

Introduction

I notice that I consistently hold views which are opposed to those of most polite people I know. These include my ex-wife and a couple of my children, absolutely everybody I still know from Reed College, and friends and acquaintances throughout life.

In my opinion, my views are based on the best evidence of science and human nature. They are only logical. However, the people who hold contrary views cling doggedly to the belief that their views are supported by science, and that my views are a reflection of ignorance, bigotry, suspect religious beliefs, and an ill-natured desire simply to feel better than other people. Since arguing with me is beneath contempt, they rarely stoop to defending their opinions against an unworthy person such as they suppose me to be.

The differences are often cast as political: liberal versus conservative. Although I am generally conservative, most of the views I express here should not have much to do with politics. I prefer to characterize myself as a realist and people who disagree with me as The Anointed, burrowing from the title of Thomas Sowell's "The Vision Of The Anointed: Self-Congratulation As A Basis For Social Policy." I find the appellation of "The Anointed" to be quite appropriate given their general tendency to regard my views is not only misguided but immoral, whereas they take their own to be enlightened, modern and moral. Moreover, they see their own views as so morally sound that they need not be subjected to logical scrutiny.

Odd man out

I find that my opinions fit together fairly well into a worldview. Every worldview must of course contain contradictions, points on which an adversary can claim a gotcha because one position is inconsistent with another. The Anointed worldview is absolutely teeming with such gotchas, however, the conscience of The Anointed is usually quite adept at ignoring them and condemning my motives for even wanting to point them out. They are generally, happily oblivious.

It is a part of the nature of The Anointed to blame every observed phenomenon which is inconsistent with their cosmology on some malign force. If it is a person, they look for a developmental flaw in childhood or a deficiency in either morals or intellect. The Anointed quiver is stocked with a standard issue of arrows to shoot at people who disagree with them. They generally condemn me as a conservative as if that explained everything. They proceed from the label of conservative to the label of Republican, as if they were synonymous. Those of a Marxist persuasion call me a capitalist. Straight and white Anglo-Saxon male goes without saying. They are quick to claim that my motives are evil and self-serving, whereas theirs are noble and selfless.

For all these reasons I think it is important to lay out an entire map of my worldview, indicating how the various points within it agree with one another, and demonstrating that it is based on science, logic and

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

a set of beliefs about human nature which antedate liberalism and have certainly never been convincingly disproven.

Darwinian evolution is at the heart of my worldview. It astounds me how many of the notions which oppose themselves to my worldview will not withstand any Darwinian analysis. Simply put, at best many modern trends and belief systems lead to evolutionary dead ends. People holding those views will die out, fail to reproduce themselves. Modern explanations of sexual and racial phenomena do not reflect anything that could have evolved by Darwinian means. My critics are absolutely blind to their own creationist beliefs and the unexamined tenets of their own secular religion as they happily condemn red state Neanderthals who want to teach intelligent design in school.

What is in it for me seeking the truth? It would be awfully convenient just to go along. If one is born into a Muslim society it is convenient to believe that Christians are indeed infidels who may comfortably be treated as second-class citizens. If one is born into an Evangelical family, it is comfortable to believe that the Bible is the received word of God and that it is literally true. And, if one is on the campus of an American university, it is comfortable to believe that the differences between men and women, gays and straights, or among the races of the world are entirely social constructs. Naturally, each of these in groups vehemently attacks the beliefs of the others as misguided at best, and probably evil, and often just idiotic. My constellation of beliefs puts me at odds with almost every organized group, leaving me the odd man out. Why do I subject myself to the abuse? Why can't I just be like everybody else and accept the dogmas of the age and place?

First, I note that the dogmas of 2012 are almost all at odds with the reigning dogmas of half a century ago, 1962. I fully expect they will continue to evolve and that several will come full circle. Secondly, I believe that many of the dogmas of this age are corrosive, antithetical to the interests of society in general and my children in particular. I am the odd man out in this generation in believing that passing on my genetic and cultural heritage to children, grandchildren and beyond is our highest calling.

My core values

This bears emphasis. **It is my belief in perpetuating my seed and my culture which sets me apart from most of my generation.** I hold this belief as an a priori, like a commandment from God. It is consistent with the biblical command to be fruitful and multiply as well as the evolutionary principle of survival of the fittest. My seed will survive if I want it to happen and if I am strong enough to make it happen.

This belief that the interests of seed and culture, ie, my family and my society, supercede that of me as an individual is at odds with most of the manifestations of individualism, setting the individual above society, which dominate modern thinking. To those who don't share my belief, the most I can do is to say is that we disagree, and ask for mutual respect. I'll respect your belief that your arrival on earth was a random, meaningless event and that the highest use you can make of such an accident is to enjoy yourself to the max. Let us agree to be civil and not get into each others' way.

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

In common with the existentialists, the Scottish philosophes and the Greeks, I have a tragic worldview. People are full of self-delusion. We can be loving and altruistic, but are in equal parts selfish, cold and cruel. We can be startlingly individualistic, but we are generally herd creatures. Humans suffer from the lottery winner syndrome. We soon adjust to whatever good fortune comes our way and build it into our plans for the future, but we never plan adequately for the downside. Attempts by the government to improve the lot of the people are doomed to failure. They expand the ranks of bureaucrats and the power of individual politicians. The rents they create (using the economists' definition), taking from one party of citizens to give to another, inevitably come to be both essential and unsustainable.

Those few countries happy enough not to disappear in defeat at the hands of an external enemy have generally collapsed from having promised more than they could deliver. Rome did. Argentina has done it several times in our lifetime, wiping out citizens' pensions and savings as they went. The fall of the USSR likewise bankrupted its citizens. Greece is in the process of doing so: buyers of Greek bonds have taken a haircut, and civil servants will get less salary, retired people less pension than promised in Euro buying power. The United States and Western Europe have promised an abundant lifestyle to all citizens regardless of their ability to contribute to the society. Inevitably, the takers have come to outnumber the givers, and it is increasingly clear that the imbalance will result in massive default or devaluation. I think a clear view of human nature, and of history, is essential at this point in history.

The equation is always the same. Much has been written about it; I address irrationality below in my section on religion. Politicians buy current votes with future promises. Business people buy current labor peace with promises of future healthcare and pensions. Governments borrow for massive infrastructure projects that they contract to political supporters. In every case, when the bill comes due, those politicians are long gone and the common people are stuck with the bill. If their backs are to the wall, they may revolt and leave the bondholders holding the bag.

I expect that my children will come of age under straitened economic circumstances. The United States and Western Europe will have experienced massive inflation. Because women today are having fewer children, there have to be fewer young people entering the workforce when my children do. Because the most intelligent people in society are having the fewest children, I expect that my kids will not have as difficult of a time competing for challenging jobs, especially if they do turn out to be intelligent and have good qualifications.

I don't want my kids to be burdened with today's illusions about people and about the labor market. For one example, if affirmative action has survived and has reached Ukraine, they need to understand what it is and how it works. They need to understand how and why Jews see themselves as different from them, perhaps threatened by them, and what if anything that implies. They need to know how to interpret what they see, when to speak and when to shut up about it. They need to know the difference between bravely saying that the emperor has no clothes and being foolhardy. I no longer need a job – I can afford to be a bit foolhardy, as I am doing now.

Sex

Sex evolved for procreation, not for fun

Here's a radical Darwinian notion. Sex and gender roles evolved under a regime of survival of the fittest. Fun and fairness had nothing to do with it.

There is no evolutionary reason to imagine that men and women evolved with comparable sex drives. They have different biological imperatives. The man's biological imperative is to sow his seed as widely as possible. The champion in this regard was Genghis Khan, who had thousands of children. His DNA appears in eight percent of the males in the area comprising his former realm. Reproductive success for a woman is limited by the number of children she can bear and rear to maturity, perhaps 10 at the outside. Being picky is essential to being successful. A woman should prefer men with the right genetic stuff and with enough in their wallet to ensure that the kids reach adulthood.

It should not be a surprise that males of our species evolved to look for sex more or less any time with more or less any female partner able to conceive and bear his child. Women seek sex when they have a man who has all the right traits and they are ready to conceive. They accept sex, yielding to the man's primal drives, when it suits them, bringing material goods, protection, or fortifying the relationship with the kids' father. Under worse circumstances, rape is preferable to death. All women are quite ready to turn sex down when there is nothing in it for them. The consequence is that most men do not get as much sex as they would like. Hugh Hefner, Wilt Chamberlain and Tiger Woods are the exceptions.

Men evolved to be possessive. The male could never be positive, prior to DNA testing, of paternity. A man naturally wants to ensure the survival of his own genome. In nature it is quite brutal: the males of many species kill offspring sired by other males when they get control over a new female. Women evolved to be possessive because they need protection and material support while raising children. The degree of possessiveness varies among societies. In tribal societies where everybody is closely interrelated, it they just try to keep sex within the tribe. When exogamy is the practice, possessiveness is stronger. A guy don't want to be raising the milkman's kids.

Sex as a sport could only fully emerge when there was enough leisure time that it could be indulged. This was the case in classical Greece and Rome¹, and it has increasingly become the case in the last two centuries in the West, first among the moneyed classes and now among the hoi polloi as well.

Of course sex feels good; otherwise our animal ancestors would not have bothered with reproduction. Among humans it is also a status thing. Being with a beautiful woman is more of a status symbol than driving a Rolls-Royce. Any fool with money can buy the car, but winning an attractive woman requires intelligence, charm, and usually money as well.

¹ See "Full Circle" by Ferdinand Mount

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

The observation with me that women use sex to entice men to give them what they want is not new with me. Freakonomics reports about prostitution even in monkeys. Prostitution would not exist if women's sex drive equaled that of men - they would be doing it for fun. Paid sex is rare in places such as college campuses where liberated women are relatively available.

Now a little thought experiment. If (1) women have traditionally used sex to get what they want from men, but (2) now that they have their own careers and can provide for their own needs, (3) what do you suppose happens to women's general willingness to "put out" to satisfy men? Logic says it should go down.

Marital rape entered the statutes as a crime within the last few decades. Previously men could just demand sex of their partners. The stories of drunken men coming home and overpowering their wives certainly have some substance. Now that women are on an equal footing, legally and financially, those guys are going to be hurting for sex unless they can develop a bit of subtlety and savoir faire, two qualities beyond the capability of many men.

Other factors affect women's drive. They feel most like sex during ovulation. On the flip side, many find sex during their period not only messy but unenjoyable. Many are not so keen just before and after, either. Pregnancy gets in the way in more ways than one. Delivering a baby stretches things all out of shape, and feeding a baby takes a lot of energy and costs a lot of sleep. It is months after delivery before she can derive any enjoyment from sex. Her headaches and moods are very real things. Sometimes a woman "just doesn't feel like it" for reasons that are valid enough to her but incomprehensible to her partner.

So, the most normal of women much of the time simply aren't up to having sex. A guy has to get used to this idea. Girls are different. Guys encounter cognitive dissonance when the message we get from popular culture is that we should be getting sex on a regular basis, but it isn't happening. We can feel cheated. "Everybody else is getting laid - why not me?" and feel inadequate in ourselves or blame our woman.

