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Hey folks, welcome back to the q&a section of the Dark Horse podcast live stream, we are now going to address your questions. And by we I mean I. Okay, so we're gonna start with the questions that came in, in the initial stream. First one is how does evolution account for racism and prejudice. Now, this is an interesting one, because, in my opinion, it accounts for them very easily, and also tells us a lot about what we have to do in order to get past them. But I've had an ongoing battle with some of my colleagues, including most prominently Richard Dawkins, who does not believe it is productive, to look at issues like lineage versus lineage competition through an evolutionary lens. That is to say, it remains for me to compel my evolutionary colleagues, that lineage against lineage competition is a meaningful level at which to analyze evolution. So I am excited for that challenge. I've thought deeply about this. And I'm quite compelled that there's a great deal of value to be had in thinking of evolution in those terms, and that it is not metaphorical. It is quite literally something that selection, sees in quotes and acts upon lineages are real. And they line up quite well with things we tend to see as races. So anyway, there's a lot more to be said on that. But yes, it's an excellent question. Second question. What's worse, media outlets financially incentivized to keep us angry and paranoid, or happy and complacent? That's a tough one. I mean, you know, you're talking about two different failure modes. And the truth is, I guess I would fear, angry and paranoid more than happy and complacent, it's possible to wake from happy and complacent and recognize that something needs to be done. In fact, in some sense, that's, that's the matrix. So I guess I would prefer the latter. But I could be compelled that actually that state is more dangerous. And, you know, maybe that's the actually version. Okay, third question. voting rights were about representative democracy. Minnesota and Minneapolis are 100% progressive, is this not proof that Democrats actually don't have blacks support beyond mere lip service? Well, again, I would go back to this principle that I'm quite a strong believer in, which is that you can't hold people responsible for making bad choices when they only have bad choices to choose amongst. So my point would be when that is the case, we all end up doing something that we said, we say to ourselves makes sense, but to others may look incoherent. And it was not clear when I initially presented this. My point is that many of my friends on the left cannot fathom how anybody ends up voting for a guy like Donald Trump, to me, actually, it's not so hard to understand. It's not a rational choice. I don't like it, and I wouldn't have voted for him. But I can certainly understand a mentality that is just simply fed up with the same old corruption and eager for something new. And so in any case, it's it's a choice that I think looks very different in light of the fact that no good choices are provided as alternatives. So what that means in response to your question is that I see a lot of people acting incoherently. And when I see that, rather than judge them for the incoherence of their action, I have to ask myself, did they have clearly better choices? And often the answer is no.

