

This does not seem like an auspicious moment to be raising children. Ukraine does not seem like a good place. That is, however, what I am doing. Here is why.

The savants and pundits have never been as pessimistic as they are now. Rising generations are smaller, less intelligent and less well-educated than those they replace. The world is awash in debt. The central banks are marching in lockstep off a cliff. They know they can't print money forever, but they have no way to stop. Governments will never be able to support the pension, health, and welfare benefits they have promised. Almost no government in the world has a balanced budget, or the hope of ever having one again.

The breadth, depth, and nature of the cataclysm are beyond any prognosticator's ability to forecast, but there is a brooding sense that it will be bad. It will be far more widespread than the Great Depression of the 1930s. It is exacerbated by the fact that technology has made people in the lower strata of the ability distribution superfluous. There are fewer and fewer jobs customarily done by people with less than average intelligence that cannot be better done by machines.

In one sense I have no alternative but to be optimistic. Not to have children would be to admit defeat – to remove my genome from human evolution. But the fact that so many people are making exactly that choice may create favorable conditions for my own children. The fact that it is such a Western phenomenon

means that the place to raise them may be in Eastern Europe.

The demographics of my children's generation

Looking at the first two columns of Table 1, the reader sees that East Asians and whites are having children at a rate well below replacement.

Table 1 – How well two parents in the current generation are represented in the future, as a function of the fertility rate.

		Replacement of one couple, by generation, at current fertility rates					
		East Asia	Whites	Latin America	South Asia	Muslim	Africa
Effective Replacement	<i>Fertility rate</i>	<i>1.57</i>	<i>1.71</i>	<i>2.04</i>	<i>2.39</i>	<i>2.64</i>	<i>4.66</i>
	This generation	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	Children	1.57	1.71	2.04	2.39	2.64	4.66
	Grandchildren	1.23	1.46	2.09	2.86	3.50	10.9
	G Grand	0.96	1.25	2.13	3.42	4.62	25.3
	GG grand	0.76	1.07	2.18	4.09	6.11	59.0
	GGG Grand	0.59	0.91	2.22	4.89	8.08	137
	GGGG Grand	0.46	0.78	2.27	5.85	10.7	320

Succeeding generations will be smaller. Because these are the richest countries, it means that the world will consume less. Even without improving our methods, it will take fewer resources to feed them, house them, and provide transportation. This will be a blessing.

But technology is improving. Bloomberg projects that within 10 or 15 years we will be getting enough of our energy from renewable sources such as solar and wind to substantially decrease our use of petroleum. Self-driving cars can afford to be smaller, safer, and more efficient. They will be boring, reducing cars from status symbols to mere transportation. If the most efficient way to use the roadways turns out to be point-to-point, on-demand, multi-passenger taxis, there will probably not be too much complaint, just as long as the shared vehicles are comfortable and have Wi-Fi.

From an environmental standpoint, fewer people will be a good thing. The populations of Japan and some European countries are already falling. Other countries are not far behind. As average age creeps up, their people consume less. Oldsters don't buy that many cars, clothes, new houses or appliances.

Turning back to children, a glance at Table 1 shows that a rapidly growing percentage of young people will be from economically poorer areas of the world – Africa, the Muslim countries. These are peoples that have not mastered technology either at home or as immigrants to the developed world. People who will be made redundant by technology. On the other hand, the decreasing percentage of highly intelligent children among the decreasing number children born to the East Asian and white populations should find themselves in demand. That was certainly the experience of the smaller generation born during the Great Depression. It will give the social justice warriors fits; it will not be fair. However, I expect that if my children are properly reared and educated that they will do well financially. There will not be that much competition.

Demographers will say that our children passed through a population bottleneck. When they reach adulthood, today's crisis should have passed. The world will be their oyster. They should be in a position to raise sizeable families. Whether or not they will is a separate question. It will require a change of mindset.

The mantra among today's intelligentsia has been that there are too many people in the world. Most of my peers believed they were doing themselves and the world a favor not having them. None of my college classmates has a fertility rate of 2.0, the four natural grandchildren that would sustain their genome.