Even at that blissful moment when the stars are in alignment, the smell of roses wafts gently through the bedroom, Johnny Mathis sings imploringly from the music machine, dinner has been wonderful and to her you are the only man on earth, she still wants things her way. Slowly, slowly. Put your hand here, not there. Don't kiss too eagerly or roughly. Put the pillow here. Wait, wait.... She makes the moment perfect for herself, and if you are lucky, you too. Her satisfaction is so complete that it may last several days. As she will remind you in two hours, when you are raring to go again.

In the final analysis, the pleasure of heterosexual sex is the pleasure of giving more than receiving. It is the pleasure of being with a satisfied woman. If you are fortunate she will say as much and show affection, which boosts your self esteem immeasurably. But if you are simply looking for fireworks to go off when you climax, my unexplored hypothesis is that gays probably have more to offer.

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

It used to be different. Chastity was the norm not only for priests but for unmarried folk of both sexes. Not having sex was not perceived as abnormal. Doris Day sang "Love and marriage go together like a horse and carriage... you can't have one without the other." You needed to get married.

After that, the Bible taught that "The wife's body does not belong to her alone but also to her husband. In the same way, the husband's body does not belong to him alone but also to his wife." She was expected to please him, whatever her own desire. People married to have children; sex for that purpose is seen differently than sex simply for pleasure. However, other outlets, such as a mistress or discreet visits to a bordello, would not ruin a man or a marriage if found out.

Friends have noted that there are women in Western society who are sexually aggressive. The illusive "cougar" of porn-site reknown. A survey of the sex scene cannot ignore them. They are liberated women, setting their own agenda. As an instance, one such invited me to Argentina on a moment's notice because she needed a Spanish speaker to negotiate a real estate deal. That we would share a bed was understood. I had to turn the offer down because my passport was being renewed, but the incident certainly gave me some food for thought. I assume she wanted sex. Quite clearly she wanted no strings attached. She surely didn't want to have kids. Friends tell me of barroom come-ons from women who complain that their husbands and lovers just don't do it for them. So, let me then be clear that women are not always hard to get. I'll stick with my observation that when you do get them, they generally want it their way.

Sex itself has been a victim of our modern dogma of total equality between the sexes. Though we have made the sexes hypothetically equal in all ways, the actuality has not changed much. The upshot is that while expectations are higher, the incentive for women to offer heterosexual sex is lower than in times past. Far fewer people even want sex for procreation. Some guys succeed handsomely in this brave new world, but a vast number of hetero men simply park themselves in front of the TV or video console, pork up, and forget about any sex but cybersex. More and more decide they are gay. Being homosexual has become accepted, and in some cases fashionable. It hardly seems surprising that more guys take that option. Women also take the gay option; it frees them from any demands on their bodies by smelly men. And it is the children who suffer. They don't get born.

Men and women are different and evolved to fill different roles in family and society

Sarah Blaffer Hrdy is the reigning expert evolutionary biologist in the realm of mothers and children. Her book "Mother Nature" addresses all the ways in which mothers and children have adapted to each other over evolutionary history. Human babies are unique in being born fat because human mothers are unique in having the ability to abandon them without severe emotional pain in their first week of life. The baby needs to be able to survive until her milk comes in and she accepts him. Unlike any other baby ape, they are also cute and cuddly so they will win her heart and she won't abandon them.

Babies are attuned to their mothers' high-pitched voices, body smells, touch and manner. They also learn about daddies along the way, but they know mom is where the food is. Mothers are attuned to the

babies' high-pitched cries. Whereas fathers easily sleep through the night with a baby in the room, mothers wake up when the babies need them. Or even when I just want them. These are a few of the many ways in which mothers and babies coevolved.

When my babies have been hungry, they have been happy to take a bottle from daddy. When they need entertainment or patching up one way or another, they will accept attention from daddy if mommy isn't around. But mommy is always their first choice. This doesn't hurt my feelings – it is how evolution created us, or if you prefer, how God made us. On this question there is not an iota of difference between what a Christian fundamentalist or a Darwinist would believe. The interesting question is how gays and feminists managed to come up with a competing worldview without the support of either.

Sexual Orientation Is Largely a Matter of Choice.

John B. Calhoun² discovered that rats and mice raised in a rodent paradise, ample food and places to nest, were consistently able to turn it into a hell simply by virtue of their overcrowding. Just being with so many other rats/mice overwhelmed their socialization mechanisms. Individual rats became withdrawn, narcissistic, or violent. All, however, became sexually dysfunctional. At first they turned hypersexual and homosexual, then later predominately asexual. Mothers abandoned broods. Most amazingly, their socialization mechanisms were so shattered that even when populations fell to sustainable levels, they were no longer normal enough to sustain themselves. They died out. I think this research has bearing on human sexuality.

Twin studies are the gold standard in distinguishing between environmental and hereditary traits. Specifically, identical twins raised apart, where the twins share 100 percent of their genome and only a small and unpredictable portion of their environment.

Wikipedia offers a fairly complete summary of twin studies regarding homosexuality: Google "Biology and sexual orientation." Although gays have been striving mightily for two decades to find something like a "gay gene" that would account for homosexuality, the bottom line is that researchers still consider environment to be more important, probably far more important, than heredity in determining sexual orientation. They say heredity is even less of a factor among women than men. Crudely put, what's an ugly women to do?

This makes intuitive sense. Even in the dark old days we knew that male homosexuality was a matter of opportunity. In surroundings like prisons, English boarding schools, the British Navy or ancient Greek armies there simply weren't any women, so the men often made do with each other. Sometimes being gay is a matter of childhood experience. Women who were abused as children are much more likely to become lesbians. Men who were sexually abused by other men are also statistically more likely to become homosexual.

² Google "john b calhoun will wiles"

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

Going out on a limb with only my own anecdotal observations to guide me, I believe that homosexuality has become much more prevalent in the United States during my lifetime. My guess is that it is due to the fact that it is much more acceptable now than it was previously, and that feminism has made access to women quite a bit more problematic. If women are not worth the hassle, what is your alternative? I am quick to say I can't cite any research on the subject, but I will be equally quick to propose that this is not an unconscionable field for research (though I wonder if it could ever get funded!). Society has an interest in this. Any society depends on rising generations to provide taxpayers and perhaps soldiers, and a gay citizenry is by and large, with the exception of people who show up on Oprah, not going to be bearing and socializing the next generation.

One of the hardest things for young man to do is to learn how to connect with women. Women think differently, act differently, have different interests... they're a very different kind of creature than men. Societies throughout history have had elaborate socialization rituals to acquaint men and women with how the other sex works. Such socialization was essential to founding families, and founding families was essential to the perpetuation of the society. They taught me how to ask a girl to dance, and not to wear boots, in "social dance" at Castro Elementary in the '50s. This was followed by sock hops at Portola Junior High and proms at El Cerrito High School.

We have stopped the socialization process. Schools teach children that all sexual orientations are equally valid, and they no longer make any effort to teach men and women how to get along with each other. They teach the minutiae of how sexual organs work, but they leave it to boys and girls to figure out for themselves how to get along with one another.

It is safe to say that homosexual and straight men display a similar lack of selectivity when it comes to choosing partners. Any port in a storm. There is no analog to the gay bathhouse or the bordello for satisfying horny women. Homosexual men are quite aggressive in seeking sex with boys and young men. You rarely see young women working hard to get sex from men. It comes without their asking. So, confused young male virgins, in other words the majority, are susceptible to taking candy from gay strangers seeking to deflower them. Their public school indoctrination that being gay is normal, natural, and innate could be expected to lead some guys to think that they just might be gay, it might be okay, and to give in to some old satyr. On the other side, the number of girls actively seeking to deflower young men remains (for the guys, surely) disappointingly small. Musings like this went through my mind 50 years ago when gay guys came on to me with some regularity. I can hardly believe they have backed off now that being gay has become fashionable, featured on TV as cooler than being a clueless straight guy.

My bottom line on this is that people with a religious orientation, or who just want normal sons and the possibility of grandchildren, are absolutely right to be concerned about the way sex is presented in the public schools. Their reaction of shock, or more likely plain disgust, to the antics of the more outrageous gay activists is likely founded in a real assessment of the danger they pose to a society that they value. If, of course, they are still among the naïve who value anything in American society. In any case, blatant and unwanted discussion of sex by people of any orientation is rather off-putting. A number of sex acts,

once considered deviant and not discussed, are now taken to be normal. The creator of "Two and a Half Men," hardly a prude, recently got in trouble with the feminist establishment for saying "we're approaching peak vagina on television, the point of labia saturation." Add the factor of homosexuality and you have really nauseated and old-school characters like me. I am certain that many activists want to do exactly that, to egregiously offend me. They manage. I am unapologetic about being square.

Gay activism is one of the many currents in modern society which is vigorously watering the seeds of destruction which are inherent in classic liberalism. I liked the liberalism of my youth and will miss it.

Situation of women

Every sexual species, plant and animal, exhibits dimorphism. The females and males are different not only in the matter of sex organs but almost always in behavior. Documenting this fact is among the crimes that has put sociobiology on liberal blacklists since the publication of the book by that title in 1975 by EO Wilson. As is typically the case with issues which ruffle feathers, upsetting the worldview of the folk whom Thomas Sowell calls "The Anointed," they have vehemently attacked the sociobiologists while making scant effort to create a body of science which would refute them. To steal from Wikipedia, "In one incident, [one of them] poured a pitcher of water on Wilson's head and chanted 'Wilson, you're all wet.'" Wilson later spoke of the incident as a source of pride: 'I believe...I was the only scientist in modern times to be physically attacked for an idea.' The Anointed have not produced an iota of science to refute Wilson with regard to either sex or race. Sociobiology is now mainstream science.

The behavior of the males and females of every species has evolved to serve the genetic interests of those males and females. Sociobiology has demonstrated that each sex has its own genetic interests and distinct genetic strategies. Sauce for the goose is not always sauce for the gander. In the broadest of terms, among mammals it is in the interest of the male to impregnate as many females as possible whereas it is in the interests of the female to see her few offspring arrive at adulthood. It is in the reproductive interest of a man to philander. It is in the reproductive interest of a woman to monopolize her man and have him invest all his energies in her offspring.

The traditional female virtues celebrated in song and rhyme of coyness, chastity, tenderness and sympathy were all clearly directed to this end. Likewise the traditional male virtues of manliness, that is, willingness to defend family, clan, tribe and nation, and the willingness to work hard to support a family. The balance among these characteristics has evolved somewhat over time³ but they remained reasonably constant during the transition from Stone Age hunter-gatherer societies through agricultural societies and even early industrial societies. They served the interests of the species well – the population of Homo sapiens mushroomed.

