

Episode 93: An Eye-Opening Discussion On Practical Solutions...

Mon, 7/18 3:27PM 42:14

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, children, human, rewilding, planet, carter, families, future generations, nature, world, humane education, population, nonhuman, costs, freedom, wealth, talking, impacts, living, future



SPEAKERS

Commercial, Nandita Bajaj, Carter Dillard, Outro, Nandita and Carter, Jack Humphrey



Jack Humphrey 00:00

If you've been craving a discussion on overpopulation that goes beyond the superficial social media arguments and news headlines, you're in the right place. Next time you hear Elon Musk talk about increasing world population, just post the link to this episode as your rebuttal. conversations like the one you're about to hear are woefully few and far between most prefer to talk about the many symptoms like climate change, ocean acidification, extinction, inequity, biodiversity loss, but there's only one root cause and it's the one thing almost everyone prefers to ignore. And lest you think you're about to listen to yet another long list of problems caused by human overpopulation without solutions being offered. Fear not. There is a way out of this and the solutions are just humane and practical. Whether humanity takes the path that gives us the best chance to avoid the worst of what currently lies before us remains to be seen.



Jack Humphrey 01:10

You're listening to the rewilding Earth podcast.



Jack Humphrey 01:28

The rewilding Earth podcast is supported by businesses such as Patagonia, Kotula and Biohabitats, as well as the Wheaton Foundation and listeners like you. If you love the work that the Rewilding Institute is doing, please consider donating@rewilding.org. And be sure to sign up for our weekly newsletter while you're there. Nandita Bajaj, executive director of Population Balance, is a humane educator and a passionate advocate for planetary health. Nandita's area of interest is on the intimate links between pro-nativism, anthropocentrism, and

overpopulation, and their impacts on human rights, animal protection and environmental preservation. As faculty with the Institute for humane education at Antioch University. Nandita teaches two courses, human rights as well as Pro natalism and overpopulation, a first of its kind online course that she designed to explore the impacts of the pervasive and oppressive pressures on women to have children and the resulting impacts on them other humans animals as well as the planet. Carter Dillard is the policy director and board member of the fair start movement. Author of justice as a fair start in life, Carter began his career as an honors program appointee to the US Department of Justice. He later served as legal advisor to the US Department of Homeland Security and the National Security Law Division. He wrote his thesis reformulating the right to have children under Jeremy Waldron

N

Nandita Bajaj 02:46

Humane education is both a field of study. But it's also an approach to educating and advocating that draws connections between human rights, animal protection and also ecological sustainability. And so from this framework, we start by looking at the human population issue and the underlying causes that are fueling population growth. And I basically describe two cases that touch on the humane education perspective. One being our worldview of extreme anthropocentrism. Or as Eileen, Chris calls it a human supremacist worldview, a widely shared unconscious worldview, that humans alone possess intrinsic value, and that nature and all other beings are important only to the degree in which they serve us humans. It's clear even in the language that we use, we call much of the nonhuman world resources. And our ultimate goal is has been and is to dominate the planet with our species. The second piece of how humane education ties into population is that population growth actually depends on the subjugation of personal and reproductive autonomy. Having children is a you know, Poppy in the population arena, it's seen as a contentious issue.

N

Nandita Bajaj 04:25


But if you kind of break it down, you look at having children, when done under the right circumstances, in a just and sustainable way, as Carter will speak to in a bit it can be and is for many a beautiful, purposeful and joyous thing. But one cannot assume that is the case for everyone. And once you start kind of peeling back the layers of what's actually going on, you see that population growth is actually happening on the backs of those with the least personal and reproductive autonomy.

