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**Bret** 00:09

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse podcast live stream Q and A section number 27. I am here with Dr. Heather hiring and we are going to endeavor to answer your questions about this, that and possibly the other.

**Heather** 00:25

Maybe the other, maybe

**Bret** 00:25

we'll see we get to it. Yeah, yeah. But

**Heather** 00:28

we wanted to start by saying that our normal schedule would have us doing our next live stream number 28 on the Fourth of July, which obviously is a meaningful day here in the United States, where many of our viewers are from, and we think we're gonna go ahead and do it, expecting fewer people to be able to tune in live, but I know

**Bret** 00:46

you'll tune in Fourth of July. This is a very patriotic podcast, you'll be there. But please bring your own barbecue for COVID reasons we cannot supply it for everyone. That's true. Yes. Yeah. I thought I'd mentioned that.

**Heather** 00:59

Thank you. Thank you. I know I feel better. Yeah, I heard that it'll be cheaper. Yeah. And then also, for those of you who have joined Brett's Patreon, of late at the $100 level, you get access to a lecture conversation conversation on the first Saturday of every month, but that will be delayed by a week. So you will also make an announcement on your Patreon.

**Bret** 01:27

That is that coalition of the reasonable discussion, which has been fantastic. There are people who have been doing it for years. And I think we all look forward to it every month, because it's, it's a great reality check. And we come up with some really interesting things which are now finding their way into actual efforts to change the system.

**Heather** 01:46

Yeah, so you'll announce this also to your patrons. But that will not happen on July 4, that will happen the following Saturday. And as long as we're talking about Patreon, we did our first private q&a live stream last Sunday for Darkhorse members, which you had access to in my Patreon, and I think it was a very good success, we got a lot of great feedback. So you can join, you can join us there as well, that one it's a it's a private link, but you can see it at any time. And we will be doing one of those every single month. Private q&a.

**Bret** 02:18

Yeah, I recommend I thought there were some really great questions and was was more intimate because smaller number of people. So anyway, yeah, take a look at it.

**Heather** 02:26

All right. So we're gonna start as we did last time by picking up just a couple of comments, questions that we got last time that we didn't get to. So four of them. First question from last time, not from Episode 27. But from Episode 26. Hi, guys. My girlfriend says the trans rights activists make the distinction between gender what you choose and sex, how you are born. She seems to think that you are misinformed. Any thoughts? So many thoughts? Yeah,

**Bret** 02:59

number one question is the girlfriend the keeper, right? That really dictates which strategy you use in response to this question. I

**Heather** 03:06

don't think it needs to know now. Okay. Now, I think you might as well just go full truth on this. Well,

**Bret** 03:11

either way, actually, you'll find out if she's a keeper, I guess.

**Heather** 03:14

So consider it some sort of a test? Yeah.

03:18

Yeah. So

**Heather** 03:21

gender, which is what we call in humans, what we would call sex role in other species, is basically the behavioral manifestation of your sex. So yes, there is a distinction. But they are tightly linked. And so it's all evolutionary, and where you draw the line between what is quote unquote, biological, and what is quote, unquote, social is somewhat up to you. Although we tend not to talk in those terms, because the fact is, it's all evolutionary. So the fact is that gender follows from sex. Sex is binary. Gender isn't genders, the manifestation of your sex, traditional gender roles were much closer to bi modal to binary than they are now. At this point, your sex does not decide nearly as many things about what the options you have in the universe are as they did even even 50 years ago, frankly. But the idea that gender is simply a choice that is independent of what your sex is, or independent of evolutionary process is wrong. And I would say one more thing, which is that not only is that true, but trans rights activists as compared to actual trans people who are mostly not in our experience on board with the tra, ideology, also pull a motte and Bailey and so they say this, as if it's an argument which it's not, but even if it even if it were, they will also then say, actually, even sex isn't real. So they have two arguments, both of which are wrong, one of which is more patently wrong than the other. But even the sort of the weaker form of the argument, which is that gender is a choice and sex is biological Isn't Right, right. So

**Bret** 05:02

the tagline that I use is gender is the software of sex. And what that does suggest is the gender is more flexible, it's varied, it varies more between cultures. It is not perfectly plastic. But the thing that was in the middle of Heather's excellent rant there was that just the fact that something is cultural rather than genetic, does not mean that it isn't evolutionary. Both of these things are evolutionary, they travel separately through time. So we have this dual inheritance pattern. And gender is not perfectly free. Now can we free it if we want to at this moment in history, we can. But the idea that because it is not encoded genetically, that it is somehow free from the logical rules of the universe is just nuts. Which is not an attacking anybody. And you know, evergreen being what it was, we had numerous trans students, many more than we would likely have had, were we to teach somewhere else. We had very strong relationships with them. You traveled abroad, with trans students. So anyway, it's I think the thing is, Heather makes this distinction between trans people and trans rights activists. And I can't say what the overlap is. But I can say there are great many people in the trans rights activist movement who don't sound anything like the trans people who we knew who were wonderful, I think, without exception.

**Heather** 06:35

That's right. And I guess, I mean, boy, we have actually said a fair bit about this. I think I think there's a rebel wisdom video of me talking about this, and it's in a few places, and it will, we will continue to talk about this for sure. But one more thing that I will say that I have said before, is that if I were coming of age right now, as as the tomboy that I was, people would probably be telling me that I was trans. And that's simply it's offensive. It's regressive. It's disgusting. Not that being trans is disgusting. But the idea that I, as a girl who didn't, didn't have stereotypical gender norms, who far prefer dirt to dresses, and climbing trees to playing with dolls, was somehow therefore revealing my inner, inner truth as a boy, no, I never wanted to be a boy like playing with boys. But it didn't have anything to do with feeling like I wasn't a girl, nope, just just abandoned many of traditional gender norms. So that was something that was true in the 70s and 80s, which is now less true, which means that this is also the ideology in a way is regressive. It's actually regressive. It's actually sexist. And I would say misogynistic. Yeah.

**Bret** 07:49

And actually, you know, you were the first person that I heard, make this argument. I've now heard several other people make it including Katie Hertzog. And I'm not I'm forgetting there's a list of three or four amazing women who have now said something along these lines, JK Rowling actually said this. And so what are we doing that we're tinkering with something that makes amazing women? I mean, it just, it's a it's a crazy thing to be messing with. And you know, it is. It is misogynistic. And anyway, it's got to stop. Yeah.

**Heather** 08:27

All right. So I'm, this is a little bit self serving, maybe, but I'm reading this comment from last time. This is not only the most important podcast, but quite possibly in all modern history, but it's also the most prescient so that was the word I liked here. Particularly awareness of these issues is of the utmost impressing importance.

**Bret** 08:45

I think that's a little extreme, I would say most important podcasts in the last 50 years. Oh.