The fundamental difference in the modern era is that most people have abandoned the beliefs that the society to which they belong merits perpetuation, or that they have any obligation to perpetuate their

³ See Carl Zimmerman's "Family and Civilization"

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

own genome. Quite the converse: the northern European virtues of altruism and self-criticism have evolved to the point that many believe our society has become cancerous, too successful, and is unworthy of perpetuating itself. At the same time people have evolved a belief that the highest calling in life is to enjoy oneself. Multiculturalism, the celebration of the other, often winds up crediting that other with greater wisdom and virtue than ourselves. Witness the tendency among the young to seek salvation in Zen and Indian religions and even Carlos Castaneda's primitive American beliefs rather than their own cultural heritage of Christianity.

Denying the obligation to perpetuate society or even one's own seed liberates an individual from moral constraints. Since no posterity depends on them, they can do whatever they want in their lives, especially their sex lives. Individuality trumps everything. If you have no obligation to procreate, you might as well be homosexual – it certainly spares you the problem of learning about the other sex, and it provides the opportunity for a lot more of the pleasurable activity of making love.

The inventiveness of mankind – read men, because women didn't have much to do with the inventions – has loosened the constraints on both sexes, but especially women. In particular:

- Women are more mobile. In the era of horses, men did most of the riding and driving. Women have been empowered – they can get around as easily as men.
- Because machine power has replaced manpower, more occupations are open to women. They can fill roles in manufacturing, distributional, and agriculture that previously required a man's physical strength.
- Women can compete equally now that paperwork has become more important than physical labor. With some minor exceptions noted below, women's intellect appears to be fully comparable with that of men.
- The modern paper oriented workplace is better adapted to women's temperaments than to men's. Women do better sitting in a cubicle, physically inactive, doing repetitive work while putting up with a demanding boss. They thrive in bureaucracies better than men do.
- Women appear to have a more modest assessment of their own ability than men. They keep their egos in check. This appears to be an asset in certain fields such as investing. We have yet to see a woman named as a major rogue trader, like Nick Leeson who brought down Barings Bank, or as a major Ponzi scheme initiator like Bernie Madoff or Bernie Cornfield.

Conversely, women do not seem to have the same level of entrepreneurial spark as men. We do not see women counterparts of the wildly, incredibly driven Silicon Valley entrepreneurs like Steve Jobs, Larry Ellison, Bill Joy, Larry Page, Sergei Brin, Craig Venter, Bill Gates or Mark Zuckerberg. Women seem to emerge as competent, reliable managers once the businesses become somewhat stable, like Meg Whitman at eBay.

Likewise, as Larry Summers accurately noted at the cost of his job as president of Harvard, women less frequently have the right stuff to be at the top of the field in hard sciences such as mathematics and physics. The intelligence distribution for men is flatter than women – heavier with idiots on the left

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

extreme, and heavier with genius on the right extreme of the bell curve. The science is well established⁴. Although many people reject these findings because they don't like their implications, there has been no serious science to refute them.

I share the general sense that countries become less belligerent as women gain power in the legislature. However, women who have become leaders of state in their own right, as opposed to women who inherited the role from their husbands, can be pretty tough. Think of the wartime prime ministers Golda Meir and Margaret Thatcher.

Women have emerged as men's equals in almost every sphere of life. In most of them they can match men's performance, and in those where they can't, they can make enough of a stink that they get their way in any case. In control of their professional lives, they are able to assert control as well over their sex lives.

Women's self-sufficiency has had a dramatic impact on men. Just being a guy is no longer enough. Women don't need men for support or protection, and therefore don't have to put up with sex when they don't feel like it. Though the song may say "There ain't nothin' like a dame," guys are experimenting with every conceivable alternative. In the modern rat maze, women themselves have just become too damn difficult.

Heredity

The theories of heredity and evolution are inextricably bound to one another. For the most part, animals breed true. Sheep give birth to sheep, dogs give birth to dogs, and people give birth to people. More particularly, Shropshires give birth to Shropshires, Dalmatians give birth to the Dalmatians, and Chinese couples give birth to Chinese.

Heredity is not limited to physical characteristics. When you breed two fox terriers, not only do you get something that looks like a fox terrier, but it has the personality of a fox terrier rather than a St. Bernard or in Newfoundland. Among humans, temperament is likewise heritable. If it were not, it would not make sense to talk about stoic Norwegians, intelligent Jews or inscrutable Japanese. Yet, these stereotypes exist in the common mind, their reality has been confirmed by social scientists, and in many cases genes have been found which are associated with these heritable personality traits.

Species evolve step-by-step. Offspring that differ radically from their parents are very rarely viable. What we see is a succession of forms in which each generation differs only very little from its parents. In fact, on average the offspring born into a new generation almost exactly resemble the parental generation. What is important is that the offspring differ from one another, and that some individuals have traits which will lead to more reproductive success than others. Men with good looks, intelligence,

⁴ see Earl Hunt's "Human Intelligence," or the more controversial "The g Factor" by Arthur Jensen

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

integrity and physical strength will find more sex partners than ones without those attributes. Over many generations, characteristics which lead to reproductive success will spread throughout a population. Random genetic differences among children result in non-random reproductive success.

Some traits such as the peacock's tail or blue eyes and blond hair, or a slender physique may have evolved just because they are sexually attractive. If blondes have greater success attracting men, unless there is some overwhelming disadvantage to being a slender blonde, there will be more skinny blond babies. I note from personal experience that a slender frame can leave a woman without the strength to carry a squirming baby for very long. However, if she is cute enough there it appears there will be somebody else to help them with the job. Don't argue with success.

Just like every animal in God's creation, human beings have habitats. Each individual and each tribe inhabits a slightly different habitat. Different habitats favor different heritable traits. Among humans, northern climate favor lighter skin, which facilitates production of vitamin D from sunlight and maybe makes a hunter somewhat less visible in a snowy environment. A northern climate likewise favors large bodies and more body fat, as protection from the cold. Hot climates seem to favor slender, hairless physiques with lots of melanin for protection from the sun. These are generalizations; at any rate, there are reasons why evolution might favor one set of physical traits over another.

A lot can happen over a relatively short period of evolutionary history. Just about all of the breeds of dogs we know have come about in the last few hundred years. Likewise the many kinds of peaches and corn we eat, roses we smell, and cotton we wear. When evolution is augmented by planned breeding, a lot of change can happen within a lifetime. Russian scientist Dmitri Belyaev set out in 1959 to breed tame foxes for the fur industry. The breeding strain is now quite tame and has exquisite fur.

Human beings have not, by and large, been subject to selective breeding except to the extent that we select our mates. Our forms have changed somewhat within recorded history. We are bigger and our skulls are a bit thinner for whatever reason. Blue eyes and blonde hair haven't been around much longer than the plow. Our temperament has changed significantly in recent history; we are becoming tamer. Perhaps sociopaths die disproportionately in wars or on the gallows? Steven Pinker's "The Better Angels of our Nature" traces the decline of all kinds of violence among humans: war, riots, murder, rape and even bullying. Though even he doesn't know what to make of it, psychometrician James Flynn has shown that measured IQs rose three percent per generation through the 20th century.

Homo sapiens as a species has evolved incredibly quickly since we first left fossil evidence of our existence, about 200,000 years ago in Africa. About that time our verbal communications evolved into what you might call speech. Our left brains developed the ability to handle symbols and our throats changed radically in order to position the larynx and other vocal apparatus appropriately. Steven Pinker's "The Language Instinct," Robbins Burling's "The Talking Ape" and Philip Lieberman's "Eve Spoke" address this evolution. There is a tremendous amount of interest in the field at the moment; see also John McWhorter, Noam Chomsky, Luigi Cavalli-Sforza, and Nicholas Wade.

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

Modern humans evolved in Africa and did not leave until about 50,000 years ago. Predictably, more genetic diversity remains within Africa than among all of the non-African populations of human beings. Some African peoples, the bushman and the pygmies, are more different from other Africans than those Africans are from us.

Spencer Wells' theory in "The Journey of Man" is that humans left Africa via Sinai and Israel and spread in all directions. Some of them hugged the coast and moved quickly (as these things go) through Indonesia and down to Australia. Getting to Australia required some technological capability in the form of boats or rafts; no land mammals more advanced than marsupials had made the trip since Australia became cut off by oceans 100 million years ago. The ancestors of the aborigines found a continent which human intelligence could quickly dominate. They stayed and dominated. Without pressure to do so, it appears they did not evolve much.

In Wells' account, other groups of humans stayed along the coastline that led to Australia and gradually moved inland into Southeast Asia. Another group went north through the Middle East and eventually into Siberia. Why a tropical species would move into Siberia during an Ice Age takes some explaining. The short answer is meat. There were lots of mammoths (now extinct, thanks to us) and other large mammals up there if you could (1) survive the cold and (2) figure out how to kill them.

This took some ingenuity. There are of course elephant species in Africa, but people didn't hunt them. It was not worth the trouble. There was meat available in smaller, more convenient packages. Besides, elephants and other big animals in Africa had co-evolved with humans. They were wise to us, wary of our traps and snares. In Siberia we caught the mammoths flat-footed, so to speak. They knew nothing of humans. They were soon to learn.

My 7th grade Ukrainian history⁵ features a drawing of a handsome Stone Age family living in a mammoth-bone dwelling. The illustrator may not have known the natural history of the people who created such shelters, but Ukraine is studded with such archeological remains.

Europe and Asia were populated by other species of humans, among them Neanderthal man and the recently discovered hobbit people in Indonesia. Modern humans competed with them for habitat and apparently squeezed them out. Homo sapiens, being smaller than the Neanderthal, requires fewer calories to survive, and being more social and perhaps smarter was more adept at collecting those calories.

Anybody who knows anything about people knows about guys' favorite pastime. Apparently they practiced it with the Neanderthal girls. Recent genetic research cited by Cochran and Harpending indicates that Europeans and Asians – but not most Africans – carry a few percent of Neanderthal genes. They theorize that this introgression (as it is called) resulted in a kind of hybrid vigor.

⁵ Темірова Н Р Історія Україна

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

After thirty millennia, as the mammoths were going extinct and human beings had spread throughout northern Asia and Europe and even spilled over into the Americas via the Bering Strait, the ice age started to come to an end. People moved south, into China and Korea along the Pacific, and into Europe on the Atlantic side. Along the way they learned to hunt smaller animals, all that was left, and learned to fish. They also became observant. They noticed that plants they could eat would grow where somebody had accidentally dropped seeds the year before, and that wild animals which were raised around humans became kind of tame. You didn't have to hunt them.

Agriculture and pastoralism appear to have gotten their start in the Middle East a bit more than 10,000 years ago. DNA studies show that the ideas traveled quicker than the people who came up with them. Europeans adapted the concepts of farming without any accompanying immigration of the people who had invented them.

Meanwhile, back home in Africa over these 50 millennia, not much changed. The climate remained warm, with food available pretty much year-round. Peoples and kingdoms rose and fell, moved and displaced one another as peoples have done throughout history. The Hottentots, Bushmen and tiny pygmies gradually gave way to the Negro people, and tribes such as the Zulu and the towering Watusi (Tutsi) evolved within the Negro peoples.