N


Nandita Bajaj 05:01

Most of it is happening in countries with oppressive cultural practices such as low status of women, gender based violence, forced child marriage, etc. And it leads to hundreds of millions of people, especially women into situations of forced pregnancy, unwanted births, etc. So, really, when you dissected reproduction has actually become exploited as a tool to keep a lot of power structures alive, such that young women and young girls and women in general are pressured and often coerced into having children in large families in order to keep the supply of religious followers, workers, taxpayers, soldiers, etc. To keep going. So, you know, from a humane education perspective, human population growth is an issue that impacts people, animals and the rest of the planet. Because it relies on unjust practices, but also because then


the growth itself further perpetuates a lot of inequities and unjust practices. And, you know, that's kind of the interconnection between human people, sorry, people, animals, and the planet.

 Carter Dillard 06:31

If we wanted to teach children, how they should treat other beings, the first thing we have to explain to them as well, who should we be as a people? And to date, that question is largely getting answered. In the form of well, we should be people that fill a shopping mall, because Gross Domestic Product is God. And we should maintain high levels of consumption, low levels of labor cost, and a growing tax base so that we are this big, powerful entity. And that's the antithesis of being a free people. If you wanted to be a free people, you would envision yourself not in a shopping mall. But in a town hall, you would have a role in deciding the governance under which you lived. That would mean participating in the system, that would mean smaller groups of people who actually could have a voice. Your Relationship to other people on the townhall would be one of empathizing with them. You wouldn't be having a commercial relationship where you relied on incentives, backed by state coercion, you would be engaged in negotiations with them an empathetic political relationship. And empathetic people, smaller populations. Living in participatory democracy is the freedom and the opposite of a shopping mall mentality. That is completely consistent with rewilding completely consistent with nature.

 Carter Dillard 07:58

What's the point of teaching children how they shouldn't be empathetic towards other creatures if those creatures don't exist? If we haven't restored our ecology, and rewilding the earth, and the relationship that the children would have to other species is one of empathy and pro social behavior. So to Nanda, this point, it's not just about rewilding for nature's value, it's being free being free people, there's no such thing as a freedom to do whatever you want to do. That's nonsense. There's no concept like that. freedom is freedom from other people. And we know that's what nature is. And it's also freedom to do and the way we know. What we're allowed to do is by participating in a town hall, it's how we come up with the rules. So I see human education as teaching children. This is who we should be. And it's consistent with rewilding women's liberation, empathy, and it's the antithesis of a shopping mall. And it's what our, I think, what our country's founders had hoped for, but have lost because of the hegemony of economics

 Jack Humphrey 09:06

Nandita can you discuss your work on making the links between pro natal ism and overpopulation and also define pronatal ism for us?

 Nandita Bajaj 09:15

Yeah, briefly touched upon these pressures that are placed on women especially to bear children and have large families as a means to other ends. But if you take more of a 30,000 foot view at pronatal ism, it is the social bias towards having biological children. And a good

definition from Laura Carroll's book, the baby matrix is pronatalism is an attitude or policy that is pro birth, that encourages reproduction, that exalts the role of parenthood. It's the idea that parenthood and raising children should be the central focus of every person's adult life. Life. And it's a strong social force includes a collection of beliefs, so embedded, that they've become to be seen as true. And it's based on the premise that reproduction is not only normal, but also natural. For example, it has been debunked that the biological bias, the procreative drive, that we often talk about, to have children is not a universal drive.

N

Nandita Bajaj 10:33

But the social bias is so strong that we are made to believe that our desire to procreate is natural, but also universal. So what happens when you mix in these cultural ideas about having children and that we must all make that a part of our life's journey with the coercive set of power structures, like religion, like corporations, like, you know, political enterprises. And as Carter said, economic pressures to grow the GDP, you get a very toxic mix of pressures that are all pointing to one thing that everybody must have children. And so, you know, as I briefly mentioned, they show up in the form of religious pressures, which are depicted as shame, guilt, fatalism, you start to see, you know, an act of restriction of contraceptives, or a ban on family planning services, we're seeing a lot of economy driven pressures showing up in industrialized countries like Canada, US, Australia, etc, through baby bust, alarmism, a view that our economy will suffer, if we don't keep producing more people.