**Heather** 08:52

Okay. Next, penultimate question from last time, what subject or subjects in K 12 school were you least interested or proficient in? And then interestingly, Jim, not included, and I actually don't know what your relationship Jim was. I love Jim. Well, I mean, in so far, we had Jim in LA in the 70s and 80s, wasn't

**Bret** 09:12

it? Jim likes it some aspects of it like I remember climbing a rope ceiling that was a presidential fitness test. Yeah. And then I remember we had a dumb race track where nobody had corrected for the fact that the outer the outer path was longer I swear it was true. I mean, we corrected for it because we knew but whoever painted those damn lines. Now he

09:37

just drew it like as a radiant Oh my goodness. Yeah.

**Bret** 09:41

It was it was almost like you know, scenery automatically filled in by some sort of algorithm that wasn't particularly well programmed. But

**Heather** 09:49

what you learned from that sort of thing, okay, but putting aside from Jim, we had such totally different experiences in school and this again, we could speak for hours and hours about this, and maybe we should devote an episode at some point later to just what school was for each of us. But

**Bret** 10:06

I mean, I it's gonna be hard for me to come up with something because you know, even the stuff that was good was such a terrible failure in my case. But I do remember you clearly

**Heather** 10:15

learned

**Bret** 10:16

nothing. Oh, I learned mostly out of resentment. But I'll show y'all show them right now the the, I remember learning the state capitals. And I remember thinking that I had never heard of half of these cities. And I wasn't sure at what point it was going to be important that I had heard of them. And I just sort of felt like this whole thing is on autopilot, right? Yes, state capitals mattered 100 years ago,

**Heather** 10:47

right? Of yet, you know, so we were also of course forced to work learn the states, which is relevant, like if you if you're in the United States, and frankly, better geography, instead of being forced to learn the state capitals. Yeah, being being forced to learn the countries in Africa, which, you know, granted changes faster than the state capitals, but you know, actual good geography would be super valuable.

**Bret** 11:09

Right. On the other hand, you know, I granted it's not that easy, it would take maybe, you know, an hour but they couldn't have run us through like, boundary layers, right? Or reversion to the mean, or something really useful content, the third grade? Yes, the earlier the better. No,

**Heather** 11:27

you just wouldn't use that language necessarily, although we certainly did with our children when they were in third grade. But you don't you do it empirically. You

11:34

do it with, with James. Yeah.

**Heather** 11:36

Yeah, no, but I mean, I will say there's, there's again, a ton to be said here. But I, I loved school, and I was good at school. And I specifically loved English, and arts and science and math. And the subjects that I couldn't quite get into were foreign languages. I took French for no good reason. And it just made no sense to me learning it in that framework, and I don't have a particular skill for learning foreign languages. Anyway, I now see having now lived in French speaking Madagascar and having lived in Spanish speaking, Latin America. That's that's not great. But also history. Like I had so few history teachers that made it come alive that weren't doing that sort of that sort of learn the state capitals version of history, here's a litany of dates and events without context without explanation without analysis, that I couldn't fathom why you wouldn't be interested in it, that it really was only through auto didactic history, but learning it on my own, that I that I came to really grasp it. The big exception there being actually that at the, at the high school where we met, ultimately, there was a great book, a great books program, which really did this sort of interface of literature and history. And so in that, I did I mean, I read I read Marx and I read Mao and I read Lenin and Hobbes and Locke and Rousseau and you know, and Hume and Kant and I don't remember most of it but I still have the books and that that is the way to learn the history and philosophy of our country and of others

**Bret** 13:20

Yeah, but you know you were on that track you were you were in the the higher level program so you got the great books I was dumb track so I was in the okay books program, which wasn't nearly as interesting you got jack and jill climbing the hill. Oh man. Yeah, I pretty much figured out what was going on with jack and jill but uh, you know, I didn't get Hobbs so you remembered all of it. Every bit yeah, yeah. No, really school for me was a little bit like a Milgram experiment trainer you know, which I passed every day from second grade on I was not putting up with that experimenters bullshit But no, I didn't get a lot from the content. Yeah.

**Heather** 13:57

Okay, final question from last time. Where do you guys get your news these days?

**Bret** 14:03

Yeah, you have to source it on your own because every source seems to be compromised if you tune in to any sources if it's good it's not good because you'll get the bullshit that comes through that same channel. Yeah, so I would say there are some places that I look you know I definitely look at rising which actually I will be on tomorrow so rising is pretty interesting the hill is on the hill

**Heather** 14:26

for me if you said rising to me until yesterday and every time I was on the hill

**Bret** 14:31

Yeah. And it's it's quite good. I definitely use Reddit I there are certain sub reddits that I go to and there are people who post things that are useful and that will often point me to you know, when the Atlantic is saying I will find myself reading stuff there when it's insane. I don't necessarily go so I mean, I still stone Matt Taibbi has been on fire. He has been absolutely on fire. So Matt, if you're out there, keep it up.

**Heather** 15:00

I still have some print publications coming into our house. And I'm more wary of some of them than others, but the Atlantic, and Harper's are two that I am mostly still appreciative of the kind of long form journalism that they do. I had to give up on Mother Jones. Unfortunately, the New York Times is pretty much lost. I do scan the New York Times and Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal and The Guardian, you know, all about even the Wall Street Journal or, you know, less so but you know, left leaning enough that you that you're definitely looking with a particular lens.

**Bret** 15:38

The Spectator Yeah, sometimes the Federalists, sometimes not. So anyway, the other thing is, nobody has really described the method, but through Twitter and other things, using people you trust to help filter the garbage so that you're seeing the stuff that actually has content is a very useful process.

**Heather** 16:00

Yep. Okay, first question from the live stream that just ended, it seems that occupies focus on economic inequality was closest we've been to striking it a real enemy, a grid, has shift to the more superficial or divisive concerns after occupy been an engineered strategy to move discourse away from economic realities was occupy a threat to the status quo.

**Bret** 16:23

I would say it was a threat to the status quo, and it had one significant accomplishment, it lodged the idea of the 99%, which is not a precisely right idea, but it's an accurate enough idea. So to me, the 99%, if you could just get people to look at it and say there's a 1% and there's a 99%. And somehow policy is serving the 1%. To the extent that that is accurate, it raises a question, How the hell are you going to get a democracy to make policy in favor of 1%? And against 99%? It would seem like every single election, there would be a campaign to have policy that served the people in acted cynically or not, right, that would be a hugely popular programs. So how is it that you keep that from breaking out in a democracy? If you can figure out that that's the question. Now you know, what's going on. And now you know why we have a move that has decided that all of the inequities in the universe are due to racism that can't be seen or detected with a any tool of any kind, but it's there and it can't be cured. But it must be. Right. That's how we got there. Right? We're doing this instead of addressing the obvious glaring problem that our that occupy was actually targeted at which frankly, the initial Tea Party was also targeted at. So both of those movements got co opted, and they became silly or worse in the end. And we are now seeing occupy 2.0 fused with black lives matter. That's now explicitly true. We are seeing occupy revived inside of this movement. Oh, I didn't know that. Was it? Yeah. Where did I just see it? There's a occupy protest in New York and I forgotten what it is that they are. Oh, yes. It's an occupy something or other that is demanding a $1 billion reduction in the police budget. Something like that. Anyway, yeah.