Evolution of Intelligence

That's a thumbnail natural history of the human race. And out comes the scientific challenge to wishful thinking about race. In the face of all of the changing demands imposed by climates, living conditions and food sources, people did what any animal species would do. We evolved. Geographically separated groups of people evolved differently, to confront the demands posed by different situations. Going back to the point about heredity made above, random genetic differences among individuals within a given generation resulted in non-random reproductive success. Natural selection favored certain sets of genetic traits over others, resulting in differences between families, clans, tribes and races. The separation of the human race into separate races, which had been under way continually in Africa itself, dividing them into the Hottentots, Bushmen, slender Ethiopians and more robust Nigerians, accelerated under the pressure of more rapidly changing conditions outside Africa.

The pace of innovation picked up rapidly, with considerable innovation in stone and bone tools. People developed better flint knives, separable harpoons, and boats. Moving into cold climates, they became pretty good tailors. They learned how to prepare animal skins as clothes, bones as needles and sinews as thread. They learned how to build shelters to keep the weather out and heat in.

Cooperative hunting is a characteristic of every human society. Presumably it took somewhat more planning and coordination to hunt mammoths in a frozen landscape. The hunters would need to construct ambushes or traps and conspire to drive the animals into them.

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

Food storage is a big issue in northern climates. People had to learn how to dry, salt, pickle, freeze and otherwise store provisions for the winter. People had to learn how to plan many months ahead. Calendars and astronomy were of practical importance. They needed to know when the seasons would come.

Agriculture forced additional improvement in planning. Farmers needed to know the exact time to plant seeds, regardless of the weather on that particular day. Societies built astronomical observatories like Stonehenge to precisely determine the seasons. Farmers needed to figure out how much grain to set aside as seed for the coming year. Pastoralists needed to figure out how many head of cattle and sheep their land could support, and how to divvy up common grazing land.

Agriculture quickly led to stored wealth and fixed settlements, in other words, civilization. Civilization imposed huge new intellectual demands on people. Keeping track of stored wealth required reading, writing and arithmetic, all of which emerged somewhat before Abraham's time in Mesopotamia and Egypt. With increasing populations, tribes grew to become kingdoms and kingdoms expanded through conquest to become empires. Running an empire requires a lot of communication. Written laws and written instructions were essential.

Reading and writing posed a new form of intellectual challenge for mankind. As with any activity, some people were better at it than others. Mastering these skills was a strong evolutionary advantage. Witness Joseph and his progeny, who prospered mightily as they kept records for the Pharaoh in Egypt. Traders, accountants and scribes have done better throughout history than mere farmers and hunters.

Psychometricians define the g factor, intelligence, as the measure of ability to get things done in the real world. Intelligence tests typically include first a written measure of verbal intelligence and second, one of mathematical intelligence. In other words, they measure a person's facility with these two skills which were new to mankind only a few thousand years ago, and new to the majority of people in most modern societies within the last millennium.

This is a short story on intelligence. Intelligence is largely the facility to work with reading and writing. People with this facility have had a significant reproductive advantage over people who don't have it. The principle of survival of the fittest would certainly favor the spread of literacy and numeracy in civilized societies. Literacy and numeracy are pretty much the definition of intelligence, so we could say that civilization has rather highly favored more intelligent people.

In their book, "IQ and the Wealth of Nations," psychometricians Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen compiled the results of intelligence tests given in 185 nations over a number of years using a variety of different tests and sample sizes. The results are quite clear.

Northeast Asians – Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans – display the greatest national intelligence. They are followed by the European countries, the northern countries having slightly higher average intelligence

than the southern ones. All of these populations together are similar enough to be considered as a group, one which pretty much corresponds with what we call the first world.

The second tier of nations, ranked by intelligence, includes the Middle East, Latin America and India. As for the third tier – I'm not gonna say it, but you got it. In the broadest of terms the three tiers are separated by 15 IQ points apiece on average: 100, 85 and 70. See more on the measurement of intelligence below.

There is a striking correlation between the regions where intelligence is high and those where literacy has been widespread for a fair period of time. In the first tier countries literacy has been the norm for a few centuries and has been strongly encouraged by culture and families. Although literacy has been present in countries in the second tier – indeed, it evolved in the Middle East – it has not been highly favored for several centuries. The third tier countries simply had no pre-colonial history of literacy or numeracy.

There are exceptions within populations. India is a *mélange* of a vast number of peoples, some of whom such as the Sikhs and Parsees are well above the national average. It is the same among Europeans. Ashkenazi Jews have an average intelligence of about 115, one standard deviation above the norm for Caucasians of the same countries. Cochran and Harpending, in "The 10,000 Year Explosion," their book about mankind's extraordinarily rapid evolution since the dawn of agriculture, associate extraordinary Jewish intelligence with the demand for literacy in the culture. Jews have always been required to read Scripture. As sojourners, they have almost always been required to learn a second language, that of their host country. Often excluded from simple pursuits such as farming, they had to pursue intellectually demanding professions such as trading and finance. The authors hypothesize that some of the genetic diseases endemic to Jewish populations, notably the sphingolipid diseases such as Tay-Sachs, may persist because they favor increased intelligence. Whatever it took to get there, the Jews became the smartest human tribe.

How is intelligence measured?

Most people know that intelligence is distributed according to a Bell curve, the Gaussian distribution. It is worth a few sentences on what that means.

An intelligence test is made up of questions that people can get right or wrong. What percentage of people gets a given question right, discounting for the blind luck factor present in multiple-choice tests, is a measure of the difficulty of the question.

Intelligence is measured on a scale centered at 100. A person with an IQ of 100 is by definition average. Average for what is a relevant question. Practically speaking, 100 equates to average for Caucasian people in the United States and Western Europe. That is the way the convention was established a century ago, and while it may no longer appear fair, the standard has persisted.

Psychometricians use statistical concepts to define how individual people's intelligence is spread out above and below 100. They arbitrarily chose 15 as the standard deviation in the intelligence distribution. So that is the intelligence scale: an average intelligence of 100, and a standard deviation of 15. Having fixed these two parameters, they can assign a number, IQ, to the measurements taken of any individual's intelligence.

Of course, the measured IQ depends on the place and time, what kind of day the test-taker is having, and luck in guessing answers. Statisticians have measures for all of these quibbles as well. A test's reliability is the measure of how well the results cluster if you give similar tests to the same person many times, or the same test one time to similarly intelligent people. Modern intelligence tests are fairly reliable... they have been working at it for a century. Arthur Jensen's "The g Factor" gives a good account of how they are developed.

The Implications of Intelligence

Here's roughly what it means. A person with an intelligence of 115 will have a 50 percent chance of correctly answering a question that five out of six people would be more likely to miss. A person with an IQ of 115 is smarter than five out of six white Americans or Europeans.

The number of people at higher and lower IQ levels falls off rapidly. Among average white folks, one in 50 has an IQ of 130, and fewer than one in 1000 has an IQ of 150. Among Ashkenazi Jews, with an average intelligence of 115, you can expect one in 100 to have an IQ of 150. Although Jews make up only about two percent of the American population, if you extrapolate these numbers out the right-hand reaches of the bell curve, you will conclude that in the very highest reaches of intelligence, 180 or 190, there should be about as many Jews as non-Jews. It is impossible to measure, but empirically it seems to make sense. Jews are vastly overrepresented in the top ranks of entrepreneurs, politicians, lawyers, professors and every other profession that requires exceptional smarts.

Asian-Americans have a higher average income than white Americans. Some of it may be due to hard work, but quite a bit has to do with intelligence. Anybody who has sat next to Asian-American students in school knows that they are smart.

And, dropping down the scale, there are populations within America that do not do as well as white people. I do not wish to invite the charge of racism – it will be made regardless – but I invite anybody to cite serious scientific research refuting the conclusions of books such as "Race, Evolution, and Behavior" by Philippe Rushton, "Race Differences in Intelligence" by Richard Lynn or "The Bell Curve" by Herrnstein and Murray. There are essentially none. You can stay abreast of the argument by googling "mainstream science on intelligence" and tracking the work cited there. The minority viewpoint is articulated in "Intelligence: New Findings and Theoretical Developments". The latter represent the rearguard effort by the academic left, led by Richard E. Nisbett, to downplay differences in intelligence. Reading them, you get a sense of how weak the argument against differences in intelligence really is. It amounts to wishful thinking and concluding that we don't simply have enough evidence. Just like the Tobacco Institute

doesn't think we can yet conclude that smoking causes cancer. Those who don't want to believe simply allow themselves never to be convinced.

Keeping this all on a hypothetical plane, one can easily see that if we were to insist that Jews make up no more than two percent of the lawyers or doctors, it would be patently unfair. It would take us back to the infamous "gentleman's agreement" which restricted Jewish enrollment in the Ivy leagues. Jews are smarter than that, and nobody has made such a proposal. However, similar proposals regarding other races have been enacted into law all over the world. This unfairness disproportionately affects Caucasians. It is an irony that Jews have been a driving force in getting things like this enacted. Because the average Jew is smarter than 98 percent of the minority populations being favored, enforced diversity hasn't had that much impact on them. It has had significant impact on white Americans. Because their edge in intelligence is certainly significant but not as vast, they more often compete with the favored minorities. Kevin MacDonald proposes that Jews may have consciously or unconsciously engineered this "let's you and him fight" situation between whites and minorities to advance their own genetic interests by handicapping the majority population⁶.

Temperament

The measurement of temperament is not nearly as precise as that of intelligence. The Big Five framework of personality traits has emerged as a robust model for understanding the relationship between personality and various academic behaviors. The Big Five factors are openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. It turns out that these factors are heritable, and since race is nothing more than heredity on a large scale, personality or temperament turns out to be associated with race⁷. Moreover, controlled scientific research generally validates the stereotypes that our grandparents held. People are not all the same, and the averages of peoples are also not the same. Philippe Rushton's bibliography in "Race, Evolution and Behavior" provides a pretty good index into the literature.

Differences in intelligence make an immense difference in individual lives and in society

What people do; how they occupy their time

Environment

The Anointed, who assume that they understand better than we, the hoi polloi, are always trying to stampede us into a forced response to some environmental crisis. The crises they imagine usually have some basis in reality. However, if they were as serious as advertised, we would all be dead several times over. Bjorn Lomborg is a Danish scientist who joined a couple of environmental crusades before

⁶ Kevin MacDonald, "A People that shall Dwell Alone," "Separation and its Discontents," and "The Culture of Critique."

⁷ See Geert Hofstede addresses "Cultures and Organizations."

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

catching wise and exposing them a decade ago in "The Skeptical Environmentalist". In my lifetime the crises have included:

- Mutations from the use of atomic power (1950s)
- Songbirds dying out from pesticides -- Silent Spring (1960)
- Smog and air pollution (1960s and 70s)
- Global cooling (1975)
- The population bomb (1980)
- Destruction of the ozone layer (1985)
- Genetically modified foods (1990)
- Acid rain (1980s)
- Depleted aquifers (starting 1970s)

I don't want to say that there is no substance to these fears, only that the crisis mongers who insisted that drastic, immediate action was necessary to save the human race have been wrong time and again. Society has coped reasonably adequately with most of them. Smokestack scrubbers cleaned up acid rain, catalytic converters have greatly cut smog, and the 1987 Montréal protocol on ozone destruction has been very effective.