**Bret** 04:02

Okay. Ah, interesting. A pallet of bricks was placed in the path of Dallas rioters last night next to the courthouse where there wasn't any construction. You can find the video on Reddit and Twitter. I saw this video, I decided not to show it because I cannot be sure of what it is. But it certainly was striking. And there's a long history of agent provocateurs taking a protest and making it look like something that it isn't we saw this in the WTO protests, and elsewhere. So if in fact that video is what it appears to be, it does look like a stack of construction materials placed near a building with large vulnerable windows with no other reason to be there. But what I would have wanted was somebody to tour me around and to see what else might explain that stack of materials. I would like to know from witnesses whether that stack of materials really did show up in advance of the protest or if it had been there for a while. Basically, I would like somebody to do due diligence on that clip and figure out whether somebody was attempting to create violence to seed violence by putting materials that would cause people to innovate that strategy, or whether there was some innocent explanation and that just the place where it appeared something was up and so people commented upon it. Anyway, if people do know, if there is someone who's done due diligence, somebody on the ground in that location, I'd be very interested to know about it. But thanks for the question. Okay, could research stations offer sanctuary in these types of quarantine? How does someone set up these facilities? What services do they usually offer? So I assume we're talking about biological research stations. And you know, I don't know that Heather and I have actually talked about it. But of course, we just emerged from the tip of teeny Biological Station in Ecuador, at the point that what was then called the novel Coronavirus, was emerging. And so anyway, the two things sit closely together in our minds, of course, they've been great refereed refuges. They're not cheap to be at. And that's for sure. Just think about the idea of having a station deep in, in this case, the Amazon rainforest, where the forest is constantly trying to reclaim all of the building materials, and every morsel of food has to be brought in, by boats and, and the like. So anyway, it's a it's an expensive operation to run, they're not easy to set up. And on top of all of the practical details, if they're going to be any good, they have to be somewhere with a diverse biota, which inevitably means a tremendous amount of I don't want to call it red tape, because some of it's quite necessary, but a tremendous amount of regulation surrounding what can be put where and why. And so in general, the field stations all have some origin story in which some person went through herculean efforts to set the thing up. We know this was true in Madagascar back when Heather was working there, and we were familiar with the place the Michelle peninsula had just had a new park set up and research facilities would arrive afterwards, I assume, actually, we didn't we never saw research facilities there. But But in any case, it's an interesting question. Probably somebody has documented the process and done a bunch of work to compile the various examples that might tell you. But I don't think setting up a station in order to have a refuge makes much sense. It's there, there are easier ways to do it. Okay, let's see, is there some way we can help the cops capture and charge the white anarchists that would make a huge difference in the community? Well, I don't know. I mean, and I'm not even sure what the right thing to do is at some level, I want to grab the white anarchist by the lapels and say, you know, you're you're externalizing harm on other people, by living out your fantasies in public this way, you're doing harm to the very communities you claim to be helping. And I am certain it's not the same for all of the anarchists. Some of them are just confused. Some of them are looking for an excuse to bash heads. Those are two different phenomena. So I don't know what the right way to address it is, and one certainly has to create a situation where people who
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break the law and engage in wanton violence and destruction are punished that's very different than normal civil disobedience. And to the extent that the harm that they do comes back to haunt them, they'll learn not to do it. That's one of the reasons that I was was so angry at Mayor Wheeler for coddling this behavior is that he eventually he essentially ensured that it would boil over in some spectacular way, which it now has. Okay. Let's see. Minneapolis, black man dies after police confrontation. The Mirage of no consequences. Have you counted the rocking chair dead in your town? yet? I don't know what this means. Well, I unfortunately, I don't know what it means. I wish I did. Have you counted the rocking chair, rocking chair dead in quotes in your town yet? Don't know. Okay, someone has suggested Jordan Hall with respect to a president or vice presidential strategy. Jordan is a good friend. I think a he has one of the downsides of many of the candidates who would be worth advancing in this, which is that very few people know who he is, I would certainly want to see him involved in solution making. And actually, this is something I didn't say the catastrophic failure of our stream threw me a little bit. One of the things I would advocate for the general election is that we stop pestering candidates about the policies that they would enact. Presidents don't make policy they lead, it affects policy. But what I would suggest would be an appropriate substitute for the absurd spectacle of asking presidential candidates to be detailed about where they would get the money to do this. And that and, and all what I would advocate is that instead, we have them outline who they would bring into an administration and take advice from that that is actually a basis on which we can judge somebody if they're listening to the right sort of folks. And the fact is, nobody can do it all. A president has to take a tremendous amount of input from people who know what they're talking about. And they have to delegate to other people. That's what they do. They take input from others, and they delegate. And so the question of to whom they would delegate and from whom would they solicit information seems highly relevant. I would imagine, Jordan would be an excellent candidate for supplying insight on many topics, and I would hope that we're This or this plan to work that he would be involved that way. Okay, most people have heard about sexual dimorphism and hermaphroditic ism. But is there such a thing as sexual polymorphism? And if so, how would that arise? evolutionarily? Thank you for doing the podcast so often? Well, if I understand the question, oh, no, wait a second. Well, the question could be one of two things, either it could mean, sexual dimorphism, as opposed to polymorphism, as in more sexes than two. And the interesting thing is that, in general, that's not what we see that we see asexual organisms, and we see sexual organisms in which there are two sexes, and then we see weird stuff and things like fungie, where sometimes there can be many, many, many mating types, which aren't exactly sexes, but nonetheless, it's something. But maybe the question here is actually asking about, like size dimorphism, where there are more than two sides where it's not like, males are large, and females are small, or sometimes it's the reverse in some species. But there could be many sizes. And in fact, we do see this. In some places, we see things like female strategies, yes, that is the actual term for it. Female strategies in which males take on a female like form. Often, this is in the context of something like a mating ball, where
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I've seen it in garter snakes, for example, where garter snakes will come out of hibernation, and females will effectively be mobbed by males, and they will be driven into the center of a ball of males trying to mate. And one strategy for getting to the female is not to be bigger, but to be small and female like and to be driven by the group who are confused about the sexual identity of the individual toward the female. So that can create a sort of third form, you know, a male and female female like form. By the way, I've also seen that Inuits in rough skin newts in the Pacific Northwest, where I do not believe it was a known behavior, but I've seen it multiple times. So anyway.

