The American Version

The resilience chain described in this series has a domestic version. It runs more slowly and more quietly than the international one. That makes it more dangerous, not less.

The global water and migration pressures documented in Parts 3 and 4 of this series are external forces acting on the United States. But the resilience loop described in Part 2 — water determining food, food determining stability, stability determining migration, migration determining infrastructure stress — is not only a description of what happens elsewhere and flows toward America. It is also a description of what is happening inside America, running on a slower timeline and through different mechanisms, but driven by the same underlying physics.

The American version of the resilience problem is distinguished from the international version by one critical feature: the resources, technology, capital, and institutional capacity to address it exist. The United States has not failed to build resilient infrastructure because the tools are unavailable. It has failed to build resilient infrastructure because the political economy of infrastructure investment consistently favors the visible and immediate over the durable and long-term. The result is a physical plant that was built primarily between 1900 and 1980 and is operating on borrowed time — not in crisis, but in a condition of managed deterioration that compounds with each decade of deferred maintenance.

Water Infrastructure: The Invisible Emergency

The United States has approximately one million miles of water pipes, most of them installed between 1900 and 1970. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that a water main breaks somewhere in the United States every two minutes — roughly 240,000 breaks per year. Those breaks represent not only immediate disruption but also the progressive failure of a system that was never designed to last as long as it has been asked to last. Lead pipes, cast iron pipes, asbestos cement pipes installed before the risks were understood are still in service in cities across the country. The Flint water crisis was not an aberration. It was a preview.

The EPA's most recent Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey, released in April 2023, estimated that the United States needs to invest approximately $625 billion over the next 20 years simply to maintain and improve existing drinking water infrastructure — not to expand capacity, not to modernize toward higher standards, but to keep the existing system functioning at its current level. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021 allocated approximately $55 billion for water infrastructure over five years. That is meaningful progress. It is also roughly 9 cents on the dollar of what the EPA estimates is needed.

The Western Water Reckoning

The western United States faces a water reckoning that is already visible and accelerating. The Colorado River, which supplies water to 40 million people and 5.5 million acres of irrigated farmland across seven states and Mexico, has been over-allocated for a century. The river is legally committed to delivering more water than it physically carries in most years. Lake Mead and Lake Powell — the two largest reservoirs in the United States — dropped to their lowest recorded levels

in 2022, triggering mandatory cutbacks under the federal shortage declaration framework. The seven basin states then failed to agree on rules for the years after 2026, and in 2026 the Interior Department set operations for 2027 and 2028 itself, cutting deliveries to the Lower Basin states by 1.25 million acre-feet a year. Lake Powell stood at about 22 percent full in mid-September 2026.

The Ogallala aquifer, which underlies approximately 174,000 square miles of the Great Plains and supplies roughly 30 percent of all groundwater used for irrigation in the United States, is being depleted at a rate that makes its long-term availability for agriculture uncertain. In the southern portions of the aquifer — beneath Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas — depletion rates are severe enough that the aquifer is expected to become economically unviable for irrigation purposes in parts of those states within decades. The agricultural economy of the southern Great Plains was built on water that accumulated over thousands of years. It is being spent in a generation.

Housing: The Accumulation of Deferred Decisions

The United States faces a structural housing shortage that is the accumulation of approximately forty years of under-building relative to household formation. The national housing deficit — the gap between the housing units that exist and the housing units needed to accommodate current and projected households at reasonable occupancy levels — is estimated variously at 3 to 5 million units, depending on methodology. The shortage is concentrated in the metropolitan areas with the strongest labor markets — the places where economic opportunity is greatest and where the inability to build sufficient housing has translated most directly into unaffordability.

The housing shortage is not a mystery. Its causes are well documented: restrictive zoning that limits density in the areas of highest demand, permitting processes that add cost and time to construction, community opposition to new development, and financing structures that favor certain types of housing over others. These are policy choices, not physical constraints. The materials and labor to build more housing exist. The political economy that would authorize and finance it has not consistently materialized.

The Quiet Compound

What distinguishes the American version of the resilience problem from the international version is not the severity of the individual components. By global standards, American water infrastructure is functional, American food supply is robust, and American housing, while unaffordable in many markets, is not scarce in the way that housing is scarce in developing world cities. The American version of the problem is a problem of compounding deferred maintenance — of systems that were built well and have been maintained inadequately, that are still functioning but are functioning on borrowed time, and that will require either deliberate investment or forced response as they age further.

The danger of the slow version of this problem is that it does not announce itself. A water main that breaks every two minutes is not a crisis — each individual break is a local event, handled locally, reported locally, forgotten quickly. An aquifer that drops one foot per year is not a crisis — it is a trend line that becomes a crisis sometime in the future, at a point that is always far enough away to defer the response. A housing shortage that adds 100,000 units of deficit per year is not a crisis — it is a market condition that produces manageable pain for most people and severe pain for a minority who are not politically positioned to force a response.

The United States has the resources to build genuine resilience into its physical systems. What it has lacked — consistently, across administrations of both parties — is the institutional capacity to prioritize investments whose payoff is measured in decades rather than news cycles, and whose failure, when it eventually arrives, will be attributed to whoever happens to be in office at the moment of the break rather than to the forty years of deferred decisions that made the break inevitable. That is not a water problem. That is a governance problem. And governance problems, as the rest of this portfolio documents at length, are the ones that are hardest to fix.

* * *

The strongest counterargument

The strongest challenge to this piece is an optimism argument: the American infrastructure deficit narrative, while factually grounded, systematically understates the adaptive capacity of market and institutional responses. The steelman: water markets in the American West have been allocating scarce water toward higher-value uses through trading and leasing arrangements that did not exist a generation ago. The housing crisis has produced a genuine policy response in states from California to Montana — zoning reform, by-right permitting, accessory dwelling unit legalization — that is beginning to move the needle on supply. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, whatever its adequacy gaps, represents the largest federal infrastructure commitment in a generation. The system is responding; the deficit narrative has not updated to account for it.

This is a legitimate objection and deserves engagement rather than dismissal. Water markets are a genuine adaptive mechanism, and the expansion of trading arrangements in the Colorado basin has improved allocation efficiency. State-level zoning reform is real and accelerating. The infrastructure bill is meaningful even if insufficient. The argument that the system is incapable of response is weaker than the argument that the system responds too slowly and too incompletely relative to the pace at which the deficit compounds.

The response is that the optimism argument conflates direction with adequacy. The directional signals — markets emerging, zoning reforming, legislation passing — are real. The adequacy question is whether the pace and scale of response matches the pace and scale of the deficit accumulation. On water: the Ogallala southern depletion trajectory is measured in decades; market trading has not materially altered the extraction rate in the most severely depleted regions. On housing: California's zoning reforms have produced meaningful supply increases in specific markets; the national deficit continues to grow. On infrastructure: $55 billion over five years against a $473 billion identified need closes roughly 12 percent of the gap, during which the remaining 88 percent continues to age. The falsification condition is simple: show that the rate of deficit reduction exceeds the rate of deficit accumulation. That test has not been met.

* * *

The resources to build resilience exist. The capacity exists. What has been missing is the sustained institutional attention that transforms available capacity into deployed resilience. The final part asks what that would actually take.

* * *

About the Author

J. Ken Rhodes writes on geopolitical risk, institutional resilience, and economic frameworks for assessing system-level fragility. His work focuses on the gap between official narratives and behavioral evidence — and on the analytical infrastructure required to read one through the other. He is based in the United States.

Contact: jkr@rhodesresearch.org | rhodesresearch.org