Other scares turned out not to have much substance. Despite the widespread use of atomic energy we have not become a world of mutants. Eliminating the use of DDT did reduce the pesticide load on birds - and it also resulted in significantly increased human deaths from malaria. Global cooling simply did not happen – the scare mongers had to change their tune quickly to global warming. The population bomb was likewise just that. It bombed. Birthrates in just about every advanced nation have fallen so low that the populations are beginning to drop. In the greatest scientific experiment in the history of the world, half of the world (the New Hemisphere) has widely embraced the use of genetically modified organisms, while the Old World has rejected them. Americans have not exactly been dying in droves.

At the top of the list of today's environmental fears are global warming and massive extinctions. There is a germ of substance in both of the fears. However, they are also characterized by beliefs of religious intensity held by people with almost no understanding of science. People have abandoned a supposedly archaic, primitive, unexamined belief in God for a modern but still thoroughly unexamined belief in Gaia. As Americans have always done, these zealots pursue their beliefs with evangelical fervor, attempting to force them on everybody else. I'm just independent enough to resent somebody else speaking for me, and especially somebody who insists that I shut up when they are doing so.

Global warming

I believe the world is getting warmer. Although the system of worldwide measurements of weather and climate is incredibly complicated, it seems reliable enough that we can draw the conclusion that temperatures are going up. We can certainly conclude that the concentration of greenhouse gases is increasing. We can also conclude that the earth's cloud cover is increasing. Other things, such as the amount of soot in the air and the net reflectivity of ice and snow are harder to measure and compare

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

over time. Some important factors such as wind and ocean currents and changes in land use are extremely hard to measure.

It is certain that measuring climate change is a huge undertaking that requires thousands of people around the world. Collecting the data, purifying it, distributing it and processing it is likewise a vast operation. Paul Edwards' "A Vast Machine" documents the complexities in the operation. He describes all of the inputs that were considered important for modeling up until the time he wrote the book.

Climate change is a highly political operation as well. The International Panel on Climate Change is a UN body. Its existence and its funding depend on the existence of climate change as a global problem. Whether or not they should be advocates, they are perforce advocates of the position that climate change is imminent and dangerous. The IPCC's willingness to fudge the evidence is becoming more and more evident. The East Anglia e-mails indicated that scientists would fudge the data to support their convictions. The IPCC was unconcerned about the totally overblown conclusion in their 2007 report that the Himalayan glaciers would melt by 2035, and they took a couple of years to retract it. They had very partisan people from organizations like Greenpeace editing what were supposed to be scientifically neutral papers. Their high-handed disregard for expert opinion has disenchanted several scientists who chafed working under their umbrella and have come out to denounce them.

In my opinion, the most significant single fault with the IPCC's analysis concerns the factors which they did not include in their model. Most important of these is the effect of solar cycles. Solar radiation increases and decreases cyclically. Actually, there are about five cycles. When they reinforce one another it can result in major increases and decreases in the emission of solar radiation.

Solar radiation, gamma rays, ionizes gases in the Earth's atmosphere. These ions in turn seed clouds, and increased cloud cover results in increased albedo, more solar energy being reflected back out into space and hence a cooler Earth. Thus global warming is at a maximum when solar radiation and hence cloud formation are at a minimum, as it was for the last quarter of the 20th century. Two recent books describe the phenomenon: "Climate Change Reconsidered" by S Fred Singer and others, and "Die Kalte Sonne," by Germans Fritz Vahrenholt and Sebastian Lüning. They not only describe the science of how sun cycles affect global warming, but they document the underhanded, unprincipled and totally unscientific methods by which the UN bureaucrats at the IPCC attempted to muzzle sun cycle researchers and deny them resources to pursue their theories.

The skeptics' conclusion, which I share, is that greenhouse gases (GHG) are increasing and that greenhouse gases contribute to global warming. GHG are, however, only one factor. We hear nothing of the fact that global warming has essentially stopped dead since the year 2000, an observation accounted for by the solar cycle theory but not envisioned it all by the IPCC.

There are many reasons that we should end our dependency on fossil fuels. Extracting hydrocarbons from the earth is an inherently polluting activity. Digging up tar sands and coal totally blight the

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

landscape. Drilling for liquid petroleum and natural gas is less messy, but only by a matter of degree. The more we can decrease our dependency on fossil fuels, the better.

I was a long-time investor in photovoltaic energy. I did not realize what a fool's paradise I had entered. The German government subsidized the industry massively, papering over the inherent inefficiency in solar cells. I got out with a profit, after which I looked quite a bit more deeply into the matter. There are at least three major problems with solar energy. The first is cost: although photovoltaic cells and reflective technologies become cheaper every year, they are still not as cheap as electric power from hydrocarbons or nuclear fuel. The second problem is the daily cycle. Solar only work in the sunshine, and we don't yet have cheap and efficient ways to store electrical energy in great volumes. Third is the space that they take. It takes about 16 square kilometers (6 sq. mi.) of solar devices in desert sun in Ivanpah, Ca. to generate one third of the energy that could be provided by a single nuclear station. However cheaply solar collectors can be made, we just don't have the real estate to deploy them on a massive scale.

Wind farms have a similar issue with intermittency. They only generate electricity when the wind is blowing. That means that they are useful in contributing to an electric grid, but they can never carry the entire load. They need to be complemented by other types of generators which can be brought online as the winds die down. Currently, fossil fuel generators are the only type that can be fired up and down at all quickly.

Hydroelectricity requires rivers. China is the most aggressive nation in the world in damming its rivers. This has caused huge political problems with its downstream neighbors in India, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and even Russia. Argentina's Yacereta dam displaced tens of thousands of people. The native peoples of Brazil are up in arms about the Belo Monte dam now under construction. All hydroelectric dams suffer the problem of silting up; they have service lives of under 100 years. In short, new hydroelectric power cannot possibly be the source for much of mankind's expanding energy needs.

We are thrown back on nuclear power. I live in Kiev close to the 1986 Chernobyl meltdown site. It is worth quoting a few statistics. About 50 people died immediately from radiation in that disaster. The UN's maximum estimate of lifetime mortality from the incident is 5000. Chernobyl was without a doubt the worst nuclear energy disaster in history, and yet even using the most extreme projections, it cost far fewer lives than are lost mining coal in a single year. And coal also carries long-term risks such as black lung disease. Reviewing all of these arguments, I find myself in agreement with environmentalist Stewart Brand's conclusion in "The Whole Earth Discipline." We have to figure out how to use nuclear power, because there is nothing else that we can exploit in the next two or three decades which can come close to providing the power provided by hydrocarbons.

As Daniel Kahneman so humorously and so thoroughly reports in "Thinking Fast and Slow" people are not very good at evaluating risks. While we do not have proper respect for dangerous things we deal with every day, such as automobiles, we have an irrational fear of remote dangers such as being bitten

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

by sharks and radiation poisoning, which actually pose small risks. The disposal of spent radioactive fuel is such an issue. Using nuclear power actually reduces the Earth's store of radioactive materials. We mine uranium ore, concentrate the radioactive part, use what we can, and put the rest someplace safe. If we were to put spent fuel back into the earth from which the ore came, the world would be no worse off than before it was mined. However, such a solution would be politically impossible. Once it has been concentrated as nuclear fuel, it probably makes sense to keep it concentrated and simply bury it someplace along way from everybody. Siberia, Greenland and Antarctica are certainly remote enough. The question is inherently one of politics rather than physics or engineering.

Brand and I also agree on matters of efficiency. High efficiency (high temperature) coal-fired generators would save the earth more pollution than any non-hydrocarbon solutions we could implement over the next decade. The science is simple. The maximum energy you can derive out of a combustion process is limited by the ratio (in degrees Kelvin) between the temperature you achieved by burning your fuel and the temperature of your cooling medium. This is the Carnot equation. Hotter generators are more efficient.

We also agree that the single most important step in reducing fossil fuel usage, and hence carbon dioxide emissions, is in changing people's consumption habits. We need to make more efficient cars, airplanes and houses. In general, all of these things need to be smaller. There is a lot of wisdom in the ecologists' exhortation to "Live Simply That Others May Simply Live." Living in mansions the size of Al Gore's Tennessee estate and driving Hummers is simply a matter of bad taste.

Some change is already underway. People in Europe and the United States are driving smaller cars, although the number of cars and the number of miles driven continues to rise. Buildings are generally more energy efficient, although we do continue to build bigger houses. Internet shopping has reduced distribution costs, and cell phones have reduced the number of unneeded automobile trips.

It will take a major economic shock to radically change things. For better or worse, it looks like the shock is on its way. The United States government and the euro zone have both been printing money – the unvarnished though accurate term for quantitative easing – at a breakneck pace since 2008. Every previous instance in history of such radical expansion of the money supply has resulted in financial collapse as governments must choose between defaulting on their obligations or dramatic inflation as they print the money they need to pay them. The net result is the same. People will have to consume significantly less. Less economic activity leads directly to less carbon emission. We're saved!

Even with a global financial collapse, it appears that additional global warming is likely. Will it be the unmitigated disaster that the doom and gloom crowd would have us believe? As uncertain as the science is about the causes of global warming, projecting the effects is even more iffy. Nobody can say exactly how ocean currents and prevailing winds will be affected, and consequently, how rainfall patterns will change. We know that plants thrive in a carbon dioxide rich environment. Presumably some food crops will grow better, and over a wider geography, than they do today. Warming will probably be helpful for farmers in the northern US, Canada, Scandinavia and Russia. Just as it has

throughout history, climate change will help some people and hurt others. It was not fair when the Sahara dried up, but that's what happened and people dealt with it. We can pray that the effects of climate change this time around will not be too dramatic, but with history as our guide we can be confident that the human race will survive.

I am, at my core, a conservative. Conservative mottoes are "if it ain't broke, don't fix it," if you don't understand it, don't mess with it" and "if you don't need it, don't buy it." I believe we should rein in our consumption just as a matter of taste. We should include externalities, costs to the environment, in the price of manufactured goods and services we buy. Moreover, we should let markets achieve most of this. Governments throughout the world have a terrible track record as advocates of solutions to energy issues. They get the science wrong and they shovel taxpayer money to their political friends in sweetheart deals such as Obama's Solyndra. If government manages to levy evenhanded energy taxes, it will nudge people in the right direction, but so far as possible government should let the markets work out solutions.

Endangered Species

The scientific argument for saving endangered species seems pretty weak, but the emotional argument is compelling. I wish the environmentalists would be honest about the appeal to emotion when they show you pictures of cute baby seals and tigers.

The claim is that every species represents irreplaceable genetic diversity, and that once they are gone their genome will be lost to science forever. Not exactly. I am sure that the complete genome of the Siberian tiger, the California condor and the panda are forever preserved in some cryogenic freezer someplace, so that they can be regenerated at will sometime the future.

A claim with more validity is that scientists have only identified small fraction of all of the species alive now on earth. They know most of the big animals, but even today they occasionally discover unknown species of mammals and birds. When I was in the Amazon in 2004 with a herpetologist we captured a colorful snake about four feet long. She did not know what it was or where to look to find out, and wasn't terribly concerned with the possibility that it might not have been previously identified. We set it free to go on making more of its kind.