**Bret** 14:04

Okay, next question. If x y offspring is costly for mammal females, I think if X ray offspring are costly for more mammal females that should read can they meaning the female select against y in the womb? In unsafe environments? Will they tend to make x x in humans do more dominant and healthy parents tend to make to tend to make x y? What are factors? Okay, I think I understand the question. The question is asking whether or not if there are costs to having offspring of one sex or another in this case, the cost is being attributed to the males and this follows from something we talked about last time where males could be costly to a female because they would have potentially an interest in draining the field. Male more than the female would have an interest in being drained by the pregnancy or by the the loading of the can't be in the egg case. But But in any case, the point is do animals do females have the ability to select against something like male offspring in the womb or select against male, wide bearing sperm before fertilization, in order to adjust the sex of the offspring that they produce. Now, this actually follows quite well from something called the Trevor's Willard hypothesis. Bob Trevor's was an undergraduate mentor for Heather and me, he's still a good friend. And he is, anyway, one of the most important evolutionary thinkers of certainly the 20/20 century and arguably the 21st as well. So what Trevor's and Willard argued was that we know from Fisher's work that males and females are, on average, equally valuable, therefore, there's no inherent advantage to producing males or females, that, that there is some advantage to producing whichever one might be scarce. But that if a female knows what quality of offspring she's going to produce, she might then have a bias in one direction or another. That is to say, because most males are losers, sorry, guys, most males are losers, if you were going to produce offspring without enough resource so that they were likely to end up not being highly competitive, you'd be better off producing female offspring who would be almost guaranteed to find a mate. If you were going to produce really high quality offspring, let's say you had a great year and your competitors didn't, then you might want to produce male offspring, because a male who wins in many of these systems tends to out reproduce even a highly successful female. So the question here suggests an analog for this. And really, the point is, yes, the logic works, there's some evidence for it. It is difficult mechanistically this is difficult to arrange. But it is not impossible. And therefore, evolutionarily, we do expect to find solutions. And let's see. Yeah, and so you know, healthy parents healthy, and maybe, well, fed parents might be more likely to produce male offspring in this case. So anyway, I'd like to see a really large study that was able to demonstrate the existence of this force or the lack of existence for it in humans, but it's certainly been seen in many other creatures.