Moreover, the richest countries of the West have been recklessly destroying the concepts of family, clan, tribe and nation that previously supported our regeneration. Quite the opposite. Insisting that we are all one, the elites impose diversity everywhere. They are forcing people of different backgrounds together in workplaces, neighborhoods, schools and indeed everywhere. The pretext is that all peoples are of equal ability and therefore all peoples should be equally represented. Western elites defend this concept vehemently in the face of overwhelming evidence of its falsity. The idealistic concept is that we belong to no family except the family of man. However, we are social animals. We reproduce as gene pools, at the level of family, clan, tribe and nation. Survival of the fittest applies to gene pools, not whole populations.

The obstacles to raising children in America

Whether or not the diverse peoples of the world enjoy this supposed, never-demonstrated equality of ability, the breakdown of family, clan and tribe, and imposition of forced diversity has made raising children in the US and the West a far more difficult project.

1. Parents raising children today are pretty much on their own. They no longer enjoy the traditional support structure of older siblings, aunts and uncles, grandparents, like-minded neighbors, institutions like 4-H and the Boy Scouts, or neighborhood schools in which the teachers really felt like part of the neighborhood.

The elites' theory is that all childcare is equivalent, and that in fact government childcare is better than friends and relatives. They point to studies showing that the health and educational attainment of kids in both environments is more or less the same.

They neglect the fact that parents and relatives care about how the child turns out as a human being. Aunts and uncles will teach a kid to mind his manners. They correct his grammar, encourage him to overcome shyness, or conversely, not to be so dominant and to let the other kids have a chance. They have a genetic interest in socializing the kid to pass on his genes, some of which they share. They want children to be interested in the opposite sex.

Paid day care workers may or may not care for their charges. It is low-paying work and the turnover is high. Only infrequently will a child develop much of a long-term relationship with a day care worker. Paid workers may be inclined to let the kids goof off, watch TV and do whatever they want as long as they are not causing trouble. They see their mission as returning a healthy child to the parents at the end of the day. How they get through the day is not a matter of great concern.

2. People want to be with others of their own kind. Growing up in California, I went to school with Chinese and Jewish kids. Nobody questioned their academic ability, but they did seem to be more comfortable with each other than us HAGVACAS (House and Garden Variety [non-Jewish] Caucasians). The Jewish kids had what seems to me to be a very well-founded apprehension as to whether we Goyim would measure up intellectually. I did not find it strange at all that although Jews were predominant in my college prep classes, the gang I ran with was a bunch of ordinary white kids. We were comfortable together; we were comfortable with each other's parents.

They discriminated in very understandable ways. Chinese, Japanese and Jewish families were often apprehensive about their children dating us. They had a very understandable and justifiable desire to have grandchildren like themselves. However attractive I might have found Vicki Toy or Emmy Gill, they simply were not going to go out with me. Even if they liked me (I'll never know) it could have scandalized their parents.

The upshot was that back in the 1950s we usually dated and married within our own race. Getting along with a person of the opposite sex is hard enough; compounding that with the difficulty of different races and cultures does not make sense. This I discovered the hard way in the '60s when I rebelliously married first a Vietnamese and then a half-Japanese. There is a lot to be said for traditional wisdom. Although my Oriental wives were smart, hard-working and honest, our culturally-defined expectations for marriage were simply different. The generalization that Oriental marriages must be held together by family and social pressure, with well-defined role models, whereas love is the foundation of Western marriage has been true in my life. My Oriental wives neither expected nor offered a loving bond.

3. The most remarked qualities of the other minority groups – those in the columns on the right in Table 1 – are not intelligence, hard work and honesty. While individuals may have those traits, we of the other groups do not impute them to most. I was a private school parent, trustee and later a teacher. I observed that the "minority kids" – by that they didn't mean Asians and Jews – tended to be disruptive and disinterested in study. Everybody saw it and everybody was conditioned to studiously ignore it.

Private schools have a tremendous advantage in that they can suspend and expel students. Minority kids experienced more such discipline than the others. However, the fact that their parents wanted them to be in these schools, to take advantage of the scholarships and get a leg up in life, and gave the administration a fair amount of leverage in dealing with the kids. Between the schools' overlooking certain behaviors and the parents' disciplining their young, it more or less worked. The schools were quite careful not to exceed what Malcolm Gladwell calls the "tipping point." If the school was more than 15% minority or a class more than about 30%, it was very difficult to control. Though the administrators were careful never to articulate it – some truths cannot be uttered - those seem to have been more or less their admissions objectives.