**Heather** 18:15

It's in New York City Police budget. Yeah, yeah, that'll help.

**Bret** 18:18

What could possibly go wrong? I can't imagine. So anyway, yeah, it was. It was a threat. It was defanged. The idea didn't go away, though. You know, the 99% is not invoked very often anymore, but it definitely penetrated the public mind it did. And now I would say, take a look at the hidden tribes report. The hidden tribes report describes an 86% in the middle of people who have more or less shared values, but are very tired because we were being pushed around by fringe ideologies on both the far left and far right. So that's kind of I saw somebody invoke it yesterday. So that is, Jonathan Hertzog. But anyway, the idea was we are the 86%, which I think is great.

**Heather** 19:02

Yeah, that is great. It's a little, it took my brain a moment to switch that 86% is not within same reference to the 1%. Right? It's it's a totally different metric.

**Bret** 19:13

Well, it was the innovation of whoever made this tweet if it was Jonathan or not, but But somehow, just as somehow the 1% is making policy and the 99% can't figure out how to get policy made on its behalf.

**Heather** 19:27

The 14% appears to have captured at least the DNC and presumably as much of the RNC as well,

**Bret** 19:32

86% in the middle is not getting its needs taken care of because the two fringes are pushing around the policy. So anyway, it is a similar, glaring defect in our system that needs to be addressed. Yep.

**Heather** 19:49

Okay, you ready? 2020 is the plan you don't need 2020 is the plan to be awarded enough electoral college votes in order to put the decision to the house. If this isn't the plan, please elaborate on your solution. path forward, which states show the most promise for a dark horse? What about kch? Yang? I pronouncing that crisis? Yes.

**Bret** 20:08

So let me address these in sequence one, we thought our biggest obstacle was ballot access, it turns out there are at least four paths to ballot access that would not require this to be thrown to the house. So all I will say is, it does not make sense for us to discuss the details of that plan yet that actually we will remove some of the potential by discussing them ahead of time. In other words, people who are not interested in seeing us restore power to the people will take up arms against it, and the more they know, the worse off we are. But what I would say is Stay tuned, you will very quickly discover what those routes are. And we can talk about which ones are most likely. And it may be that it's a hybrid strategy. But there are ways to do it. We were actually pleasantly surprised when we looked into this matter. And as far as cases,

**Heather** 21:02

Yang, which states showed the most promise and one of that cases, yeah, well,

**Bret** 21:06

it's not a weak states, we're talking about all 50 states. And this is plausible, we you know, we try to talk ourselves out of this, because if it wasn't really possible, we didn't want to put our necks out. But we ended up talking ourselves into the fact that this is possible. You don't you can do to make it more possible, sign up, add to our numbers, it costs you nothing, it takes no time. And if you do it, then people who are looking at us thinking that's a really cool plan, but it's never gonna work, those people will start to come over. And what you'll get is positive feedback. And positive feedback, as you know, is the most powerful force in the universe. So let's get there. All right, the last question was kch. Yang, you know, we have a list of people who if either Yang or mcraven are not available for this or are unwilling, and frankly, I don't think either of them would be unwilling, but there is a question about, can they. And if they can't, then we have a list of people who could slot in either place, you will notice in our document, the articles of unity, we do not mention any candidates, because the important thing is the plan. And there are a great many people who could inhabit either of these spots and would do an excellent job because of course, the key to any administration is going to be who it's listening to right, who is going to bring in to decide what to do about environmental questions about economic questions about the danger posed to us by our enemies. Nobody's a superhero. The people don't have encyclopedic knowledge of how the world works on every topic. So it's going to be a question of who they bring in, and how they make decisions. And if they're patriotic, and they're courageous, and they're capable, and they bring in the right people. Wow, are we on a better path?

**Heather** 22:44

Next question, is depression and evolutionary adaptation? If so, what's the benefit? The cost incurred seems extremely high. Mm hmm.

**Bret** 22:54

You want to go or so I would say, first thing is the person to go to on this as Randy Nessie who actually is a friend of ours from when we were in graduate school. I took

**Heather** 23:04

several did ever take anything from Randy it was in seminars with him, but no classes.

**Bret** 23:08

So anyway, he, he is an important force in, in evolutionary medicine. In Darwinian medicine. He, he wrote, he co wrote one of the most important books why we get sick with George Williams, who is now deceased. But in any case, they

**Heather** 23:26

killed off Williams, who was one of the most important evolutionary thinkers of the 20th century, 20th century,

**Bret** 23:30

absolutely. And also was a friend of ours. He was quite quite old. But anyway, he is now gone. So Nancy's point. I hope I don't butcher this, Randy, I would say Nestle's point with which I would agree, is that there is a lot of evolutionary content in depression. In other words, it's not a total failure of the system. It is a feature of the system that is adaptive, that we see emerging in very harmful ways that modernity has taken, circuits that do something useful, and it has unleashed them in ways that are harmful. And so like that, but I would just say, to add a final little piece, you know, is paralysis, an evolutionary adaptation? Yes, it is, when you're asleep, it keeps you from hurting yourself, right? Do we sometimes see people paralyzed when they're awake? We do. Why would paralysis exist? That seems like a terrible thing. Well, it is if it happens to you at the wrong moment. And it's a very important thing if it happens to you at the right moment. And so the suggestion is to depression will be very much like this.

**Heather** 24:40

So in that there's a nuance here, that's really important. That the argument is not the category isn't real depression isn't real or paralysis isn't real, but that the other contextual factors that exist at the same time change the answer to whether or not it's adaptive, right. So So Saying sometimes yes, sometimes no does not mean that we are calling into question the reality of the category. And that I think this is actually a key point that many people who haven't thought evolutionarily a lot may not into it may miss. Yep.

**Bret** 25:14

And I would the risk of confusing people, I would say that the same thing will turn out to be true for suicide itself, which is obviously a downstream con, consequences of depression. But that historically, it was a very different object. And that in modern times, we frequently see very tragic, meaningless suicides as a result of noisy data, a person can't figure out where they are and what it means. And, you know, I think we all feel that all the time. And the fact that it triggers some people to resort to suicide is maybe not too surprising. It's also addressable, if you think about what that implies, so maybe we should do that, too.