When it comes to the small stuff like insects, spiders, mites, roundworms and so on is undoubtedly true that the vast majority have not been identified. It is probably also true that large numbers of such species have been driven to extinction by human activity, such as the population of Easter Island or the destruction of Italy's forests during Roman times. It is also true that pharmaceutical companies are actively mining biodiversity for new chemical compounds that may be useful in drugs. Despite this activity there are fewer new drugs under development today than in any recent decade. It is not impossible that some bug which will in the future serve as the base for a pharmaceutical miracle stands today on the brink of extinction, but it doesn't seem terribly likely. I'm sticking with the aesthetic and moral arguments. We ought to preserve these life forms just because it is the right thing to do. I am

consciously making a religious argument. Self-proclaimed atheists make the same argument. They deceived themselves – they just don't recognize the nature of their religion.

The only way to preserve broad realms of life forms is to preserve the habitats in which they live. That seems like a pretty good idea in any case. A conservative should, well, conserve. We don't fully appreciate the value of our natural surroundings, but we at least ought to have the decency not to deprive our children's generation of the pleasure of seeing them and of the utility which they might bring in things like pharmaceuticals.

Culture and society

Western European culture

I am not a cultural relativist. Raised in America, I have lived four years each in Asia, Western Europe and Eastern Europe, and have spent substantial time in Latin America. Each culture is different. Each has some features I find attractive and others which I find unattractive. In general I prefer my own; I do not apologize for preferring to live in a culture similar to that in which I grew up. I will use the political process to defend the culture into which I was born, and to propagate it by teaching it to the next generation, especially my own children.

The paragraph I just wrote would be such common sense that nobody would even utter it anyplace other than North America and Western Europe. However, to The Anointed it is nothing less than an out and out declaration of my backwardness, bigotry and provinciality. They love the whole world to the extent that they excuse the most patent barbarism as no more than a legitimate reaction to Western colonialism, and invite people of every culture, however incompatible, to share in the American dream. At the expense of the American wage earner and taxpayer, it goes without saying. They should have broad shoulders. Besides, The Anointed would claim, white folks owe something back for years of slavery and colonialism.

White Guilt

There is a strong current of opinion among The Anointed that white people in America acquired their wealth immorally and unethically and thus have a moral obligation to give it back to those from whom they stole it.

My first observation is that ethical standards have changed since the seventeenth century. At the time we were displacing Native Americans, by treaties, wars, disease and cultural dominance, other peoples all over the world were doing exactly the same. English liberalism, just getting started, didn't keep England from establishing the Raj in India or trading opium in China. Every European nation with the means to do so established colonies, and all employed slave labor where it made economic sense: Spanish in Peru, French in Haiti, Portuguese in Brazil, and Dutch here and there. What sets England

apart is that they were the first to outlaw slavery, and they did so on moral grounds. We should be proud of them, and of the Yankees who followed suit a few decades later.

The peoples the Europeans displaced and colonized had hardly been living in a peaceful state of nature. Africans constantly warred against each other. The Zulus were expanding from the north, displacing weaker tribes, as the Boers trekked up from the south to bring South Africa under the plow. Pizarro was able to defeat Atahuelpa in 1532 because the Incas were at war with themselves. In short, all human groups were acting according to Darwinian principles, expanding their own tribes at the expense of other tribes. It was just beginning to dawn on a few enlightened Europeans that the world might be otherwise.

My second observation is that while the United States and Western Europe largely adhere to today's higher ethical standards, much of the rest of the world, especially Africa, does not. African wars are cruel, savage affairs respecting no Geneva Convention. Slavery remains widely practiced in Africa, as do genital mutilation, human trafficking, forced marriages and polygamy. It is perverse for the Anointed to "preach historicism yet judge ahistorically; they both preach enlightenment values yet attack the very group that originates and spreads those values."⁸ They judge 17th century America by 21st century values, yet refuse to apply those selfsame 21st century values uniformly throughout the 21st century world.

However unsubstantiated the logic behind white guilt, the effect has been dramatic. Whites have backpedaled for half a century, acceding to demands for affirmative action, equal representation without regard to merit and reparations for slavery, funding massive programs to eliminate AIDS in Africa. Many white people consider it almost immoral to reproduce, accepting the logic that whites have already appropriated more than our share of the world's resources and the world needs no more of us. Any strident minority can face us down. Muslims can build their mosques and even get us to stop talking about the Holocaust. American Indians can buffalo anthropologists into giving up 10,000 year old bones on the pretext that they probably belonged to some ancestor of their tribe. Mexicans can trample the American flag on Cinco de Mayo celebrations in the United States. In Europe, minorities can spew virtually any kind of venomous statements they wish about white people, but if white people say the same about blacks or Muslims, they go to jail for hate speech. We are patsies, and the nonwhite world has learned well how to exploit that fact.

Classic liberalism achieved an evolutionary peak a century ago

No era is perfect. No era even approaches perfection. The close of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th do not represent a high watermark in human achievement, but rather in human aspirations. To me it represents the high water mark of the classic liberal experiment which began with the Enlightenment.

⁸ Google John Ellis and Carl Popper for the origins of this wording

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

A lot had been achieved by the gaslight era. The United States had expanded to the Pacific Ocean. Slavery had been abolished by the Civil War. We had achieved peace with the scattered Native American groups and were attempting, however clumsily and unsuccessfully, to educate and integrate them. We were accepting and successfully assimilating large groups of European immigrants. American industry was growing at a pace seldom equaled in human history. The country had been bound much more closely together by the railroad and telegraph. Cities had electricity and telephones. Automobiles were starting to appear, and the airplane was invented. The United States considered itself a Christian nation. The United States saw itself as successful, regarded Christianity as an essential part of the success, and sent missionaries to all corners of the world to convert the heathen.

The literature of the era was critical, perhaps a bit; but essentially confident. Mark Twain dominated the scene. He wrote candidly about all of the peoples of America, black, Jewish, Chinese and Indian, without fear of offending them. Vachel Lindsay, Robert L Service, Rudyard Kipling and others wrote poems of adventure, heroism and of the varied peoples and places that had been brought together within the British Empire and America's global sphere of interests.

The dialogue between the races was more enlightened 100 years ago than it is today. Booker T. Washington and WEB Du Bois engaged in erudite written exchanges, widely citing the classics and American tradition, in discussing how to improve the condition of the Negro in America. In recognizing the need to advance the "talented 10th" of the black population, they showed a more accurate understanding of the African-American population than any modern black would dare to admit. Washington advocated education as the path to success, and enlisted a large number of Northerners to serve as teachers in the schools established by graduates of the Tuskegee Institute.

Government at the federal, state and local levels was limited. Among other things, it was constrained by its budget. There was no income tax prior to 1913, the eve of the First World War. Government did not feel the mission or have the means to redistribute wealth. The economy was essentially laissez-faire. It resulted in great inequalities, but offered great opportunity for people to rise from humble roots.

This history reflects a fundamental difference between my world view and that of The Anointed. I look at the end of the 19th century as a great epoch for the human spirit. There was a lot of confidence and a lot of progress. The Anointed see it as an era of great disparities of wealth, poverty where success had not been achieved, inequality where blacks remained separate but equal and Indians on reservations. They judge by the static measure of distance traveled. I judge by the dynamic measure of velocity, forward progress.

Distance traveled is the product of velocity and time. My concern for America at this juncture in its history is that our obsessive focus on distance traveled towards equality has come at the cost of velocity. We are no longer moving forward. We are not creating new wealth, or even new ideas. Our society is increasingly obsessed with taking the wealth created by our entrepreneurial class and redistributing it. It is a hopeless battle. The rich have their friends in Congress, as always, and manage to amass fortunes despite, or perhaps with the aid of an amazingly confusing tax regime. The middle-class

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

have to wrestle against that amazing confusion to keep from being eaten out of house and home, and the lower middle class and below, fully half of our population, contribute nothing beyond the regressive FICA taxes to the federal budget and care mainly about what benefits they might receive from it.

The social Darwinist Herbert Spencer wrote that "The ultimate result of shielding men from the effects of folly is to fill the world with fools." The Anointed take the mere utterance of such a despicable thought to be a priori evidence of moral deficiency and take the thought no further. However, a realist might ask what has happened now that the government has been actively shielding fools from their folly for eight decades. We have a population which saves less and less for their own retirement, depending on a proven only unreliable government.

Despite myriad laws passed to protect consumers against predatory lenders, the American consumer, in his folly, continues to pay outrageous interest on credit card loans and to take out mortgages that he cannot repay. The Rolling Stone's Matt Tiabbi captured it beautifully with his much repeated opening to an article on the financial crisis: "The first thing you need to know about Goldman Sachs is that it's everywhere. The world's most powerful investment bank is a great vampire squid wrapped around the face of humanity, relentlessly jamming its blood funnel into anything that smells like money." In the race between increasingly numerous consumer protection laws on one side, and increasing complexity of life and human stupidity on the other side, complexity and stupidity seem to be winning. Somehow even the consumer protection turns out bad. When I attempted to get a credit report from Experian, they somehow stuck their blood funnel into me, tricking me into signing up for \$17.95 per month service that I did not intend to order and certainly didn't need. It took a number of phone calls to get that turned off, and a total of five letters to get them to reverse the erroneous entry in my credit report. I am cynical.

Human rights

P.J. O'Rourke said "There is only one basic human right, the right to do as you damn well please. And with it comes the only basic human duty, the duty to take the consequences." Human rights are not enumerated in classical literature. The Bible prescribes punishment for people who do you ill, but nowhere the right not to be done ill. The idea that one would have rights simply by virtue of being human appears to have originated with the Enlightenment philosophers.

There is a big difference between what philosophers might theorize that a government should do, hypothetical rights, and actual human rights. The UN adopted a high-flown Universal declaration of human rights to guide member governments in 1948. In most particulars it is pretty good, describing what an ideal government should do for its citizens. In practice, no government in the world is able to fully implement all of the UN principles. First of all, they are somewhat in conflict with one another. Secondly, some cost money, with no theoretical cap on how much.

The developed world is now witnessing what happens to when rights preempt consideration of costs. Since healthcare became a right, expenses have constantly, dramatically exceeded projections as people

take as much advantage as possible of the “free” service. Rationed service and long waits characterize every public system.

Since benefits have been granted to the medically disabled, impossible to diagnose ailments such as back pain mushroomed and psychiatric illnesses are crept into the same class as physical illnesses. When crippled / handicapped / differentially abled people obtained the legal right to anything any other citizen could do, their fellow citizens were stuck with an enormous bill to make parking places, doors, elevators, restrooms and everything available to people with whatever kind of handicap, and at whatever cost. Fortunately, no government has yet gotten to the point of issuing drivers licenses to the blind, but they are getting close.