Classroom instruction proceeds at the pace of the 20th percentile student, more or less. The teacher has to ensure that most of the kids absorb the instruction. Needless to say, consciously admitting less competent students into the mixture slows a class down. In aggregate, these kids slow the whole system down. It results in "dumbing down" admissions standards, curricular materials, textbooks, examinations and graduation requirements. Some systems cope better than others. Catholic schools and the KIPP schools have a markedly better record of educating minority students than the public schools. Nevertheless, none of them can be as rigorous as the top public schools of yesteryear: Stuyvesant High, Bronx High School of Science, New Trier High School, or my own El Cerrito High School in the shadow of UC Berkeley. In summary, forcing diversity into public schools has lowered standards and hence the academic achievement of the more talented students. It could not be otherwise.

People prefer to be among others of their kind. They feel safe and comfortable in neighborhoods of people like themselves. There is a simple and fairly well borne out expectation that your neighbors will see things the way you do. If your kids are in schools with others like them, be they Chinese, Latino or white, the teachers have a somewhat narrower range of talents to deal with. To the extent the children are interested in learning, the teacher can teach. They don't have the stress of intergroup tensions.

4. It is logical that populations self-segregate to be in neighborhoods and in schools of similar people. The rich segregate by moving where they want and the poor are segregated by default – they are left behind. The rich in America have tended to pay high prices for houses a long way from the city center, enduring long commutes, so their kids can be safe and well educated.

Progressives see this as "white privilege" and have done everything they could to dismantle it. The courts imposed regimes of forced busing to achieve racial balance. They have

replaced local funding with statewide and even federal funding to ensure that all schools have more or less the same amount of money per student. The United States has long forbidden discrimination in both rentals and home sales. The Obama administration is implementing a "Small-Area Fair Market Rents" (SAFMR) program with the explicit objective of injecting low income minorities into rich neighborhoods. They want to make it impossible for anybody in America to avoid diversity. Obama is forcing Syrian refugees into unwilling communities in Maine, Vermont, Montana and other overwhelmingly white states.

It takes fair amount of money to live in a community of like-minded people. Nevertheless, sending your children to school in such a community still subjects them to the universally "dumbed-down" textbooks and curriculum, and to mediocre, highly indoctrinated graduates of education schools. The teachers are paid to deliver academic instruction. Their mission is to create homogeneity out of diversity. They absolutely will not want to bring your children into the traditions of family, clan, tribe and nation. While it would be possible under some circumstances to raise a successful family in the United States – kids that could earn a living, find a mate, and give me grandchildren who carry on my values – it does not look terribly likely. Eastern Europe looks like a better bet.

Social Capital in Ukraine

Ukraine is tough. It had the bloodiest 20th century history of any country. During the 21st it has suffered the depredations of rapacious presidents and oligarchs and a not-so-covert invasion by Russia. Yet it survives.

The travail it has suffered has protected Ukraine. Nobody wants to come here. There are very few Arabs and Africans. Most of the Jews left for the United States a century ago. Chinese come for business but they don't stay. The Gypsies have figured out that the West offers much easier pickings; those who remain in our neighborhood seem - out of fear or lack of opportunity - to make their money honestly. A smattering of long-resident Muslims from the 'Stans dominate the dried fruit and spice stands in the local markets. Though such people just pulled off the suicide bombing in the Istanbul airport, they don't do it here. No grievances.

In Robert Putnam's words, there is a lot of social capital here. Young people give old people (me) and children (my son) seats on the Metro. Any of us will stand up to give a seat to a pregnant lady. The old ladies in the market stalls love to talk with my son. They are proud that he will be a Ukrainian.

Families take care of each other. The promise of pensions collapsed with the Soviet Union. Most pensioners get a bit over \$100 per month. Healthcare is free, but it is minimal and doesn't cover prescription drugs. Old people usually get help from their families. Grandmothers, in turn, are very good about watching grandchildren as their daughters work. There is, of course, the usual bickering between mother and daughter, husband and wife, parents and children. But when all is said and done, and even through divorce, they remain family.

The Coming Chaos in the West

Pippa Malmgren titled her wonderful book "Signals." A person has to read the newspaper, listen to the news, then deduce what is likely to happen and protect himself.

The West has very high levels of unemployment. Southern EU countries have unemployment in excess of 20%, youth unemployment over 50%. In the United States, although the reported unemployment rate is under 5%, it is actually around 25%. It is a question of lying with statistics. A larger number of people work at less-than-full-time jobs with no benefits. Senior citizens such as myself often have the best of jobs and hang onto them for dear life, the result of which is that employment is actually falling among the 25 to 54 year old group, the people who should be building families and saving for retirement.