**Heather** 25:57

Next question, I'm a lesbian, I was told by several very masculine trans women that I need to, quote, get over my vagina fetish. This seems eerily similar to conversion therapy to me. And as someone who went through conversion therapy as a youth, this concerns me thoughts. It should concern you. It's wrong. It's it's simply wrong. And we all know what a lesbian is. And that's not yet. This is why the I think this, this is part of the evidence, the conflation of gender with sex. And actually, you know, so I have I know a person, I'm going to anonymize her somewhat, who is a lesbian, and was in a relationship for many years, and her partner transitioned and became unrecognizable to her. And she broke up with the partner, now identifying as a male, and is now with a new partner. And the thing that my friend said to me, about her new partner with whom she's been for several years now, was not only did my previous partner change in personality at the point that she was transitioning, but I also realized that the changes physically were unappealing to me, and I've come to understand something that I wouldn't have allowed myself to think before, which is that I, this friend of mine, actually really prefer very feminine women, you know, that, that that's, that's just the phenotype that I like. And I'm being made to think that this is bigotry. And the fact is, like, I've chose this, this woman I'm with now this love of my life, is a very slight, feminine woman. And if you had asked me 20 years ago, and this woman is a total badass, you know, she's very, she's watched, but she's No, she's very physically adept, and is probably a tomboy, yourself and all of this, and she's saying, I'm just, I'm just not gonna be ashamed of this anymore. Like, this is like this. I'm in love with this woman. And it turns out that this woman happens to have the body type, etc, that I am also attracted to. And guess what, that's part of what being a lesbian is being attracted to women, not Natal men who have declared that they're women, no matter how much other things they've undergone. And not to say that some people who are lesbians wouldn't transmit. But the whole thing is ludicrous.

**Bret** 28:20

The whole thing is completely. This falls in Douglas Murray's category of things we knew until yesterday.

28:27

That's a really good category. It's

**Bret** 28:28

a really good category. I mean, this is how the fuck is it that some man telling a woman that he needs to get over her vagina fetish is not sexual harassment or worse? Yes. How is that not obvious?

28:42

How is this not obvious?

**Bret** 28:44

I mean, frankly, I can't imagine if I was on the jury, and she had flat out hit this person. I think he'd asked for it. If

**Heather** 28:52

Yeah, if the person writing the question, that flat out hit this very masculine trans women do need to have sex, to be attracted to them, and probably have sex with them in order to demonstrate your lack of transphobia. Until yesterday, in Douglas Murray's schema, we knew that this was insane. Yeah, we knew right. And

**Bret** 29:13

I think the correct response might be something like,

**Heather** 29:17

not gonna happen, but I would try.

**Bret** 29:20

Go back to argument school because that isn't one.

**Heather** 29:25

Oh, yeah. Okay. Thank you. Next question. Thank you, too, for all you do hear. Thanks also to your son. Yes, Zack.

**Bret** 29:32

Yeah.

**Heather** 29:34

Can you help me understand what the attributes of a Maoist revolution are? I'm having trouble wrapping my head around the concept. Who has a big question?

**Bret** 29:42

Well, I mean, let's first of all, we will be attacked for saying that this is a Marxist revolution, even though leaders of BLM have said into a camera that they are trained Marxist trained Marxists. And that's what they're about, but nonetheless that we will still be wrong asserting that they Even though they have asserted that they are,

**Heather** 30:02

and many of their talking points are the same ones as other people who have identified their movements as Marxist of using things like looking to dismantle the nuclear family, yeah. Right. But I would say though, and I'm sorry, but that's like the dismantling of the nuclear family is actually straight out of Marx. You know, he, he finds I think, I think Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto, specifically say that the you know, that you have to go after the nuclear family as the sort of the center of the bourgeois thinking, before you can actually, what is it seize the means of economic power, etc, etc, right? don't have it here. But yeah, but

**Bret** 30:40

think about this, right? This has everything to do with cults breaking your connection to your friends and your family in order to invade your mind, because they need to deny you the reality check. And so going after the nuclear family is multifaceted here, there is a problem with nuclear family. In black America, as I have argued, very plainly, where does it come from? It comes from a sex ratio difference, where a large number of men are taken out of the mating pool. And what that does is it undercuts the bargaining position of women mating and dating in the black community. This is a perfectly predictable demographic fact that has nothing to do with being black. So that thing then causes men not to stick around. Why? Because men who have lots of sexual options are harder to pin down. You know, you can ask any woman with common sense if that's true, and they will tell you that it is. So this is a predictable catastrophe. But rather than address the causes of the catastrophe, they want to tear up everybody else's family, which is insane, right? The nuclear family is very important. It's very important for many reasons, including your nuclear family will provide you a reality check when people tell you crazy stuff and insist that you say it, too. So it is it is in deep need of resistance. There was some other part of that question, what was it? Yeah, well, it's

**Heather** 32:03

what are the attributes of a mouse revolution?

**Bret** 32:05

Oh, the horizontal illness? Right? Okay. The fact Yeah, this thing comes at all of that, you know, it comes at the people close to it in the form of those they know, and then insists that they, you know, it also uses

**Heather** 32:19

the youth to spread the word at first that the red guard, where I mean, even high schoolers, high schoolers and college students who then who basically denounced the would be authorities and shamed people into complying and put placards around their heads and made them publicly swear oaths, and such.

**Bret** 32:40

Yeah, the struggle section is the key defining feature. Yeah.

**Heather** 32:47

Can we replace the concept of checking your privilege with something like share your blessings? The idea being inspiring gratitude might work better than making people feel guilty, that would be more effective. That suggests, though, that the people who are asking you to check your privilege are actually interested and changing things for the better. And I think many of them are not, but I agree that gratitude is a far more effective and loving and generous emotion and ploy to use with people, in part because real gratitude isn't favorable, right? Just like no real apology is so valuable. And real gratitude is so valuable because they are inherently honest.

**Bret** 33:31

No, it also strikes me that there is a verification ism versus falsification, ism, take in a type one versus type two error take here, in the sense that if you are if you are focused on what is wrong, then you may view the world through very dark lenses, and you may have the sense that this thing has got to go, right. If you instead look at what's going right, then you would understand that you can't possibly afford to tear up Western civilization because if you do, you'll be way worse off, which does not mean that you should not be demanding a fix for what's wrong. But it means that up ending the part that works because you're not noticing it or you're discounting it is just self destructive, as all get out.

**Heather** 34:15

I used to say, and it's hard to make the suggestion in the era of COVID. But I used to say and I live to this both through what I and we did, but also through running all those study abroad trips over the years is that before you become super entrenched as to what you think is wrong with the the us in our case, go live and be among other people in another culture in another nation state for at least a few months better if it's for longer, and then come back and see what functions here that doesn't function elsewhere. And you know, better the more of those other data points you have. And yes, it's your life and you're not doing it scientifically. Therefore it's a series of anecdotes. But there is a I remember a few other moments with as much clarity as coming back to the US after the first of our long, first just adventures and then field seasons, and just being thrilled, for instance, at knowing that there was going to be water that came out of the tap. And the roads were going to be paved, and electricity was going to stay on.