N

Nandita Bajaj 12:00

You see political pressure showing up through child tax credits, or lump sum baby bonuses. And you know, some of them are camouflaged as family friendly, sometimes even feminist friendly. But again, when you dig a little deeper, you come to realize that it's these incentives don't exist to help people, individual citizens, children, they exist to promote reproduction. So you know, you mix that with a bunch of cultural pressures, which become even harder to detect because they're everywhere. They're in media magazines, in our families, that glorify parenthood that spread myths such as biological clock, maternal instinct, etc. Or even diminish small families by spreading myths about one child families.

N

Nandita Bajaj 13:00

It can be really harmful, because what they are essentially doing is preventing authentic discussions around family choices, where we're not openly talking about the true impact of having children, on ourselves on our potential children on society environment, you know, so you start to break it all down, you'd realize that our growing population is actually putting immense pressure on the planet and all the beings on the planet. Pro nihilism actually fuels this population growth, and at the same time is premised on the exploitation of people. So there's like subjugation of rights happening, both leading to overpopulation, and then overpopulation further perpetuates those injustices.



Jack Humphrey 13:52

It's starting to remind me of the things I first learned about feedback loops. When you combine

It's starting to remind me of the things I first learned about feedback loops. When you combine pronatalism, human exceptionalism, and an economic system dependent on eternal growth. It sounds like the same thing. It sounds like we invented something in our culture that we currently have that's centered around this global economic system.

N

Nandita Bajaj 14:11

Unfortunately, you're completely right. Our focus as human beings as a species, as I feel like completely shifted from what comprises, you know, our humanity to hold this incredible planet, and all of the beings of this planet in reverence, and as Carter described, you know, us a state in which we have these relationships with one another with other beings that are based in care and empathy. That's all kind of been wiped out and been taken over by this mechanistic to realistic worldview where we are kind of beset by greed and competition, and unrest and dissatisfaction. If it doesn't seem like a great way to live,



Jack Humphrey 15:09

You both are doing work to extensively go further in this conversation whether or not the whole world's caught up to you or not, because we need to we need to play and I that's why I'm so excited to have you guys here. And one one part of that is Carter, if you could talk about the fair start movement, what is it? How is it the should be the first and overriding human right? What's it got to do with nature?

C

Carter Dillard 15:35


began about 12 years ago, when I was doing research on the right to have children, a lot of the legal analysis around the right to have children said, it's a personal private, right to the parents to choose the timing, spacing the number of their children, however they wish to do it, when you dig deeper, and you look at the moral philosophy and the underpinnings of that right? That statement doesn't make any sense. It's a complete misstatement of the right to have children. First off, while not having children, like terminating a pregnancy or using contraception is autonomous. Having children is interpersonal. It's not, it's not autonomous at all. It involves the future child and the community. And so you have to account for that. Secondly, the right to have children. If you don't base it on autonomy, you end up having to find some other basis for the right. And all of our analysis showed that the right really is based on the right to continue and improve your life.

C

Carter Dillard 16:31

That's what parents should want for their children, they should want their children to represent continuity and improvement of their lives. And if you use that value, and you balance out everything else, you get, you get to a very particular right, the right starts from freedom from others or rewild, at risk restored environment where you you literally are self determining, you know, you might come down to 280 or less parts per million climate emissions so that you're not being determined at infancy by having fetal heart defects imposed by the climate crisis. And then as you add people to that nature, that vision, you have to account for how each person added, when they're an adult, limits the self determination of the people that came

before them in the entity, you end up finding that having kids properly the right to have children properly interpreted, is all about moving from the view that it's self determining for the parents, it's not, it's other determining for the children.

 Carter Dillard 17:35


And you have to do it in a way that maintains relative self determination or freedom for everybody. And honestly, that comes down to smaller families, parents who are ready. And most importantly, and this is the thing that shocks most people, a system based on fairness, or a fair start in life. And if you took all of the future children that would be born in the next generation, and you put them on an economic spectrum of wealth and power from the least to the most, to make it function in a free way, in a fair way. You'd have to redistribute wealth to ensure equality of opportunity. And the beauty of it is sort of ended with this. There is a right to have children properly interpreted. It's the first human right, it's existential in nature. So it proceeds and overrides other rights, but it's limited. And its goal is to ensure freedom and fairness for all. And the the redistribution part and this part is crucial. You can redistribute wealth as an incentive and entitlement to get kids to a fair start that enables you to do so in a way that encourages delay.

