States, the direct attacks against the United States have been used by the Bush Administration to write their own ticket in terms of military retaliation when and where they want – irrespective of facts. The successful surprise attack of 9/11 has not been seen as a failure of our control regime nor has caused anyone to question it seriously. Any serious questioning has been subsumed in specious arguments that seek to marginalize the discussion.

Yet the US faces serious challenges. Not from its extremist adversaries. But from its own failed policies and lack of creative solutions going forward.

Throughout this period from 1947 through 2007 – the US has had several clear warnings that it was on the wrong track. We went from the world's largest exporter in 1950 to the world's largest importer in 1960. by 1970 – with foreigners having nothing to buy with the dollars we paid them for all our imports – inflation was rampant, and

## Space travel not war

we had to abandon the gold standard. The value of the dollar was more or less constant – except in times of war – throughout the history of the United States. At the beginning of the Cold War, our dollar went into free fall and has never recovered. This had the predictable effect of causing massive commodity price increases, but did not change the income disparities that held the control paradigm in place. By 1980, without a stable currency underlying it, low interest banking sources went bankrupt. Without low interest loans, the cost of major capital improvements skyrocketed, and public works became a thing of the past, meanwhile bridges, hospitals, schools, universities, all stopped capital spending or got far less for their capital spending than previously. By 1990 the United States once the world's greatest creditor nation, became the world's greatest debtor nation. By 2000 we began suffering attacks from extremists who viewed the United States as undeserving of its position in the world. In 2001 a major attack succeeded. Expert opinion says that a handful of the tens of thousands of nuclear weapons held by the former Soviet Union are likely in the hands of terrorists today. They only lack a delivery system to bring these weapons to the United States. Before 2010 one report writes, the United States has a 50% chance of suffering a nuclear terror attack that could destroy one or more major cities.

Meanwhile the US is unilaterally engaged in a series of costly military actions that is causing its currency to decline at a rate of 20% per annum. If God forbid – a successful surprise attack coordinated against major banking and retail centers (NYC, Chicago, LA) by loose nukes in shipping containers then we can expect that to cause the a period of hyperinflation for US.

This unlike commodity price increases, destroys the US ability to maintain its position in the world, and to do anything to recover from it quickly. In the interim the US could permanently lose control of its trading and retail empire, and would be powerless to mount any sort of sustained military action to re-establish it. It should also be noted that we attained our dominant position not by military action, but by aiding others who engaged in military actions – so, its clear that forbearance from military action is called for regardless. Before New York, Vienna was the stock market capital of the world. London and New York vied for control when Vienna suffered a reversal it could not recover from. China, Japan, Europe, even Sydney, are all potential future centers in the wake of a failure in the US markets. A surprise nuclear attack should we be so unlucky to survive one would accelerate the trends that are undermining the US economy –it does not create it from whole cloth.

I mentioned earlier that the we could develop off-world resources as a means to maintain control and maintain nuclear peace in the world. We could have done that by aggressive development of nuclear pulse spacecraft. The same \$5 trillion that was spent wiring our world for nuclear destruction, could have been spent building thousands of

## Space travel not war

nuclear pulse spacecraft that opened the resources of the solar system to humanity – and made the United States a gateway to the cosmos – and cosmic wealth.

The world ships about 6 billion tons of cargo per year. 2/3 of that is oil and coal. 2 billion tons are food, fiber, finished goods and so forth. That's about 1 ton per person – or 1/3 ton per person worldwide. The US consumes about 4 tons per person – apart from oil and coal. The world's 9.5 million millionaires consume about 40 tons per person – apart from fuels consumed.

By maintaining a disparity of income by being 'first among equals' in growing an economy from raw materials forward – is a more positive and more tenable solution to our problem today.

Can we really get materials cheaply from across the solar system?

Why not start with energy?

Terrestrial solar power arrives fresh from the sun every morning in quantities that dwarf our industrial needs. Today we generate about 15 trillion watts of industrial energy. Most of this is obtained by burning fossil fuels. 28.3 billion barrels of oil each year, 5.5 billion tons of coal, and 1.1 billion tons of natural gas. All of this will be replaced with 3.34 billion tons of hydrogen made from 30 billion tons of water, decomposed with 98 trillion watts of solar panels covering 556,000 sq km. This system is easily expanded to double the present US per capita energy use for the entire world by adding 556,000 sq km of power satellite on orbit beaming laser energy to the same solar collectors – raising continuous output to over 248 trillion watts. This trend may continue by orbiting power satellites close to the solar surface and beaming high intensity energy across the solar system. Bob Forward showed how laser energy may be beamed from star to star to power interstellar voyages. This same technique may be used WITHIN the solar system to power worlds. Why not power the Earth? This last stage not only solves our energy problem, but prepares us for low cost interplanetary travel, and also for interstellar voyages and experimentation with anti-matter and black hole dusts.

In conjunction with building large solar panels arrays, a reusable heavy lift launcher is constructed, capable of placing 500 tons into GEO. This small fleet of launchers, first puts up a network of broadband wireless communications satellites that provide global wireless internet to the world. Through this channel, US companies may offer a wide range of micro-banking and other financial services to the world in addition to communications functions.

The US may then use its pre-eminent communications capability to develop telerobotic systems. These systems may be used to build tele-operated factories, managed by US labor, employing low wage labor

## Space travel not war

throughout the world. Here, know how and capital is retained within US borders, and shared among US workers, while foreign workers earn less, but per Henry Ford's teaching, enough to buy what they make. In this innovative way, we may maintain control even while we re-acquire our manufacturing and mining and farming functions in the United States.

Expand our tele-operated production off-shore and off-world to expand our low cost access to raw materials other than energy.

Within 36 years of 9% growth world wide and 3% growth in the US, per capita income rises to \$180,000 per year on average – and energy use rates and raw material use rates on a per capita basis – match that of the US. Within 90 years of 9% growth – beyond this point – world per capita income rises to \$4,000,000 per year on average – with general access off-world available to all – and private ownership of space homes commonplace.

At the end of this period we can expect several developments to obviate the need for continued military expenditures.

Why?

The first is that we will become tame if we allow ourselves growth.

Emergence of a 'tame' human in the absence of thwarting and frustration of impulses toward life is assured. The experience of the Russians in this regard is quite interesting;

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tame\\_Silver\\_Fox](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tame_Silver_Fox)

Second, the experience of even cislunar space travel has profound psychological and emotional effects even upon hard-core jock fighter pilot types

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institute\\_of\\_Noetic\\_Sciences#History](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institute_of_Noetic_Sciences#History)

general access to solar system resources by thousands or even millions of people, will no doubt result in profound insights among a handful that will inform and organize the bulk of humanity in new and wonderful ways. Ultimately, the bulk of humanity will live off world aboard low cost pressure vessels complete with their own ecology – leading many to similar insights.

These two trends taken together – will have a profound influence on the politics of humanity in the future.

Rather than avoiding or resisting these trends, it would be beneficial for the US to embrace these trends to continue to maintain nuclear peace in the world, and eventually peaceful resolution of all conflict as we enter the age of truly civilized human beings.

Space travel not war

Space travel not war

..  
.