**Bret** 17:52

Okay, let's see. Yeah. Brett, which hypotheses of origin of life on earth do you lean towards? RNA genetics, first metabolism, first chemical synthesis, panspermia, thermo thermo synthesis? Do you know what that's supposed to read? Here's the thing. Do you have one yourself is probably what that says. This is one of these questions, which it would be wonderful to know the answer, it is important to know that there are answers that would suffice, there are certain things that we can see. So we can, I think see enough to strongly suspect that the RNA world pre existed the DNA to RNA world, we can see that in for example, the ribosome, which remains functions like a protein enzyme, but made from four RNA nucleotides, therefore it's much bigger and clumsier and slower than an RNA than a protein based enzyme would be. But as for all the way back at the beginning, what sparked it? I don't see anything to suggest panspermia. Yet, doesn't mean evidence couldn't emerge. But I haven't seen anything that would lead us to hypothesize that extra step was necessary. So anyway, I feel about it a little bit like, you know, the origin of the universe. It's important that something, explain it. In other words, it's important that it be explicable. There are people who might specialize in figuring out what the exact answer was, but it's kind of not the same type of question as how does evolution work? And so in some sense, I don't really feel like how did it start is in my area of specialty. So in some sense, I'm as excited to learn what the answer might be as anybody else. And no, I Don't have a personal pet hypothesis. Okay. Within those species of animals that passed the mirror self recognition test, not all individuals pass the test. What would a population of a species that has more self awareness be at an evolutional? Would that population of a species that has more self awareness being an evolutionary advantage is self recognition a case of convergent evolution? Self recognition will definitely be a case of convergent evolution. How do we know that because the taxa that show it are widely separated and their common ancestors we can infer in many of these cases didn't have it. So for example, elephants and primates are distantly separated. And they both show it. And so their common ancestor would be a creature for which we have no reason to think that it had this capacity. So I think this is incredibly fascinating, you know, and there are lots of things that work like this. Grief also seems to be convergently evolved. So next part of the question is, is there an advantage to this self awareness? Undoubtedly, there's an advantage to it, it has a cost and it emerges multiple times on the evolutionary tree and persists where it does emerge. And that says it has a benefit. Does it have a cost of goods? Of course, it has a cost? Is it a net benefit? Obviously, in some places it is, would it be a net benefit to everybody? Here's what I suspect is at the heart of your question, no, I don't think it would be a net benefit to every creature to have it. And so there's every reason to think that for some kinds of problem solving, it would have an advantage probably places where theory of mind was important. In other words, creatures where one individual needed to figure out what strategy another individual was likely to deploy. And so you would expect the cost to be worth paying in those cases. All right. Thanks for your voice of sanity. Question from six from six year old son Rafferty, why do humans grow two sets of teeth? Why not? 10? Awesome. Rafferty? That's a great question. So the thing is, we humans have a life cycle that was fairly consistent until relatively recently consistent enough that this solution evolved to match the set of problems that needed to be solved. Now, I
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still think there's lots of mystery here, I'm waiting for somebody to deliver a proper evolutionary explanation for many dental phenomena like wisdom teeth, for example, makes no sense for you to have teeth that don't fit into your jaw. Now, there are some very interesting perspectives on this. And in fact, I'm in conversation with one gentleman who has quite a lot to say about this. But what we really need is Darwinian dentistry. Just the same way Darwinian psychology has begun to explore the apparatus of the mind and do so in an in a rigorous evolutionary way. We need this for dentistry. Sorry, rafted, that might be a bit beyond the questions you're asking. But let's just say some creatures do have an essentially infinite number of teeth. Sharks have, effectively a conveyor belt of teeth that just kind of puts new teeth forward as necessary. And you will note that sharks sometimes live a very, very long time, some of the longest lived vertebrates, that is to say the longest live individual vertebrates that we know of on Earth are sharks. How would you build a creature whose teeth were going to wear down if it could live hundreds of years, you know, up under the Arctic ice, for example? Well, if you build it, to grow new teeth, and to be constantly pushing new ones forward, then it would always have sharp teeth even when it was old. So that's a great solution for that, we don't need that. Because we don't live that long, we live a period of time that actually two sets of teeth, pretty much gets us there. two sets of teeth also solves a problem of growth, where you're trying to do one set of things while your head is still relatively small. And then as your head matures, you need to start doing another set of things. And so it's a pretty elegant solution that we've now made inelegant by eating foods that our ancestors wouldn't have eaten living longer than our ancestors would have tended to. And lastly, rarely, I just can't help but continue to go on on your quest, and I'm so tickled that you would ask it. Think about the predicament of elephants. So Allah Have a kind of intermediate system between our system and the shark system where you just keep generating more teeth. So what elephants have is a set of teeth that moves forward over a lifetime, right? And they sort of get pushed off the front. But there's a limited number of them. It's not like sharks, they can't just make more teeth. So when we take elephants into things like zoos, they tend to live longer than their wild counterparts and they run out of teeth, which is a really serious problem. So anyway, there's a lot to be said about creatures living in novel environments, and those novel environments creating problems that the ancestors didn't have. Anyway, great question Rafferty, keep it up, you're gonna be alright. Okay, Alina Tran tweeted no evidence supports or rules out any of these options starts to cross into humans circulated undetected while adapting to humans. Maybe the virus originated outside Wuhan. Should we be looking in places with the most strain diversity? Well, this is wonderful. First of all, I'm very happy to see Alina Chan's work. Very high quality, very careful. And in my opinion, quite courageous. As I tweeted about her work when it emerged. What she has said is that we can't rule out all of these hypotheses, including laboratory origin. We now have a
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a very nice piece written by Matt Ridley and today's Wall Street Journal saying that the Wu Han fish market hypothesis is nearly dead, and that the laboratory hypothesis is alive. All of these things do suggest that we should be vigorously searching for the origin story. If that origin story is wild, we need to know where this thing circulated. One of the weirdest things about this virus is that it showed up really well adapted, right? That's not supposed to happen, what typically would happen is the virus would emerge from a wild animal, it would make the jump into humans, and then it would spend a bunch of time evolving before it took off and became a pandemic. That's not what happened here. It got into people well adapted to them, and boom, it was off to the races. So did it go through that evolutionary step that we expect in some other place? If so, it would be excellent to know where it was, where it was, and frankly, in what creature it was. So yes, I strongly support a search for the actual origin of this virus. And we need to be courageous and look, wherever the evidence takes us. But I also think we need to ask ourselves the question, we have been assured from moment one, that the laboratory hypothesis made no sense this virus couldn't have come from the lab. And it very probably came from the Wuhan seafood market, to the extent that that is now reversing itself. And we have been told that that was the order of things by virologists by the journal Nature, the journal Science by all of these reputable mainstream sources, how did they get it so wrong? And if you're a longtime watcher of our podcast, how did we know more than a month ago that that story didn't add up? How could we know if the people at the top of the field? were confused by it? Right? The answer to that question is a biggie. So think carefully about it. All right, where am I? On 15? Oh, sorry. What's your take on youtuber michael brooks new anti ID w book against the web, a cosmopolitan? The answer to the new right. Eric is even on the cover? Well, I have not read this book. I did however, see michael brooks interviewed on rising. And I was shocked. He went on for something like 12 minutes. And I did not spot a single substantive point. So my sense is he had an idea that there was a lot of hunger out there for some sort of takedown of the IBEW and he signed up for the role. And when he got right down to it, not a lot added up. because really what is there to complain about a bunch of heterodox thinkers being civil to each other. So anyway, I don't think very highly of it. And as much as I was hopeful that michael brooks might mature into a rational voice on the left, my hopes have dimmed on that front. Okay. 16 somebody is saying they have to support rigorous public discourse. Yes, rigorous public discourse perfect. Let's see listening from Yorkshire UK. Really appreciate you guys. Thanks for all you do. Excellent. Thank you. 18 Get well soon. Heather Heather. isn't really sick she just doesn't have her voice which is very uncomfortable thing she used to go through this when she was teaching every now and again, where once the voice starts to go horse you try to speak louder in order to overcome the quietness in the voice and it would just go positive feedback to the point that she would completely lose your voice. So we're trying to prevent that from happening. But No, she's not. She's not sick. But anyway, get loud soon. How about that? That seems closer. Okay. Would you make a separate video with these things in Portland people need to be able to see the dynamic in a more shareable form. Love your family? Um, yeah, it might be worth doing something like that. I will say, you know, Andy No, has done a great job of documenting what's going on with the anarchists in Portland and he's paid a high price for it. He's been very courageous. You know, I don't love everything Andy does are some stuff that troubles me. But the fact is, he's young, he is highly capable. He has been on the story longer than anyone. And you know, in some sense, I think we owe him a debt of gratitude. He saw this coming to the extent that there was mayhem last night in the streets of Portland.