**Bret** 35:21

Yep. Yeah, it's, it's a tragic irony of the situation that really the, you know, the missing thing is something against which to calibrate. Right? How do you know whether civil Western civilization really sucks until you've seen an alternative? Right? And, you know, you could indirectly figure it out by how the rest of the world views us. It's not that we don't they don't get the proper data about how dumb we can be and how broken things can be. But they also get the idea of how much works which, you know, if you promise there is how much promise and yeah, so, again, none of this is a defense of what's wrong. But But yes, the amount that functions is astronomical and rebuilding it from scratch for no reason, because you've discounted, its value is, is insane. It's not yours to destroy, because other people are depending on it, and some of them No.

**Heather** 36:16

Massive Thank you, to you both, and to the people not on screen. That's us. And the cat and the cats. I'm worried that with the high unemployment going around, we might see things deteriorate even further, rather than stabilize. How do we encourage and guide unemployed people during this time? I understand their plight, but I'm not sure how to be part of the solution.

**Bret** 36:38

They need hope people. I mean, I don't know how to emphasize this, I think the major difference between what i and i think you see going on, and most people who align with us in terms of values, the primary distinction is the timeframe. Right? We do not have long to fix this problem, we have a history of inferring how long processes take that is misleading us, it's leading us to imagine that we have a great deal more time than we actually do. But we also have a quick opportunity, right? We are four months out from an election that could change things for the better. That's a sprint, that is not a long period of time, you can hold your breath that long. So the point is, people need hope. If they understand that there is light at the end of the tunnel, that something is coming that might work. They will be in a very different place than if their senses This is our life until we do something about it. And what are we being told is the only thing to do about it, tear it up. Alright, that's what they're gonna do, until they have some reason to hope that things are going to get better. And frankly, I am very troubled by what happened to hope under Obama, that the abuse of the concept of hope the fact that we can't invoke it without feeling derivative, that is a danger to us, because hope is a fundamentally important thing to keep people on track and focused on what matters. And when they lose hope they behave like people without hope, which is to say, destructively, and they make no attempt to preserve that, which is important. So hope, I think is the answer.

**Heather** 38:19

A guy named Eric hopper asks, on the 25th Dark Horse podcast, you kept mentioning issues being in the hopper. What do I have to do with any of it?

**Bret** 38:28

Well, let me tell you very little, I would imagine.

**Heather** 38:31

I mean, you could probably help.

**Bret** 38:33

Yeah, Dennis Hopper, either. As far as I know.

**Heather** 38:35

Yeah. Now we haven't heard from him. No, not yet. Okay, what if we play offense? We could start with our own Open Letter demanding that all 1200 health experts on the original Open Letter be fired for compromising their profession. Defense is retreat?

**Bret** 38:50

Yeah. offense. But yes, I don't know. Land defense I'm, I'm all for well, so.

**Heather** 38:59

Yeah, so we are we are shining a light. But it also, it also can feel a lot of what we're hearing from people is they're feeling more cornered. And when you're once you're cornered, you have to start by fighting off what's happening before you can get a place to stand where you can start doing offense. I think

**Bret** 39:21

you know, the thing is we need careful offense. That's the that's sort of the art that we are learning through the weird trajectory we've been on for the last three plus years. little experiment, go to your Twitter feed. Look at the hashtag hashtag Black Lives Matter at the moment. Right. I think this may have changed in the last hour or so. But I think you will find my tweet at the top of it. Right? And my tweet describes what I think that motto should mean and what it has clearly come to me and you will see I don't know 13,000 likes So saying anything bad about Black Lives Matter is a disaster now, except if you can learn how to make a critique that is robust. Yeah. You think I'm going to be canceled by the end of the day? I don't think so.

**Heather** 40:11

Yeah. And using the using the hashtags without don't use the hashtags and throw firebombs, oh, but use the hashtags for careful critique that people who also appreciate careful critique, start making it trend, such that people who don't know anything about the critique may search on the hashtag and see it and just a little seed is planted.

**Bret** 40:35

Yeah. Well, anybody who goes to that hashtag who's not paying attention, who thinks Yeah, black lives matter? Hell yeah. Right? Yeah. Well, they're gonna find this at the top, at least for the moment. And so my point is that is a foray into enemy territory. And it is not vindictive. I think it's generous. It says, Yes, black lives matter if that slogan, actually imply that black lives are undervalued, and we must do something about it. Then many of us including me, would be on board at the head of the the charge but but in the current situation, I can't So anyway, forays into enemy territory, figuring out how you can do it in such a way that it's careful enough that your cancel resistant. It's a learned art, but one worth learning. And maybe it's the coin of the round for the moment. Yeah.

**Heather** 41:22

As intellectuals and parents of assumably typical, I'll be at patriotic, highly capable, courageous teenagers. What is your advice for practical and effective steps that k 12 schools can take to semi safely open in the autumn? Hashtag unity 2020?

**Bret** 41:37

Yeah, well, we know how to make it safer. We know more time outside, greater spacing between people. Open Windows, and I would say open

**Heather** 41:49

windows open doors increase airflow. Yep.

**Bret** 41:53

Increase airflow, like fans

**Heather** 41:55

probably. But increased airflow with outside air. Yeah, increasing airflow with entirely inside air does not seem to reduce infections much if at all. And in fact, those who are in the line of the airflow are more likely to get sick. Well,

**Bret** 42:14

I think it depends how much you scrambled the air but yes, yeah, given a haphazard scheme, it probably wouldn't work. But at least in the autumn, air from outside, pumped in at a high rate spacing between people.

**Heather** 42:26

I mean, it's just tough. If you live in, you know, in Minneapolis. Yeah. What are you going to do in January? You're not going to have the doors open?

**Bret** 42:32

Well, does anybody live in Minneapolis in January? I'm sorry, I apologize.

**Heather** 42:38

We lived in Southeast Michigan for many years,

**Bret** 42:41

when we were tropical biologists it was the obvious place to

**Heather** 42:44

go into Madagascar for most of those northern winters. Yes, not most. So.

**Bret** 42:49

So the other thing is there are technologies that we could bootstrap that would help us right, like, Here, I'll dump one into the public domain because I'm not very well going to patent it at this moment. Well, how about lights that pump out UV spectrum stuff when nobody's in the room?

43:07

Right? Yes. How hard is that?

**Heather** 43:11

Yep. And even the thing that neither of us said, but which Oregon as of July 1, everyone was required, unless they're in a private space if they're inside to be wearing a mask. And we've talked a lot about masks, we started off our very first episode on March 24. Talking about masks. I hate them. I hate wearing them. But we're um, because even if it weren't mandated, it is it is the best, most effective route. Now, I don't know about second graders. You know, for most in most places, kids under 12 are exempted.

**Bret** 43:42

But they would love this mask they would you give at least the boys, you know, training and

**Heather** 43:48

how do we excite the gender typical girls?