 Carter Dillard 18:44

And that means parental readiness. And that also encourages smaller families, which restores nature. So properly interpreted the right type of children is an overriding, right. But it points towards a very particular future of smaller populations living in the sort of town hall relationships that we talked about before and this makes this makes people fighting for that future freedom fighters, and others that want to impose their will on the earth. And on future generations that makes those people the antithesis of fighting for freedom, it makes them a threat to freedom. So if this isn't just about nature and population and women's autonomy, it's about freedom properly interpreted, and I think people pushing for better family planning to empower children are true freedom fighters.

 Commercial 19:31

You're listening to the rewilding Earth podcast. From humble beginnings to global conservation phenomenon, the rewilding movement continues to grow and thrive amid the greatest ecological challenges our planet has faced in 65 million years. Here's how you can join us and help return balanced to nature. First, go to rewilding.org and subscribe to the weekly digest to keep up on the latest rewilding news, interviews and art. Second, consider donating to support the rewilding Institute's mission to rewrite out in North America and beyond. And for extra credit, please like, subscribe and share this podcast to help spread the word. Thanks so much for your support.

 Jack Humphrey 20:09

Some of what you're both talking about reminds me of Kim Stanley Robinson's fairly recent book *Ministry for the Future*, which I highly recommend to anyone listening, it takes the idea of taking future generations seriously as if they already exist with RFI's. Now, in I'm paraphrasing

taking future generations seriously as if they already exist with RENTS. Now, in my paraphrasing, he does a much better job in the book. But it was the first time I'd really seen a comprehensive, like attempt at what would that look like the Ministry for the future that people who are advocating for future generations and what life should be like, you know, and what kind of a loan we're taking out against their future? In the current system that we have? Is that somewhat of a characterization of some of the things that you guys deal with?

C

Carter Dillard 20:52

I think it is, I agree. And one way to think of a ministry of the future would be, let's take really wealthy white men saying that the world is underpopulated, we need to produce more kids. Those men made their wealth based on an unsustainable system of growth that impose insanely destructive costs on future generations and on non human animals, the most vulnerable species and entities that there are. So they're calling for a continuation of that system. The real question is, if you made your wealth based on externalizing costs on helpless entities, arguably, you should pay those costs. And if you're going to pay those costs, you should pay them in an effective way that reverses that process.

C

Carter Dillard 21:39

And we've said before, one effective way is by incentivizing small, delayed and equitable families, the question then becomes, okay, well, if you externalize those costs in park, let's say, Elon Musk, or as recline or any of the other, talk, the other men talking about under population, if you externalize those costs and doing things by not requiring that every child born enjoy what the children's rights convention promises them. And you took that wealth essentially, from those kids, and from the women who were forced to have them through the cultural and other forces not at a talked about. And we want to recoup those costs and use them for family planning to reverse the trend, and point us towards an optimality the sort of things that Partha Dasgupta talks about Cambridge.

C

Carter Dillard 22:27

How do we do that? Well, we said before the right to have children properly interpreted as the overriding human right? How could you? How could a state how could the government possibly assign property rights to people like musk, or any of the other wealthy men or publicists like Klein? How could it assign property rights, if it hadn't first established and existentially just people things like complying with the Children's convention, it can't assign property rights, it doesn't have any authority, any existentially just a position to assign those property rights. So in fact, one ministry of the future approach is really simple. The wealth at the top is subject to an overriding claim over any property rights Government has given it and that that wealth should be used to reverse the trend to recapture the externalized costs in the form of fair start family planning incentives.