At the other end, the young people entering the workforce have poorer educations, poorer work habits, and come increasingly from the minority groups in the right-hand columns of Table 1. The people who retire are not whatsoever being replaced one for one. Most young people are already redundant when and if they enter the workforce: machines can work more cheaply than they can.

Society has been rich enough to support these people despite their lack of productivity. An irony of the 21st century is that America's poor are becoming obese and obsessed with gimmicks like iPhones at the same time that they bring less and less to the country's economy. The United States government has bought peace by funneling them money through student loans, disability, welfare and other channels. Up to now, despite the Federal Reserve having extraordinarily expanded the money supply since the financial crisis, there is no inflation. The rest of the world has been willing to take American dollars and buy United States bonds.

This regime is collapsing as I write in July 2016. Foreigners are selling our bonds. The stock market is wavering, propped up only by increasingly frantic government buying via public open market operations (POMO) in the United States and similar programs in Japan and the European Union. The pundits are joking that we are entering communism via the back door: governments are printing money to buy overpriced stocks that investors refuse. When inflation eventually hits, as it must, the benefits that are being paid to the unproductive via government transfers will rapidly lose their value. Already the press is rife with stories of "helicopter money" that will be delivered to give people enough to live on. It will not, can not be enough.

The people being affected are the most impulsive, least rational elements of society. I went to the Watts section of Los Angeles in 1965 carrying a gun to put down an insurrection brought on by the arrest of a drunk driver. I did the same in the Hunters Point section of San Francisco in 1966. The world has seen them again in the Rodney King riots in Los Angeles, the Ferguson riots in St. Louis, and the Baltimore riots in 2015. Trouble simmers again in the summer of 2016 despite all of the transfer payments intended to placate the poor. When inflation hits and the transfer payments lose their potency, there will be trouble in the streets.

Western Europe is undergoing the same kind of problems, probably worse. Demographic pressure – see Table 1 again – is sending millions of African and Muslim immigrants to Europe. They have little education and little aptitude, even if there were jobs. But there aren't. Most of them remain on public welfare for years after arriving, and relatively few even master European languages. It is

becoming increasingly impossible to buy peace. Europe has no use for these people, but there is no place to send them back to. It is a pressure cooker waiting to explode.

Ukraine the Tranquil

The level of corruption in Ukraine is huge and well documented. As noted above, it has discouraged the riffraff from coming. It is a sanitary type of corruption in the sense that it is so open that the lies are transparent, pro forma. Ukrainian corruption survives without the myths of diversity or "public safety." Ukrainians do not like it, but they can see it for what it is and openly talk about what they see. Ukraine enjoys a higher level of free speech than the United States. Political correctness will not cost you your job. I expect that some readers are uncomfortable with what I write here, out of a sense that the topics are off-limits more than that I might be wrong.

Ukraine is a white nation surrounded on the south, east, north and west by other white nations. Those to the west, Poland, Slovakia and Hungary, are strenuously resisting pressure from the EU to accept asylum-seekers. Having so recently and so precariously obtained its freedom, Ukraine is rather unabashedly xenophobic. It does not want them. It is well buffered from a demographic crisis.

There is a nasty little war going on with Russia, one which has cost close to 10,000 lives already. Although it certainly could, Russia does not appear ready to move on the rest of Ukraine. The country would resist, and Russia would lose materially and in world opinion without gaining useful resources. The political risk of living in Ukraine seems acceptable. An added benefit for a foreigner is that the war with Russia has made Ukraine an incredibly cheap place to live.

Ukraine has long been known for having the world's best soil – its "black earth," exceeding even Argentina's pampas. The soil has not been degraded by overuse. It is well-watered by an extensive river system. Global warming would only improve the weather. With a falling population, the country can easily feed itself.

Conclusion

Troubled times are coming to the West. The economies are collapsing and there will be civil disturbances. Western society has changed to the point that it is almost impossible to raise children with traditional values. The West simply cannot do what any breeding population must: raise succeeding generations as numerous and fit to survive as the previous.

Ukraine is not ideal, but it appears to be the most likely place on earth to raise children who will be successful in the latter half of the 21st century. Others assure me that all countries along the Baltic-Black Sea corridor are more attractive than the West. Having children is a gamble in any time or place. I am making my gamble in Eastern Europe.