**Bret** 43:51

Oh, they'll figure something out. You don't think if you gave them a bandana, they'd figure something out? Yeah, I think they wouldn't think they would. Yeah.

**Heather** 44:02

Okay, if leaders fear losing their jobs, why don't use a tactic from their playbook and adopt the strength in numbers move. You can't target what is everywhere. I have ideas and the tech know how to implement solutions, please contact. Okay, cool.

**Bret** 44:15

I would say I wonder what happens if and how can this not be a thing that we have seen. If one workplace had just by accident, it had more courageous people by a significant degree, who managed to find each other and talk about this without outing themselves too early, and then mounted some kind of useful, careful resistance, you would have a workplace in which the opposite thing had unfolded. Right. And that would become a model. Yep. So it must not be allowed. How do they prevent it from ever happening? I really want to know if it worked once what would happen next because that has to be an interesting story. 45 minutes

**Heather** 45:00

Are you really? Okay, well, we're going to do a couple more here. I was I A to 15. We switched over to this round of questions. So we'll go probably an hour and 15 minutes here. a suggestion for someone in Dr. Steven pourhouse, or podcasts I don't know, on the podcast discussing polyvagal theory. And someone else who looks to be speaking to the other people in chat, but recommending a thread on Twitter about the current political and cultural moment for someone named at Adrian Lee Oliver, do you know who that is? No. Next question. Why are some humans more energetic than others? Assuming caloric intake is pretty similar across the board? What explains it? Some people seem to have such different amounts of energy than others? Is it all just perception?

**Bret** 45:48

What's its development on perception?

**Heather** 45:50

Yeah, that's development.

**Bret** 45:52

You know, there are certain things that rarely get mentioned that haunt every discussion in which they're absent. One of them has to do with development, we often talk about what people are like, but we don't talk about the process that makes them that way. We certainly don't include it in evolutionary discussions nearly often enough. And so I think the one that educationally I found was absent from almost every discussion was one of motivational structures, that is to say, what is it that you find that causes a reward to be released internally, that has everything to say about what you're gonna be able to get yourself to do, and what you won't be able to get yourself to do. So we are all hobbled by a motivational structure built for an environment in which we don't have enough food, which almost all environments have not enough food for the creatures that live in them for automatic reasons, any population that has too much tends to grow until it doesn't have too much. So what that means is that our physiology and our neurobiology are wired around getting us not to spend energy, right, because spending energy is an energy you have to replace by finding more food, if you can preserve it. So this causes people who do not have a developmental experience, that that gets them to value. What happens when you are energetic, tend to default to being sedentary, which is very dangerous, we have too much food, most of us. And so what that means is we'd be better off to burn more. But it's very hard to convince your physiology of that when it has what, probably billions of years of nearly unbroken privation. So this is a it's a, it's something we trip over. Because our environment is very novel, which is of course, the subject primarily of our upcoming book, what happens to creatures that find themselves in a novel environment like us,

**Heather** 47:51

I guess I would add one thing at the mechanism level, which is hormonal. So in keeping with the focus here on development, let's skip from this more sort of poly hormonal explan example of energy, because there's a lot of factors that go into that. But certainly it is hormonally mediated. One of the reasons that, you know, going back over into the trans discussion, one of the reasons that many of us objects to the idea that you can simply transition from being a man into being a woman full stop, is that hormones aren't just on off switches that toggle on and then you're experiencing the effects of estrogen or progesterone or testosterone or other androgens, and tarloff, those are the so called activation effects, which are in the moment, but there are also organizational effects. And you know, this is a rubric that is used by many endocrinologist, not by all and it's you know, it's a it's a it's a schema for how hormones work. But organizational effects are those effects that basically organize or create the background anatomy and physiology, on which later developmental, anatomical, physiological and neurological effects can happen. And so if you go through puberty, for instance, as a boy and become a man, and then decide that you're going to switch into in, you're going to transition, the fact is that your body was organized hormonally by testosterone on the other hand regions and you can't ever undo those effects. And so it will never be fair, for instance, for you to try to compete against women. So there are similar but with young, many more hormonal inputs, explanations for things like diet and energy, that how it is that you have your early childhood and especially puberty, adolescent transitions, with regard to the hormonal inputs, how much exercise you're getting, what kinds of foods you're eating, you can't simply change all of that and as an as an adult, and erase all of the effects from when you're a teenager. Those won't totally disappear. They were organized visual effects that you're you're now going to live with forever.

**Bret** 50:03

Yeah, absolutely. Which is the death knell to the argument that people should be allowed to transition very young.

**Heather** 50:12

Or just have their puberty stopped until they know, right? Because you

**Bret** 50:15

can always do it. And the answer is you can't always undo it. Yeah, this is a permanent effect, you know, not as severe as a surgical modification in some ways, but every bit is physiological. Yeah.

**Heather** 50:27

Next question. You have argued that blacks deserve something due to their origin story. Why should they not be viewed as any other individual born into adversity for any number of reasons? Does it matter what group they belong to?

**Bret** 50:39

Yeah, but this sounds almost like an argument about reparations. It's not like deserve like compensation. It's like

**Heather** 50:47

dessert. Let's just be clear. You have not argued for Reparations,

**Bret** 50:51

I have argued that reparations are justified by the history, but that they are such a terrible remedy that we would be stupid to institute it and that there are remedies that would work to do the job much better, and wouldn't head us into very dangerous waters from what we probably would not recover.

**Heather** 51:07

I just asked her as Coleman Hughes writes extraordinarily well, on the question of reparations and why he thinks it's not a good idea.

**Bret** 51:14

Yeah. I think frankly, a lot of people who've thought very carefully about it, and including a great many black scholars recognize that it's just not a good remedy. But anyway, the point is deserve, you know, why do you deserve to have a healthy environment? Well, in that sense, that's the sense of deserve that I mean, every American should have access to the necessary prerequisites to live a decent life. And to the extent that people are born into circumstances, that they don't have the tools to get out of, by virtue of the way things are distributed, or special hazards that afflict some communities and not others. That's just not decent. So we have an obligation to fix it. And what I've said before is that Native Americans, American Indians, and American blacks have a special case, it's not the same situation as populations that came from elsewhere in the world, which did face racism, but were able to overcome it. These two populations have a special set of obstacles that come from the origin stories. And they mean, those special obstacles require a meaningful remedy, which we haven't yet fully hit upon. But I think it's readily doable. I can't imagine why we wouldn't end it is the decent thing. So let's do it.

**Heather** 52:34

Okay, we're gonna switch to the questions that have come in this hour, and go through as many as possible in the order in which they came in. Brett, in your recent conversation with Eric, you said the Unity plan, quote is the best plan. We've got short term now the deepest plan, we have dot dot, dot, then you were cut off. Have you finished that thought?