C

Carter Dillard 23:20

There's no question about it. If we took that wealth, and we used it for that purpose, we would completely bend the arc on climate emissions, child welfare, and inequity problems, women's

autonomy, we would bend the arc totally in the right direction. And the question is, what's stopping us from taking that wealth? I think the question becomes increasingly powerful to people. And as the wealth gap grows, I think that question is going to get answered, we're not subject to a future that we can't control because of people at the top, I think they're going to be subjected to a massive shift. That would reflect a massive act of justice, that would point towards the ministry of the future, which is like you took this wealth, you put the cost on others, we're going to take it back for the right purposes, and government can't stop us. That is a just argument that we've been making for four years, multiple peer reviewed pieces, and not one philosopher, ethicist, or political theorist has been able to dispute the claim.

N

Nandita Bajaj 24:19

So the only thing I'd add to the Ministry for the future peace, which I think sounds like a beautiful book. It's a fantastic name for a book, and it's an excellent concept. It's obviously not a new concept. Indigenous people have been talking about, you know, planning for many generations ahead of us. But the one thing one comparison I want to draw to our inability to care for or to even think about future generations, is the same kind of human supremacist worldview, just the way in which we see other beings, not the nonhuman world as inferior to us, somehow we have this bias where we see those who don't yet exist, who must have, as Carter says, access to the same rights, the same nature, the same quality, actually a better quality of life than we currently have.

N

Nandita Bajaj 25:23

Because this is not a great standard, ecologically to be living by, we don't have the ability to put them in the same in the same space, as we put ourselves somehow we see ourselves those who exist as superior to those who are to come after us. And I've, you know, I find that the intergenerational injustice piece really striking, because in our social justice movements, hardly anyone is speaking about the injustice that we are forcing upon the future generations, we know, it's not going to be a just world if we were to continue on this path, with business as usual. So even our fight for human justice, as we currently are engaging in feels very limited in a variety of ways, but one of them is a complete lack of recognition of the future generations. The other piece, you know, tagalong, the social justice aspect, I feel, there's also a bit of reductionism that goes on in our social justice movements, or even the feminist and reproductive and sexual health and rights movement, is this view, that talking about reproductive autonomy, you know, as an absolute right, is, is the only thing that we should be focusing on or fighting for.

N

Nandita Bajaj 27:06

And as I originally alluded, and then, you know, Carter has spoken about the responsibility peace, majority of the people in the world currently do not have reproductive autonomy. So the fact that we are trying to uphold this right to have as many children as we want, is actually kind of based on this co-opted idea that we all want to have children, it's based in a pronatalist idea that that we have been kind of brainwashed with, that everybody must have children, as many

children as we want. So, you know, number one, we're not free to decide how many children we want, because the want, quote, unquote, has very much been constructed for us by all of the power structures that I've spoken about.

N

Nandita Bajaj 27:59

The second thing is, as Carter has spoken about, the unfettered right to have as many children as we want, is actually a flaw. Because it undermines the rights of all of the other people and all of the other beings and nature by having that unfettered right, but then also it undermines the rights of future generations. You know, if we are truly talking about social, if we only want to talk about the human piece, we are talking about social justice, we have to include the true meaning of justice here. It's not just justice for one aspect, but it really needs to include everything and everyone that exists, exists now and has yet to exist.



Jack Humphrey 28:52

I thought I had thought a lot about this, but the way that you put that just now, it just hit me really hard. And and and we weren't even talking at that point. I mean, I wasn't thinking at that point of all nonhumans. I was really only thinking about the human condition and the unfairness that we're placing the the, you know, in the future, but how do we tie this all in to rewilding the need for providing a vibrant, safe, non polluted future for ourselves and the rest of the planet?

C

Carter Dillard 29:22

I think one way you can do it is to say that there is a right to relate with a rewilded natural restored planet was the right of all humans to have that relationship. Again, that relationship is crucial for health, because we've seen that even a one degree centigrade rise as carbon causing significant fetal heart impacts on infants. So Paris, the Paris accord was completely completely missed the mark because we're looking at significant impacts. And it's, you know, looking at an additional Point five to one degree centigrade on top of that, who knows what will happen. So instead, we have to treat restorative less than 280 ppm. policies as part of a human right to relate to nature and treat restoration as the imperative and that's it's physically doable. If there was significant investment in sequestration family planning, we no longer recognize the property rights of the worst violators to continue doing what they're doing because governments can authorize threats to the people they represent, to continue than I think we can we can get there.