The right to equal treatment regardless of race has frequently been interpreted as a right to equal outcomes. Combined with the right to a free public education it has resulted in extraordinarily expensive programs to raise the average performance of all students to that of whites. For instance, a judge mandated that the Kansas City schools spend whatever it took to make black kids’ test scores come out equal to white kids. It cost billions of dollars, bankrupted the system, and had no discernible effect. Money simply cannot give people the ability, or even the motivation to learn. Since it is in the pursuit of noble goals, with other peoples’ money, governments have proven very slow to learn this lesson.

Reproductive rights, a woman’s right to control over her own body, has been conflated with the newly coined right to free medical care, resulting in a supposed right to free birth control, including abortions. Of course it is not free – it is paid for by the taxpayer. Moreover, many of the taxpayers required so to pay are vehemently, morally opposed to birth control. No matter.

Society vs. the individual

Our society celebrates the individual. We do not even recognize that an individual has obligations to society, and would never consider the notion that society’s interests might override those of the individual.

Writing about sex, I noted above that this modern view licenses total sexual freedom. If reproduction is no longer the aim, what you do and with whom you do it is nobody’s business but your own. This is pretty exactly the position we have taken throughout the west. Carl Zimmerman traced the progression in his 1939 classic “Family and Civilization.”

Zimmerman describes a universal progression of family organization from the "trustee family" through the "domestic family" and finally the "atomistic" family" in three separate eras: classical Greece, Rome, and contemporary Western civilization.

In the broadest terms, in a "trustee family" the current generation is seen as only a trustee for an entity that exists for all time. The trustee family fills the roles that will be taken over by the church and state at

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

higher levels of civilization. Specifically, the trustee family administers its own justice, fights its own wars, and keeps family members in line. Trustee families existed until recently in the Kentucky hills, and they are our plague as America fights in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The "domestic family" is the bedrock of traditional civilization, a mother, father, and children who view themselves as integral parts of a civilization: church, state, civil society, and a family structure. The key feature of a domestic family is a commitment to bearing and raising children. The motive may be somewhat economic -- children are certainly useful in an agricultural setting -- but it is equally religious. The parents of a domestic family feel an obligation, usually religious, to bear and her children, and the society reinforces the message that children should obey their parents. The church's call is to "proles, fides, sacramentum" or children, fidelity, and the sacred. Zimmerman goes on at length about the ways in which the Protestant Reformation, the counterreformation, the Enlightenment and then the English, French, and Russian revolutions undermined the domestic family.

The "atomistic family" evolves when civilization reaches a high plateau, in which a wealthy, literate class emerges. These intellectuals are skeptical of received wisdom, especially religion, and dedicate themselves to the pursuit of individual pleasures. The morality which held the domestic family together comes to be held in contempt. The individual reigns supreme, and the traditional constraints on divorce, abortion, adultery, homosexuality, all forms of what is otherwise considered sexual but privately, and of course childlessness fall away. The worthier citizens feel they have better things to do with their time than raise children, and the society has to depend on immigration and the fertility of minorities to replenish itself.

The primacy of the individual has implications beyond family. Patriotism is passé. If we don't recognize our society as having any valid claim on us, serving in the military to defend it is absurd. Paying taxes is likewise absurd. We should all be like the Greeks and Italians, parting with each penny of tax only under duress and allowing the state to fall apart. We need it only as a vehicle to rob Peter to pay Paul -- give us our pensions -- after which it can safely fall apart. Maintaining the state for the benefit of our children makes no sense if we have none.

Likewise, if we do not have children, we might as well occupy our time with whatever diversions most amuse us. As Charles Murray⁹ wrote, without religion or children "The purpose of life is to while away the time between birth and death as pleasantly as possible, and the purpose of government is to make it as easy as possible to while away the time as pleasantly as possible—the Europe Syndrome." There has been an explosion in the diversions of ordinary people: surfing, hang gliding, mountain climbing, skateboarding, video and video games, drugs, rampant consumerism and of course all manner of sex. The human animal, when liberated from the obligation to raise children, and freed by our inventive

⁹ Murray, Charles (2012-01-31). *Coming Apart: The State of White America, 1960-2010* (p. 284). Random House, Inc.. Kindle Edition.

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

machines from the need for hard work, has an amazing amount of time available just to fritter away. We are increasingly ingenious in doing just that.

Our diversions cost money – entrepreneurs ensure that we are interested in expensive pastimes, such as watching football games, rather than cheap ones such as walking or swimming, and they make sure that the cheap ones such as bicycling become as expensive as possible. Our artificially induced appetites drive us to look for ever more income. Women not only enter the workplace but bang on incessantly about equal pay. What else do they have to do? After four decades in which mostly female human resources managers have tried as hard as they can to make things even, one must conclude that the male sex is smarter and more cunning than women ever previously credited, or that the problem is miscast or illusionary.

The primacy of the individual over society results in several costs to society. I have mentioned in the section on rights the considerable expenses associated with providing the handicapped with equal access to all public facilities and attempting to have children of all races achieve equal standardized test scores. We dedicate large amounts of money to teaching children with Down's syndrome, protecting children against schoolyard bullies, and other worthy causes which not to support would cause one to be labeled a misanthrope. In a way, we are all bullied into doing "the right thing" despite possible misgivings. We have a fond hope that society is rich enough that we can do all these things without too much sacrifice on our parts.

There is, however, a price. It is often expressed in money. If it costs \$100,000 a year to educate a child with spina bifida, that is money that does not go to the child who might contribute more back to society over a lifetime. When our emphasis is the individual rather than society, we do not make that calculation.

Protecting children against bullies comes at a cost. First there is the monetary expense of whatever quasi-police force is set up in the schools to enforce the policy. More important is the dampening effect that it is bound to have on normal processes involved in the transition from boyhood to manhood. The male of the species is inherently competitive. We are inherently rough. We jostle each other, punch each other on the shoulder, and put each other down as a matter of establishing a dominance hierarchy. That is all going to go away as surely as toy guns in school. It is another step toward raising boys who will never become men. And as non-men, I am afraid they will not assume men's roles and responsibilities in society. And women will once again ask, what happened to all the good men? And once again the answer will be, ask yourselves, you made them what they are. They are emasculated. Don't you like it?

As a bottom line, our energies now go into ourselves. Not our children, and not the society that nurtured us. Long term evolutionary success would demand the opposite. We would of course have to have children, and those children would have to belong to a society which afforded a collective defense against not only external enemies, but cultural decay of the society itself. We don't have it. We are dying out by numbers, growing dumber by achievement on standardized measures, and losing moral worth via the unmeasurable coarsening of everyday life.

Adoption

These thoughts are prompted by comments on my Amazon review of “Blue Nights,” by posters who were outraged that I might imply there was any difference between adoptive and natural children. I had written that adoptive kids are a “mixed bag” and that Joan Didion was lucky to get one who had the intellect and interest to pursue literary interests similar to her mother’s

Following the example set by celebrities such as Mia Farrow, Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie, an increasing number of Americans have decided to adopt rather than bear children. Though they give high tone moral justifications for a desire to adopt, there are a considerable number of selfish considerations which are never mentioned. At the heart of the issue is the difference between having a cat or a dog and having children. Cats and dogs are companions; kids are part of your life forever. You have to teach dogs and cats not to bite and pee on the carpet. A parent's obligation to children is to give them character, to raise them to be successful adults in the society into which they were born. For the religious, bearing and raising children is a fulfillment of God's command to be fruitful and multiply.

There are many legitimate reasons to adopt. The most obvious is infertility – one or the other partner is infertile, and therefore as a couple cannot get pregnant. There are same-sex pairs for whom natural childbirth is not an option. Such couples may choose not to try among the many expensive alternatives, such as in vitro fertilization, surrogate parenthood, sperm donors and the like, for religious reasons, financial reasons or just out of plane squeamishness. And, there are couples who know they carry genetic disorders such as Tay-Sachs and whose faith would not permit them to abort if amniocentesis showed that the fetus would be affected.

None of the Hollywood people I have read about choose to give this reason. Instead they say that the planet is overpopulated as it stands, and they feel a moral obligation not to add to the crowding. There are children, like those in Darfur and Cambodia, who will never have a chance unless they are taken out of their miserable surroundings. It is certainly true that an individual child will be better off if adopted by a Western family; however, such adoptions will not put a dent in the problem of overpopulation in poor countries. There will always be more poor wretches where those came from.

The argument that the planet is overpopulated is out of date. Birthrates in every first world country, and in fact much of the world outside of Africa, are below replacement levels. Without immigration these countries will start to shrink and population within the next couple of decades, as old people die without enough births to replace them.

Moreover, as Thilo Sarrazin argued in “Deutschland Schafft Sich Ab” and Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen so thoroughly document in “IQ and the wealth of nations” and “Race and Intelligence,” and as Murray and Herrnstein wrote in “The Bell Curve,” not all human populations are equal in human potential. People who choose to adopt from a different country (northeast Asian countries excepted) are generally drawing from a shallower pool of inborn talent. There are bright kids in any country, but

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

they are more plentiful in some places than others. It goes without saying that the children of the best and brightest are the least likely to be available for adoption.

The selfish reasons to adopt rather than having your own kids are pretty compelling. Giving birth is a dangerous process. One in 10,000 US pregnancies end up with the death of the mother, and 65 out of 10,000 children don't make it.

A far more immediate consideration is that childbirth takes you out of circulation for a while. There nine months of pregnancy during which a woman suffers from morning sickness, bloating, small digestive issues and a lot of other unpleasantness as her body shifts resources to the fetus. Then, for a conscientious mother comes a year or so of breast-feeding, which means turning her body into a milk machine for an insatiable baby. Mom loses a lot of sleep and energy. A woman's body is never the same after childbirth. The parts that have been stretched are never quite going to go back to their girlish form. For a celebrity this can be a real liability.

Although fathers get off a little bit easier, they have to accept and live with their wife's mood changes and peculiar needs and cravings. They also have to understand that she doesn't feel much like sex for much of this time. If he gets any action, she's going to look at it as doing him a favor. And, she won't have her previous level of energy for socializing or much else.

Taking all this into consideration, why would you want to bear your own children when it is so much easier to let somebody else do all the hard work, the animal functions of gestation and lactation, and simply pay for the end product – a baby. For somebody with a celebrity lifestyle, it is possible to adopt, hire a nanny to bottle feed the baby, and never miss a beat in life.

For most of us the desire to have our own children is a matter of ego and/or religion. We're pretty happy with ourselves and we want our genotype to go forward through the ages. We think the world will be a better place was little copies of ourselves running around. For the followers of the Abrahamic religions having kids is a fulfillment of the commandment to "be fruitful and multiply." Heaven is only a promise, but achieving immortality through our kids seems like a fairly concrete possibility.

You have to be a bit settled in life in order to adopt. Most adoptive parents have steady jobs and steady lives. One can easily extrapolate that people in a position to adopt are a little bit above average. From that follows the proposition that natural children would also be a bit above average. Statistics tend to bear this out. In families with a mix of adoptive and natural kids, the natural kids score a few points higher on IQ tests. There is one Rhodes Scholar in the Mia Farrow ménage, and it should not be at all surprising that it is the natural child of Mia and Woody Allen rather than one of their many adoptees.