**Bret** 52:54

Mike? Apparently not. Yeah, okay. What I would say I think what I'm what I was getting at in that statement, and you know, it's been days. So who's to say, but years and social media years in 2020? time? Yeah. But what I think I was getting at is this. We are talking at this level, about how to take a very broken electoral system, and hack our way into it to be able to do enough useful that things start moving in the right direction. That's the reason for the unity 2020 plan. Longer term. The question is, well, what do you do having gained access? How can we make civilization more liberating at the same time that we make it safer, right? That's a readily doable thing. We are, what a systems theorists would say, we are stuck on a local optimum, there are higher places we could go that would accomplish more of the values that we all share. But we can't get there by virtue of the structure of the system that keeps us on these little low peaks. So how you address that is a deeper question. We have to storm the cockpit. But once we're in the cockpit, then there's a question about well, actually, where do we really want to go? And I think, you know, I'm itching to have that conversation. Because I know that we can do better on almost every front that people would want us to do better that all decent people would agree would be a positive change. And how to do that involves compiling people with the right sorts of insight and having discussions about what will work and, you know, if you're hearing this thinking, Oh, my God, he's a liberal, he's going to do some do gooder thing, and it's going to create damage. Well, now, the whole point is, look, liberals tend to miss the unintended consequences of positive change. So how can you hedge out that risk, so you can move in a direction discover whether it works, abort the progress in that direction, if it's not working, these are all readily doable, and we've lost track of it because we've seen no Nothing but predatory governance for most of our lives.

**Heather** 55:06

Next question is from Echo, who reliably asks excellent questions. This one, I think due to limitations of character count is a little hard to parse. So I'm gonna try. Alright, so she's referencing here, the Masters tools, which is Audrey Lorde, quote about, you cannot use the Masters tools to destroy the Masters house, something like that mantle dismantle the Masters house. So is the Masters tools, idea confusing enlightenment tools with IQ question mark. If IQ is fitness for specific intelligence skills, linked to the function of modern functioning of modern society, the idea of other tools may be to open new outcomes using other skill sets. might this be a misused statement against conservatism? So much there?

**Bret** 55:57

Yeah, that's a hard one to parse. Yeah, I would say, Look, I'm sure there are interpretations of this quote that can be rescued. But the problem is, the quote doesn't come with an instruction set. So even if it as it was delivered, it made sense the way it is now wielded, and we know this firsthand, because we've seen it done. It is typically wielded against things like science, right? The idea being well, that's your toolkit, we're not going to be able to use that to get where we need to go, which is nonsense. You know, as I have said many times, you know, where the best tools are there in the Masters tool shed, and for good reason, for obvious reasons, right? You want tools to take apart the Masters house, the Masters tool, shed is the place to find them. So we need to democratize those tools, we need to get them to as many people as we can and teach them how to wield them with great deafness. And that is the solution and to be told that it is the opposite of the solution is nothing but counterproductive.

**Heather** 56:54

Yeah. So I mean, I think and I'm sure echo would agree with the idea that the Audrey Lorde, quote, makes no sense. But the more I look at this, the more I think that what's being asked here is art, is it possible, in fact that there are more things that humans can do than those which have been privileged by the current society in which we live. And if we look to some of the other skills that humans might have, might we build a different kind of future that would be in fact more just and free for everyone? Oh, of course,

**Bret** 57:29

there are tools that aren't in the Masters tools. They're not in anyone's tool shed and bootstrapping them as a great idea. I mean,

**Heather** 57:36

implied in the Masters tools, quote is we the historically and and currently oppressed have special access to those tools, or indeed, we have had those tools all along. And you the dominant oppressor class have kept us from using them and kept them from being valued. And there may be some instances of that sort of maybe, but, but the idea of none of the tools, and therefore none of the outcomes that we are currently living with, are valued or can have a place in the future that we want to design or an end that we envision. You know that that's clearly heading towards dystopia very quickly.

**Bret** 58:20

So I will say more in the future about the term Dark Horse and why I chose it. But the basic idea is that the Dark Horse, which is a feature of a story, I think I've talked about this before, written by Benjamin Disraeli, the dark horse has been trained in secret, and therefore no one knows how to bet on it because they don't know what it's capable of.

**Heather** 58:44

So that is dark is not a reference to its color. Well, it is dark, just by happenstance, but but it's a metaphorical meaning of its darkness is more important than the story. Yes.

**Bret** 58:54

Right. So the point that I'm making is that that very metaphor suggests that there are tools beyond the common ones, right? And that those tools every so often emerge, and they change things. So you know, the Fosbury flop for example changed. I jumping. I don't know that high jumping is particularly important. But the point is something enters and everything changes. And, you know, same could be said for black people in many sports, including baseball as Matt Taibbi was discussing in his takedown of white fragility. Anyway, there's lots to be said for that which we do not know. Because our vision is limited to that which we expect. Yes, absolutely. There are tools beyond what the master has. And yes, those might be even more useful. But don't neglect the tools in your shed because they're awfully good.

**Heather** 59:46

I've heard you say that means must be subservient to genes, but also that we must rebel against our genes. Wouldn't rebelling against our genes be a set of memes helped me reconcile the contradiction.

**Bret** 59:57

Well, no, I think your question reveals that you get the problem. It's not a simple one, we are wired such that our cultural nature is subservient to our genetic nature. But if you can hear this podcast, you can also hear me say, if you knew what your genes were willing to do in the service of spreading them, you'd throw up. Right now it's absolutely despicable some of what they want. Now, some of what they want you to do is absolutely beautiful, right? But to choose that part of what your genes want you to do that is honorable and decent, and fits who you claim to be. And to reject that part that is despicable and destructive, and not who you want to be. That's the sweet spot. So you're already in rebellion. Right? Now the question is not Can you rebel course you can rebel. The question is, can you rebel without providing an advantage to those who don't rebel? Those who will do everything their genes want them to do? That's the deep question. I don't think anybody knows for sure what the answer to that question is, I can tell you that I don't know of any reason that that is impossible. But I do not think it is a simple process, we have to figure out how it is that we rebel against the portion of what our genes want us to do. That does not fit our understanding of ourselves without providing advantage to those who refuse to join us in that process. And as far as I see, either we figure that out, or rocket

**Heather** 1:01:24

courageous capable patriots. If not mcraven, Yang, YouTube would fit the criteria for unity. 20 with flying colors, thank you both for your bravery.

**Bret** 1:01:33

Thank you. Yeah, I see it. It doesn't,

**Heather** 1:01:37

it's gonna be on the left.

**Bret** 1:01:39

Have you seen my political compass test?

**Heather** 1:01:41

Yeah. Now you're a little bit farther left than I am. Yeah.

**Bret** 1:01:45

Thanks. Here's the thing. First of all, you meet ticket doesn't fit one of the features of the plan.

**Heather** 1:01:51

Right. So I said, who's going to be on the left? Oh, I see. Yeah, I'm not a plausible Republican.