**Bret** 31:16

Andy now is in a position to say I told you so about it. Okay. Let's see. Let's see is now a good time to buy a gun? If you haven't already. That seems like a loaded question. And that seems like a decent pun.

**Bret** 31:42

is now a good time to buy a gun. If you haven't already know it's a terrible time to buy a gun. Because the lines of the gun store out the door as I in my neighborhood, at least when I pass the gun store, there are people literally lined up outside or at least there were right before lockdown. So just economically speaking, I would say supply appears to be low demand appears to be high that suggests the price of guns will be high. So I'm just going to take a strictly economic stance and say Nope, you should wait for demand to drop and supply to increase. Okay, look at same two questions. How would we deal with Congress which has the same pressure from the parties? And what safeguards do we Institute to keep people from gaming the system? Yang and MC Riva are Yang and mcraven. Unbelievable, I believe Yang and mcraven. Together would be unbeatable. Maybe I'm naive, but that's what I think. I actually think there are more unbeatable people out there, then you would imagine, but to the extent that we have a duopoly of influence peddlers, they have an interest in keeping the unbeatable people away. That's what the primaries are for. So in any case, what do we do at the Congress? Well, here's the thing, if you think really hard, you'll realize that there are bound to be three kinds of people. Okay, you've got people who will do the right thing, no matter what, probably not a lot of those in Congress, maybe a few. You got people who will do the wrong thing, no matter what, they're just committed to doing bad stuff, probably not a lot of those in Congress either, right? It's just not a very good strategy. So how would you get the Congress if you were that dumb, and then there gonna be a lot of people in the middle? Who will do the wrong thing, if they're not left with better choices, but might rather not live in a corrupt system. And so I think if you gave the Congress an opportunity to do the right thing to feel good about it, you know, to be able to look their kids in the eye, all that sort of thing. I think you'd find a good number of them, we're up to the challenge. Not all of them. The ones who aren't, I say we, I say we throw those bums out. I mean, like yesterday. So anyway, what would that look like if we actually put this plan into motion and it worked, and you had president and vice president governing together as a team with no affiliation to either of the parties? Wow, would they have a tremendous amount of power behind them that came from the actual people? And wow, would that create a large incentive for people in the Congress who are capable of doing the right thing to come on over to the right side, so let's do it. Let's just get rid of those two parties. There's so god awful. Okay. Brett, this one is for me. Awesome. Go buy the ingredients to make egg drop soup for Heather for her voice. It works like a charm in this person's experience. I recommend those free range eggs that have the hens backstories included inside the cartons and cost like 599 Can I ask you a question? It's not exactly an answer to what you've said here. I may try that could well could be the thing. free range eggs.