Quite a few adoptive children start life with major handicaps. Some have obvious problems such as spina bifida, Down's syndrome or other problems which the birth mother simply did not want to cope with. When you visit orphanages in Ukraine, you see quite a bit of fetal alcohol syndrome. It is also

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

prevalent among children given up for adoption by Native Americans and certain Latin American countries to which Americans often go for adoptions.

Diagnosable conditions aside, you have to consider the population of women who get pregnant without the capacity to carry through and take care of a child. They are disproportionately women who don't have very good control of their lives. They may be simply rather slow witted, or have emotional difficulties. The number of American-born white babies available for adoption has been shrinking over the past few decades due to several factors: the widespread availability of contraceptives, abortion, and the lack of stigma associated with keeping the child. Simply put, in the nicer high schools you no longer hear about girls going to spend the semester with their aunt in Peoria for a "change of pace." The result is that fewer babies are available for adoption, and of those that are, the odds of being dealt a Steve Jobs in the adoption lottery are a whole lot slimmer than they were in 1955.

Genetics has been one of the most rapidly advancing fields in science. Every year we know substantially more about how the brain develops, and it becomes clearer and clearer that John Locke's theory that the brain is a "blank slate" at birth is untenable. The infant brain has a great deal going on, and approximately half of the characteristics that we call personality – temperament, intelligence, and so on – are inherited. They are inherited within families, tribes, and entire peoples. It is not by accident that Chinese children turn out to be smart, studious, and often somewhat introverted. Likewise it is not by accident that Jews tend to have higher verbal intelligence and excel at business. It is true that Chinese and Jewish cultures nurture and encourage certain attributes and their children, but it is equally true that most children born into those societies have the native ability to absorb that which is taught.

At the level of families, this means that to the extent that any child can be understood – certainly a limitation which frustrates every parent – their own children stand the best chance of being understood. That is because they are like the parents. Judith Rich Harris writes in "No Two Alike" that direct parental influence in the family home probably doesn't account for more than 15 percent or so of the kids' personality. Most of the parents' influence is already in place at the time of birth, in the form of the kids' genetic endowment.

Comparing adoptive with natural kids, you find that parents will generally have a better intuitive understanding of their natural born kids than of adoptees. Moreover, they will probably have a better understanding of kids adopted from their own population than cross-cultural adoptions.

Given the scarcity of adoptable white children in the United States, a great many people look overseas. The situation changes from year to year, and there are a large number of adoption agencies who attempt to match families and children. The business is somewhat tainted as well by baby selling.

A generation ago quite a few parents were able to adopt children from China and Korea. The intelligence and temperament characteristic of their native lands usually enabled them to do fairly well in American schools in American society. After the fall of the Soviet Union it was possible for quite a while to adopt children from the newly independent Eastern European countries as well. All of these countries are

getting more and more difficult to deal with. Although there are lots of children in Ukrainian orphanages, Ukraine gives its own citizens the first pick of newborns, and presents unnecessary hurdles to Westerners attempting to adopt older children out of orphanages. When you visit the orphanages you meet a lot of very normal kids. My advice, if you want to adopt, would be to spend time visiting orphanages in Ukraine, get to know several kids and a good Ukrainian attorney, and plan to adopt a somewhat older child, so you have some idea what kind of personality you are inviting into your house.

All that said, the advantages of having your own kids rather than adopting seem overwhelming. I would caution anybody who is thinking about adopting simply to avoid the hard work of pregnancy and nursing to visit a few schools and ask the counselors hard questions about adopted kids. Many adoptions work out fine, but the chances of the relationship failing are quite a bit higher with adoptees.

Religious belief

A great deal gets lumped under the heading of religion. Religious beliefs addressed the question of the nature of humanity, what happens to us when we die, whether or not there is an afterlife, whether or not we achieve salvation. The morality inspired by religion tells us how we ought to treat one another. The link between the two is the supposition that if you are not good you will not get to heaven, as if an eternal reward were the only reasonable motive.

This is certainly a matter of shades of gray rather than black and white. On one end of the shading there are fundamentalists, Haredi Jews, Wahhabi Muslims and fundamentalist Christians who take the words of their holy scriptures literally. They have a concrete belief in the afterlife, and a concrete belief that all of the events recorded in the holy book are reported as they actually occurred. God created the world, then created Adam, then created Eve from Adam's rib, and so on down through the miracle of the virgin birth and Christ's death, resurrection and ascension into heaven.

Throughout the history of the church there have been people who found the accounts in the Scriptures hard to accept. The Catholic Church convened the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. to write a creed to which all could subscribe: the Nicene Creed. It involved a lot of compromises. One of the biggest was acceptance of a trinity made up of God, Christ, and a third entity called the Holy Spirit, one and three and three in one. We in the Anglican Church call it a holy mystery, because it doesn't make sense on any secular level. Another thing mystery accepts that the actual body and blood of Christ are present in the communion via a process called transubstantiation. There are people who truly believe, people who act as if they believe so as not to make waves, people who grin and go along, and people who scoff.

Certain sects such as the Mormons have their own peculiar beliefs. Among theirs is the notion that a lost tribe of Israel somehow wandered into the Americas, prospered mightily, wrote the inspired texts that Joseph Smith found on his farm in New York, and then disappeared. Oddly, for all the knowledge which anthropologists have gained about native peoples in the Americas, there is not a trace of evidence to show that Joseph Smith's people actually existed. In fact, there isn't even evidence of writing on tablets,

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

much less the writing of words which track suspiciously well with the text in the King James version of the Bible.

Devout atheists have a great deal of fun picking these beliefs apart. My question to them is, does it matter? Does it matter what happens after death? Human manners, mores and laws govern our behavior on this side of heaven. The beliefs of the three great monotheistic religions, the people of the book, have enjoyed great evolutionary success. Christianity and Islam are the dominant religions throughout the world. Other belief systems such as Hinduism and Confucianism are more geographically constrained and make no extravagant claims about salvation. Confucianism doesn't even concern itself with an afterlife.

Let's go back to the evolutionary success. The ethical system that the monotheistic religions developed has enabled the people infected, if you will, with their belief systems to prosper. The peoples multiplied and the beliefs multiplied.

It is the nature of all animal populations, humans included, to compete with one another for habitat. Human populations consist not only of a gene pool but a meme¹⁰ pool, all of the cultural baggage that a given society has accrued and passes on to its progeny. Religion is among these memes.

Of course, any society in the world is not going to compete successfully unless they believe they are the best. You can't have a society that thinks of itself as losers any more than a football team that thinks of itself as losers. You don't have to extrapolate very far to see that people will think that their own belief system is superior. If the belief system includes religion, they believe that their religion is superior. That is no big surprise. If they're Liberal Democrats, they believe that the Liberal Democrats have the only unclouded view of the world.

Psychologists have written a lot of great books recently about the many ways in which we deceive ourselves. Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky pioneered the field. Kahneman's "Thinking Fast and Slow" became an instant classic a couple of years ago. Emanuel Derman pursued it with "Models Behaving Badly." Kenneth Rogoff captured the nature of financial self-deception in "This Time Is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly" Dan Ariely's humorous "The Upside of Irrationality: The Unexpected Benefits of Defying Logic at Work and at Home" tells us how to take advantage of it, and Robert Trivers' "The Folly of Fools: The Logic of Deceit and Self-Deception in Human Life."

¹⁰ Richard Dawkins coined the term. From Wikipedia: A meme (/'mi:m/; meem)[1] is "an idea, behavior or style that spreads from person to person within a culture." [2] A meme acts as a unit for carrying cultural ideas, symbols or practices, which can be transmitted from one mind to another through writing, speech, gestures, rituals or other imitable phenomena. Supporters of the concept regard memes as cultural analogues to genes in that they self-replicate, mutate and respond to selective pressures.

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views
www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

I would advise an ounce of humility to anybody who claims, as Karl Marx did, that "religion is the opiate of the masses" or decries the idiocy of red state fundamentalists. As I attempt to demonstrate in this entire article, The Anointed are beset with as many unexamined beliefs as any of the religious people of whom they are so contemptuous. Moreover, the misconceptions of the religious, if they are such, are evolutionarily beneficial. The misconceptions of The Anointed are so self-destructive that one might assume they will die out fairly soon. Perhaps they will vanish with the economic cataclysm which Western welfare states seem to be inviting on themselves. I am reminded of a bumper sticker:

God is dead – Nietzsche
Nietzsche is dead – God

I suspect that the religious are going to have the last laugh. My fear is that it will not even be Christians.

Spiritual and Moral Questions

Although nobody seems to remember anymore the etymology of the term, we still speak of Judeo-Christian ethics. There was recently a flap about the 10 Commandments being displayed in a courtroom in Alabama. The claim was that it was the intrusion of religion into the state. I'm sure that they would retroactively redact the word God out of the Declaration of Independence if they could.

The truth is that our systems of law and justice have evolved out of a Christian tradition. The Ten Commandments are in fact the foundation of much of our law. The Golden rule, which Christ gave as his second great commandment, is a cornerstone of our ethics. Of course good ideas have no copyright. Much of the same wisdom is echoed in Confucius, for instance. And a lot is out of date. If you read the 613 Jewish mitzvot, you will find that Jews should be stoning homosexuals. If they continued the practice, Castro Street would run red with Jewish blood.

Charles Murray claims in "Coming Apart" that the Christian ethos was an essential part of America's exceptionalism and success. In his words the virtues of industry, honesty, marriage and religious belief gave meaning to our lives. We had meaningful things to do and were part of a society which was appreciative of our efforts and which reciprocated. The result was a high level of honesty, incredible numbers of volunteer associations, and large families which populated an empty continent. Nitpickers will observe that the continent was already populated with Native Americans and that certain Americans employed slaves. Murray's point is that the Americans' self-image was their asset. Nobody in the world had developed an ethos which would have treated blacks and Native Americans any differently; it was up to these early Americans own progeny to do so, and that progeny's on progeny to retroactively condemn our founding fathers, judging them by the standards of the 20th century.

The discussion here is about ethics and morality. Christianity had and continues to have both. They gave meaning and structure to people's lives. Certain groups of Christians such as the Mormons are still shaped by quite traditional values and are conspicuously successful in the American context. It is maddening to The Anointed that men like Mitt Romney and Jon Huntsman can be so wrong and yet so smart, so imperturbable and so successful. If there were a just anti-God he should smite them!

Catalog of Curmudgeonly Views

www.grahamseibert.com/curmudgeon.pdf

Religious people more often make responsible parents. Of course, there is a constant parade of failures on the Jerry Springer show, Oprah, and in the tabloids. The news media gleefully seek out poster children for the proposition that religion is evil. By and large, however, I think the statistics show that kids raised by two parents supported by a religious belief do better in life than others. Whether their motives are good or bad, informed or not, I believe that religious parents are more likely to keep their kids from sampling drugs and alcohol, having sex at 13, and dissipating their lives with TV and video games. Of course the societal influences are strong, and even if the parents try, they will often fail. You can add your anecdotes of conspicuous failures here; my own children offer a few.