

3.2.2.3.2.28 Unwarranted restrictions to population growth

A limited, even negative population growth makes a fine female strategy. It reduces the percentage of young women, such raising the sexual market value of women who get older.

A male public sexual strategy regarding population growth would be to put few or no restrictions on it.

It is a misperception anyway that mankind has to implement policies to limit the growth of its population.

It is a misperception because it assumes that mankind could control nature.

Whether mankind wants it or not, not mankind, but ultimately nature will control how many humans are too many humans. If mankind grows into too many people, there will, repeat: will, be events that downsize the number of people. No need to worry: mankind will never be too many people per se.

There may be too many people (by human judgment) for certain political goals. China imposed strict population growth restriction policies in the 1980 because a restricted population growth is good for national development.

Raising children consumes a lot of manpower, as well as resources. Societies which have low population growth rates can, at least in the short run, achieve more economic growth, because women can easier be integrated into the workforce.

But economic development is a dubious quality. People in rich societies are not happier than in poor societies. Of course, it's good for anybody's ego to be richer than one's neighbor.

But all in all, rich human environments are boring. To live among comparatively poor people, and among people with a comparatively

high rate of unemployment, and in crowded conditions, and in an environment with many children, is more charming than to live in a comparatively rich environment.

Most people strive to improve their material environment. And while many people have an obscure feeling that they were happier when they were poorer, most people probably can not articulate what went wrong when they became richer. They think that because they are richer, they should be happier, but they are not.

Most young people who run away from home enjoy their freedom. For many of them, life after running away is an exciting adventure, even if sleeping rough or in abandoned buildings isn't as comfortable as in the bed at home.

Many young adults go traveling, often equipped with backpacks, and sleep in dirt-cheap, and dirty, accommodations. And still, when they think back later, they consider these travels as one of the best times in their lives.

Many travelers enjoy traveling to poor countries. They encounter there a friendliness that is different from the polite helpfulness of rich countries.

When people read books, they are often more attracted to tales of vagabondage than to tales of orderly, established lives.

So why do so many people organize their lives in the orderly, uninspiring fashion? Why do they not avoid the wealth trap?

It can be assumed that poor and crowded conditions are more appropriate to the human mental archetype than golden-cage conditions. And it can be assumed, furthermore, that a generation mix in which children are most numerous, and youth are second most numerous, and young adults are third most numerous, and adults are fourth most numerous, and old people are least numerous, is what human minds feel is natural.

Of course, mankind has been very successful, at least in principle, in fighting premature death, so if humans do not restrict reproduction, the number of people keeps on growing.

But being alive is not a value in itself. A comfortable death, and before that, during one's lifetime, optimal sex, are values in themselves.

It is the wrong strategy to focus too much on ensuring that everybody reaches the age of 79. Yes, people have an instinct to prolong our lives for as long as possible. But for a very large percentage of people, not dying earlier means not dying early enough.

Most earth can support 100 billion humans. In crowded conditions, not in golden cages.

Nature itself will decimate the number, in case earth can't support it. There is no way (NO WAY) that mankind could prevent this. Because mankind itself is part of nature, not a god controlling nature from outside.

Is it acceptable that nature will eliminate billions of people to correct overpopulation?

A stupid question! Every century, billions of people die. They die anyway, always died anyway, and always will die anyway.

There cannot be a categorical (moral) imperative to prevent human death. The only ethical concern can be to prevent suffering.