**Bret** 34:58

How far could they go? possibly get. All right. Next question, how can a critical mass of people be convinced to vote for a ticket that's
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only half from their side over the one? That's all from their side? Thank you for asking that question. Here's the thing, people are sick of this crap, they are sick to death of it, if you provided them something that looked honorable and patriotic, and where they didn't know how it ended, where there was some reason to get up and be hopeful in the morning, lots and lots of people would be there. The thing that prevents a plan like this from coming into play, is that people imagine from the get go that because it doesn't come through the door that they've been told is the only possible way to get to the White House, that it's a non starter. But you have to think beyond that the parties have by by advancing these two corrupt them whence they have announced to us that they are not interested in leadership at a moment when absent leadership, we could very well drive ourselves extinct. We could have a civil war. So at you know, at what point do your party's announced they're not interested in leadership, and you don't listen to them? I say it's time we listen. Let's do it. Alright. Great proposal. Brett. What are ways to spread these ideas? To a large audience, Joe Rogan has the platform and certainly wants to improve America. Thank you, sir. Thank you. I don't know, obviously. I mean, Joe Rogan is maybe the most important person in media today. And for good reason. I have to say, Joe, is exactly who he seems to be. And so his success, it couldn't happen to a better guy. Would he be interested in this? I think you'd only be interested in it if he thought there was a real chance. But but Yeah, that'd be the obvious way. How do you reach more people than have a chit chat with Joe Rogan about it? Or frankly, Joe, you can talk about it with anybody, I've put it on the table, I'd be happy to tell you what I forgot to say here that might be worth discussing. But yeah, wonderful. The idea is now public domain. Let's spread it far and wide. Okay. Somebody just wants to thank me for our content. Great. You're very welcome. All right. The anarchists are being organized and exploited by the globalists, you know, I see this allegation a lot. And I have no idea if it's accurate. It's one of those rabbit holes that I haven't gone down, maybe just because I haven't had time. Or maybe because I secretly suspect it doesn't much matter. I mean, to the same extent that there's some web of corruption that advances lackluster presidential candidates whose main purpose is to prevent real change from happening. To the extent that that's the thing. It's not all that important that we figure out the details of the corruption. What's really important is that we figure our way out of it. Okay. Did I check the generational hormone theory yet? Its main premise is that the population cycles are driven by generationally fluctuating hormone levels, and human populations are included. Here's the thing. I think there's something to this, but I think the hormone bit is a red herring. There is a way in which generations follow some sort of pattern and many people have spotted it. Whether that has a molecular explanation, I don't see any reason that it needs to. The fact is, each generation provides the developmental environment for the next generation. And because of that, you would expect certain kinds of parents to produce certain kinds of offspring and you would get this kind of repeating cycle. So I think there is something to the cycle, I remained to be convinced that it has anything to do with hormones or more likely pheromones or whatever. I think it's basically just developmental environment and exposure. Okay, what about Tulsi Gabbard? Mixed ethnicity and desire to end wars could be a good path going forward. And the fact that the dems turned on her at the point she got 60% disapproval speaks volumes. Okay. I'm quite far the end of that. But here's the thing. I actually like the idea of Tulsi and I considered her for the second spot problem if he has some serious negatives, which I'm not sure she deserves. But nonetheless, the most important thing about this proposal is that it works well enough to get two patriots into the White House to govern as a team.

**Bret** 39:56

What I am not convinced of is that Tulsi Gabbert is not too divisive to make that happen. I wish she wasn't. But in particular, she has a major stumbling block when it comes to Jews on the basis that she is perceived to be anti Israel. Now, I don't think that's what I see. But let's just say the most important thing is that we get patriots into the White House. I personally believe Tulsi is a patriot. And I believe she is all of the things that would be prerequisites for this. The question is really, how electable would she be? And I don't know the answer. I'm open to being convinced that she's the right person. Okay. My president proposal doesn't address elections, Congress or lobbyists to name only three major issues. How does putting a new head on it? cure a body politic? That is diseased, as deeply as ours seems to be great question. Totally agree, except that it does address it in a way, which is, if I mean, just for a second, write the script from Inauguration Day, never mind how we get there, what it looks like, I believe those questions are answerable to, but let's just say we did. Okay. Now you have two people walking in as potentially the heroes that have freed us from this corrupt fog that we've lived under most of us for most of our lives. So what kind of power do they have to confront the corrupting influences? I would say tremendous. And, as I said, prerequisite to be in those spots from my perspective, would be highly competent, patriot and courageous, you'd have to be courageous to go up against those forces. But what better than people who are highly creative and motivated to make America function to figure out what the solution to the corruption problem is, and I would love to see what they come up with. I'd love to be involved in helping come up with something and I've done a lot of thinking on that front, too. But thanks for the question. It's an excellent one. Okay, you mentioned that Trump was a separate family. Do you think the GOP will drop Trump post Trump? And do you think he will haunt all future GOP candidates? So very interesting question. I don't think so at this point, I think he is, you know, in narrative terms, he effectively decapitated the GOP. And I think there was a time early on where if they could have figured out how to rid themselves of him, they would have, but I think at some level, it's a brutal political game. And he is the master of it. And so they have, they have reluctantly agreed to share the spoils in order not to have to confront him. And I would expect that to be durable. But anyway, time will tell I guess. Any books exercises practices, you suggest a recent college grad graduate use to help in their development into a good experimentalists Research Scientist hoping to enroll in a biomed Ph. D. program next fall. Thanks so much. Great question. The there are really two parts to the answer. One is, the best thing you can do, I think, to become a great experimentalists research scientist, is put yourself through the mental exercise of generating hypotheses, generating useful predictions, good ones, and then figuring out what experiment would would actually successfully test for them. So you can do that a lot of times. And if I can give you one, slightly bizarre piece of advice.