C

Carter Dillard 30:39

From a historical perspective, it's pretty easy. In the middle of the 20th century, towards the late part of the 20th century, environmentalists were locked in a battle between whether it was deep green ecology, or it was nature as a human resource, the latter camp one, the latter camp insured the climate crisis, their mistake, foisted, unknowable suffering on future generations. There's the debates over they were wrong. The rewilding folks were right, we have to treat our right to be free from others, right you as as a as the fundamental human right. And there, you know, two to three dozen specific policy tactics that can move us in the direction of rewilding,

but we had fair start, we do it from the perspective of wanting to be free. There was there was a debate a long time ago, still continuing somewhat between political theorists, politics is about power.

C

Carter Dillard 31:41

So the question was, how do you define power? What do you mean by power, and the mistake that we and a lot of other people made was to think of power as violence coming from the top down from government powers any form of human influence, that debate largely has been won by the group that said there was any form of human influence. It's climate emissions, it's bad parenting, it's cultural influences. And if it is, if that's the case, then being free means you have to start from a position where there is no power, human power, that's a real Wild Earth. And then you slowly build up consensual, relatively self determining groups of people who are using that power, but you never crossed the baseline of eliminating nature. So again, I think if you want to take freedom seriously, we you start from the perspective of rewilding the foundation for climate restoration. It's the foundation for climate restoration, just f, the number four cr.org, it's a great resource on how we can start to restore climate to logically, nature and they're at fair start and population balance.

C

Carter Dillard 32:52

There are dozens of other tactics in terms of how to restore nature, socially, through better family planning. And the key though, is to see it as a fundamental human right, the right to nature, right to relate to nature, being part of a right to a fair start in life, one that overrides any competing claims, it has to be seen that way to be effective. We can't be cowed by governments who claim to have authority when they basically put the vast majority of people in imminent risk that by doing so they waived their authority to continue to operate in that sense. So that's how I would look at the importance of the nonhuman world it's the necessary condition for human freedom.

N

Nandita Bajaj 33:34

Human expansionism, it's irrefutable that we have had an irreversible impact on the more than human life, we have wiped out most of the wild world by dominating the planet. And, you know, if you look at it again, from the humane education perspective, our responsibilities basically to uphold

N

Nandita Bajaj 34:03

the rights of humans, the rights of nature, the rights of the planet, and for all of us to be able to coexist in a relational empathetic, carrying capacity, a capacity that allows us to hold the planet and the reverence that that it deserves. From that perspective, the way that human expansionism has and is impacting the nonhuman world is as most of your listeners will know we are in a state of dangerous ecological overshoot. And that's primarily because of things you've already said Jack population, our consumption and the growth economy. We know we are grossly overpopulated.

N

Nandita Bajaj 34:47

I know a lot of people don't like using the word overpopulated. But if you look at it from the perspective of science, it's just a word that describes that we have, we have surpassed our carrying capacity just like any other population, we are not exempt from that word. So I don't mind using it. But we are overpopulated by at least three to four times what our planet can sustainably handle. Our consumption levels globally are on the rise with a swiftly expanding middle class.

N

Nandita Bajaj 35:22

And our nation's, as I've spoken before, are pushing for an increase in both the population and consumption in order to grow our economy. It's a dangerous combination. Well, the main reason we have been pushing our sustainable limits and natural laws is because of industrialization, which has augmented our capacity to produce food faster than our population was growing, a scenario that no other species has been able to execute. And while we think of this as some kind of an exceptional achievement, we know that it has come at the cost of forcefully taking over the carrying capacity of all other life forms, and essentially wiping most of them out, while causing a number of other calamities, climate change being one of them, ecosystem destruction, mass extinctions, and the degradation of the living conditions of our own species.

N

Nandita Bajaj 36:26

So you know, even if you compare where we were at 10,000 years ago, when we were such a tiny little speck, a mere 1% of all of Earth's biomass, living in a much more harmonious relationship with the rest of the nonhuman world, we have now completely humanized the planet. Our numbers are biomass, combined with the biomass of the animals that we kill for food are basically majority of the biomass, it's 96%. And the rest of what remains is wildlife compared to 10,000 years ago, when it used to be 99%. To quote Eileen Christie, again, she's one of my great mentors, all of this and expansionism has basically been in pursuit of the human food pantry, she calls it, it's basically to feed our insatiable demand and growth, the food enterprise basically poses the largest threat to the nonhuman world, our animal agriculture system that kills upwards of 100 billion animals each year, is actually one of the largest causes of habitat loss, wildlife extinction, methane and carbon emissions. You know, in terms of the greenhouse gas emissions, it's 30% of the emissions are coming from our food production.

N

Nandita Bajaj 38:02

To further if you look at the water usage, 70% of the freshwater that is taken from our ecological watersheds goes to basically maintain that food pantry, the food enterprise, and that is water that is then being taken away from nonhumans, who call that water home. It's either killing or driving them to extinction, in many cases, even before we could meet them, as I think Carter has described, like, what the ideal world would look like, is we really do need to scale back tremendously our human enterprise in a way that, of course, is empowering, kind,

empathetic. But also, I think, once we start to do that, and we arrive at a place where we feel that we are truly liberated and not living in a, you know, sense of competition and greed and scarcity, there comes an opportunity for us to then cultivate the reverence for this incredible, miraculous planet, that that is life giving that has this incredible biodiversity. We, you know, we're each and every organism has a role to play to, to to, you know, to really truly live in a humane relationship with ourselves and the rest of the world.



Jack Humphrey 39:29

Carter, what about you? What's What's your most hopeful feeling when you get one?



Carter Dillard 39:35

Well, I think it's definitely around the sea change and fertility. I mean, I think, for lots of reasons, the average woman in the world is having half or fewer children than she would have had in the early middle part of the 20th century. And that sea change outweighs I think even shorter, live trends like the to Germany of neoliberalism or other things that we might be afraid of, I think we're seeing our species turn itself in the right direction. And then the question is, how do we catalyze that?



Carter Dillard 40:10

I think the gap between rich and poor and we know the rich made it based on an unsustainable system that put costs on others, I think there's real hope that we can convince people that they have a right to take resources at the top that were were made through externalizing costs, and use them to better plan, I think they could we could catalyze this sea change in a way that would make it a qualitative shift towards does Gupta is optimality optimality, we've got several studies we've published on the website that show people are responsive to that sort of incentive entitlement.



Carter Dillard 40:47

So I think look, in some ways people before us have done the hard work of shifting the the growth rate. In a way that's that's going to point us towards a net down arc. And I think there's a unique opportunity with the gap in wealth that we can capitalize that in the qualitative direction. And that makes me very hopeful.



Jack Humphrey 41:07

At the bottom of every episode of this podcast, we have extra credit, go to rewilding.org/pod. And look for episode 93. If you were inspired today to learn more, and go much, much deeper, that would be the place to go and the thing to do so again, both of you. Thank you so much for taking your time to do this. This was really, really a great episode.

N Nandita and Carter 41:28

Thanks, Jack. Thanks for having us. And thanks for the incredible work you guys are doing to.

O Outro 41:34

Thanks for listening to the rewilding Earth podcast, we do what we do because of you. This podcast is supported by listeners like you who longed to live in a wilder world. Please consider donating@rewilding.org And subscribe to our weekly news and article digest while you're there. To go the extra mile you can follow and share rewilding, or if on Instagram, Facebook and Twitter. Bonus points for sharing this podcast with your friends. To listen to past episodes, go to rewilding.org/pod