**Bret** 43:56

I got very good at reinventing the wheel, which reinvented the wheel has a very bad name, right? People think reinventing the wheel is wasting your time. reinventing the wheel in science can mean generating a hypothesis, not knowing whether anybody has come up with it before coming up with the predictions that follow from it experiments, you would run all of those things. And then you go to the library. Very frequently, you'll find somebody did have the hypothesis before and they went through the work of testing it. And what you get to do then, is track how good you were at figuring out a, what they would find be how you would test it, all of the things that you're going to need to know. So it might take you years to generate a good hypothesis, the experiments that follow from it, and then run the experiments where it would take you hours to do it mentally, and then track how you did relative to the people who did the relevant work. So you can train yourself by checking against what's already been done. And I think that that's a very useful technique. We don't teach people enough we tend to teach them the results of experiments as if that's the key thing rather than Put them through the exercise of generating them themselves. Good luck, by the way. Okay, if the virus was lab generated and therefore highly exploratory, is it more likely that the virus would take an increasingly volatile and harmful trajectory? Or to attenuate more rapidly versus the trajectory of viruses? in general? Great question. I don't think we know, I think in general, my concern is that we not give the virus more room in which to evolve that the thing becomes more frightening, the more instances of it exist in the world, because each of those instances is an opportunity for innovations. And so even if it evolves in the direction of being more benign, I don't want it to be more persistent. And since what it is trying to do is persist, I'd like to give it as few opportunities to discover new ways of persisting as possible. And so that means effectively blocking access to new people, not not only people anything that can infect, but primarily people. And that if we were to do that the chances of us stamping it out the way the original SARS Cove disappeared, are increased. And that's really what we should be hoping for is to drive it to zero. And the more innovation room it has, the less likely we are to succeed at that. All right, next question. Hello. Hello, back. See, next question. Recently, there's been wide interest in scientific evidence for benefits of meditation, especially that of Zen Buddhism, what's your opinion? Funny, you should ask. I suck at meditating. I'm really almost impossibly bad at it. I do other things that I think have some of the benefits of it, but I just really don't have very much hope of getting good. I did. I was on a panel with Sam Harris in Australia, year ago, year and a half ago, something and he gave a workshop. And anyway, I enjoyed it. But I still don't feel like I was any good at it. That said, scientifically speaking, I frequently find that when I follow my own understanding of biology, and I carry it through to its logical conclusion, I land somewhere that sounds to me a lot like what I understand Buddhism to, to believe so I think there's a lot to Buddhism, there's probably a lot to meditation. And so anyway, if it works for you, I think do it, it sure isn't going to be harmful to you. And to the extent that it's philosophically deep, you know, by virtue of being connected to Buddhism, all the better. Okay, can leftists reclaim free thinking and labor reform? Yeah, this is a tough one, I think we need to be broader minded about what leftists are, you know, and I said, and it resonated for some people on a past podcast, that what makes me a progressive is the fact that I know that we absolutely need progress of a major form, or we're going to go extinct. And so therefore, I have to be a progressive, but that doesn't mean I'm signed up for the things that progressive tend to advocate for. I think this is the same question. In some sense, we need an enlightened left to figure out what progress looks like and at the point that we have an enlightened left doing that, then all the other things will follow naturally. Can we reclaim the left from the numbskulls who are in charge of it at the moment?

**Bret** 48:41

I don't think that should be our objective. I think we should make them obsolete. That's the better plan. Okay, Brett, please take a moment to read this when you have an opportunity. And it comes with a URL that I do not recognize. Oh, looks like the hunt for patient zero. I think I know who patient zero would be in such a URL, but I will look at it anyway. It's an interesting story. Okay, what do you think about the sentiment? My voice won't be heard unless I smash bricks into the store or windows? I don't like that sentiment. I don't think it works. And frankly, I think it's typically a rationalization by people who want to smash bricks into Windows, because it's fun. So anyway, yeah, I don't think very much of it. Chickens walk in a big circle ending up back at their roost just in time every night so they don't get very far. No, no, no, no, no, no. You think I'm asking how far free range chickens could go. I was asking about free range eggs which if they can get anywhere at all, it's basically just downhill. Okay, love you bread, but the center right candidate will quickly be labeled a Nazi. And the center left candidate a socialist. The idea is do a I am out? Well, I disagree. And I would spell that out if I was more confident of my spelling. Yeah, look, they're gonna get labeled all kinds of things. And in fact, we've got to have a talk about, there's not much we can do about this Nazi thing except recognize that the term is being used so frequently in such stupid contexts that it's losing its meaning. And frankly, I'm angry at everybody who's doing that. Because if there's one term, you don't want to screw up, it's Nazi, you're going to need that one at some point, and you don't want to have ruined it. So cut it out, guys. But as far as socialists go, we have badly misunderstood this one. And you know, there will be those who look at my COVID haircut and hear me saying things that aren't completely derisive about socialism. Now think, aha, we got them this time. But no, it's not like that. Okay. socialism doesn't work. I think the reason that socialism doesn't work is crystal clear. That does not cause me to fear all socialists. It causes me to fear socialists who wish to impose socialism. But that's not what most socialists are doing. It's not what Bernie Sanders is doing. So anyway, I don't fear socialists, even though I know socialism is a dead end, and often a dangerous one. But we should have that conversation so that everybody is armed with the same model. Or if the model is wrong, somebody can tell me what's wrong with it, and I can fix mine. But anyway, for another day. Okay. Frederick von Braun, if you are wrong, that is not what the backstories indicate the chickens live a brave life of adventure. I don't know what conflict I've walked into here. But it's fascinating. And chickens are central that much I can tell. The generational hormone hypothesis is an evolutionary hypothesis. And there's a lot of statistics from both the human and animal populations to support it. Okay, so somebody really wants me to check into this, I guess I should check into. All right, you got my attention. Hello, Brett, do you attempt to position yourself as a scholar on this program from an objectivist? a political standpoint? In other words, please

**Bret** 52:21

talk about how your worldview informs your role as a scholar podcaster. Yeah, this is simple. This is simple. I have a rule. It's explicit. Sometimes I put it on the board for students so that they can formalize it in their own minds and adopt it, because I think it's the right one. It's like this. It is natural, for your scientific perspective, to influence your political perspective and your ideology. Totally normal. It is completely unacceptable for your political beliefs, or ideology to influence your science. What you're getting here on this podcast is me as I actually am, right? The only thing that's different on this podcast from who I actually am, is that I curse more in real life. And I don't do it on this podcast when I can avoid it, because I don't want to get demonetised for no reason. But if we put that aside, in general, you're getting me as I am. You're getting me as my student saw me. And the point is, look, I'm being honest with you about the relationship between these two things. What I think is true, scientifically influences what I want politically, and I'm not embarrassed about that. It doesn't go the other way. And that's important. Any scientist who doesn't maintain that border is suspect. And so anyway, you're not getting one or the other, you're getting both. If it's not clear to you that one, that's something I say is on one of those channels and not the other. You could ask, but I will try to make it clear and probably should just trust your gut about which part of my my worldview you're hearing at that given moment. Okay. Let's see. Hello, Brett. Do you attempt to visit Oh, that same one? Okay. I think employees of prisons, nursing homes and meatpacking plants get little or no paid time off and they are paid very little. is just mandating paid time off going to help a lot. Well, look, I think a lot of people are underpaid. And to the extent that important functions like nursing homes and prisons, and meatpacking plants are essentially taking advantage of their workers in a way that has externalized costs in the form of presumably brutality in prisons and neglect in nursing homes and pathogen spreading and packing plants. You know, it comes back to haunt us and other forms. So yeah, we should. We should build a system that doesn't do that. We should price everything much better than we do in most cases. Okay. I have reached To the end of the questions, this has been very interesting. I am looking forward to having Heather back to make the sound of my voice less dominant and to increase the richness of the conversation. But in any case, interesting experiment. All right. Please, like, subscribe, comment, spread the word about how we're going to oust these decrepid clowns from their position in our would be democratic republic and I will see you all next time.