**Bret** 1:01:56

No, you are not now. You are not a plausible Republican.

**Heather** 1:01:59

Not plausible democrat anymore, either.

1:02:01

Right? Yeah, me either. So yeah, anyway, thank you, Rob. But it doesn't it doesn't work

**Heather** 1:02:06

for this plan. Yep. Help professors. Know now Professor Weinstein don't hate the player hate the game. We should focus on structural change to maximize opportunity for everyone, in my opinion. That's reference to

**Bret** 1:02:19

I don't know, either. But I mean, I agree. Yeah, it's all about the structure of the game, you want people to behave well build a game in which behaving well puts you ahead. I mean, that's the whole thing. So elsewhere, let's see in the fourth frontier talk that I gave, I describe the following principle, you've got two kinds of systems, right? You're one side of this divide or the other. On one side of the divide, you've got a system where the cost of keeping civilization running belong to the good people. These are systems in which personal responsibility dictates what gets done. Those systems evolve towards ruthlessness. Whereas if you make a system in which the cost of keeping civilization running, go to the assholes, they evolve towards benevolence, decency, wonderfulness, beauty, all the things that you would want. So really, the only big question is, which side of that divide is your system on? If it's on the wrong side? Can you move it and the farther you move it in that direction, the faster it moves in the direction you want it to go. So you can adjust the speed just by figuring out okay, to what degree the cost belong to the assholes. If the cost belong entirely to the assholes, you'll move very quickly in the right direction. If they 50% belong to the assholes, you'll move half as fast. So anyway, this isn't that tough once you reduce it to its elements. But mostly, we're just gonna argue about whether my saying so is the result of some sort of deep seated racism that must pervade my thinking because of the color of my skin or some other nonsense.

**Heather** 1:03:50

Here's a donation for guitar lessons. Smiley face. Thanks very much for the continued example in two areas, one, faith and science and reason. Two, presumably As for you, Brett being respectful and patient, little brother. Ah, next question, you had a plan for mitigating the spoiler effect of your unity 2020 plan? What is this plan?

**Bret** 1:04:11

Yeah, there are two things that mitigate the spoiler effect. One is the left right part of this. And by the way, I need to come back to the fact that some people, some small fraction of people are thrown by the fact that it says that we want somebody from the center left and the center right. And people are like centrism sucks, which I agree it does. But that is not what we're doing. This is not a tepid plan. The plan is about the center because that is where you meet in order to do things like save the Republic. Can

**Heather** 1:04:39

I interrupt here and say you so you've said this thing about centrism before and it got it struck me as strange and it struck a few other people who commented as strange like what's wrong with centrism? I think back to your point, I don't remember who you said it was but said You know, there's 84% of us who aren't at the extreme 6% 86% of us are the extra hidden tribes or ports, oh, it's hidden drives. Okay, since 86% of us who aren't at one of these extremes that seem to be driving policy and conversation at the at the national and international level now 86% is therefore the center. Oh, so you know, you're not you're not left out of that you're not you're not to the left of that 86%? Well,

**Bret** 1:05:23

no, I think my left ism doesn't make sense to people because they don't understand what it is. So I am describing myself as a radical because I believe only radical change will save us that we are in a bad I'm a radical in the same way that somebody who wants to storm the cockpit of a plane in which the pilot has just died is a radical, therefore radical action, you're not allowed to start in the cockpit. Well, we're gonna fucking die. We don't do it. So I'm a radical, right? But I've also said, I want to live in a civilization that's so good, I can afford to be a conservative, right? Because I want that civilization that's so good that I want it to stay, I want to be against change, because change is very likely to be going to make it worse. So

**Heather** 1:06:01

and there are many features of our society that you do feel as though I are very good and should not be changed or dismantled. Absolutely. In fact, a huge fraction of the reactionary thing isn't across the board, burn it all down, though. Wait,

**Bret** 1:06:17

that's the thing. If you went through my belief system, I'm sure some of it's wrong. But if you went through it, you'd find a weird grab bag of places where I'm like, Yeah, let's go we've got to change that. And you know, that thing better stick even though most of the people who are in theory on my side of this debate would disagree. So you'll find a an eclectic mix of things based on independently arrived at conclusions about what causes the thing to work,

**Heather** 1:06:42

which is the definition of not being ideal. Yes. It's also you have you have you and I as well, and your brother and many other people have generated our, our thoughts and our positions based as much as possible on deriving them from first principles in each of the cases as opposed to adopting a slate and entire platform from the dams, the republicans or the libertarians, the greens are whoever it is, right? It's taking them issue by issue and saying, what is it that I actually think about this, as opposed to? Oh, my friends think these other three things that I agree with? Maybe I should just agree with them on all the rest? Yeah,

**Bret** 1:07:18

it's also the definition of liberalism. Right? This is what liberal mindedness is. So back to the question about the spoiler effect, by taking somebody from the center left and the center, right. We do not spoil for either party to the typical spoiler derives from that party to which it is closest, and therefore awards power to the party that is farther away, in this case, splitting both tickets, it harms both parties, which is good because the parties suck. Okay. So that's one way. The other way is that built into the plan is a mechanism whereby if the ticket is not viable as the election approaches, we pull the plug on it, right. So the point is, we can revert to that prior state you don't have to worry about signing on because you're not going to be responsible for some horrible outcome. Either this thing is capable of going the distance or it isn't.

**Heather** 1:08:09

So one thing that occurs to me maybe this isn't the place to raise it but it's harder to do that in the era of mail in voting that when everyone is voting actually on the same day, you can actually watch things and pull the plug last minute for instance and you can't do that as much like i don't i don't know what the mail in voting for the national election will look like in terms of the the timespan but I know for the the primaries here in Oregon we had like three or four weeks Yep. And so that that obviously in the month before a national election in the US so many things change October surprises a standard piece of the puzzle, right?

**Bret** 1:08:47

This is why we have not been specific about the mechanism is that we don't know the full detail of the world we're living in and so that we can't build the failsafe with precision yet but we are very committed to the failsafe we understand this is one of the top two concerns of people who are interested in the plan but skeptical of it. And so anyway, it's top of mind and stay tuned and Have I mentioned that you should follow our accounts and send us your email address. That would be really helpful. It would help us show that we have the momentum and momentum is the name of the game.

**Heather** 1:09:18

All right. Hey Britton, Heather. Can the Dark Horse podcast be classified as an evolutionary stable attractor? Also, I'm from America's little brother Canada with signing up for the unity 2020 movement help the cause in any way? Yes, absolutely. Okay, so first question let's that was an easy answer to the second one. Can it be classified as an evolutionarily stable attractor?

**Bret** 1:09:42

I don't know it depends. We fuck it up, I guess but the I think I don't

1:09:48

know. I don't know how to. I don't know how to do this one. Yeah, it's it's it's joke ish. But

**Bret** 1:09:55

yeah, it's a little tough. I mean, I would say, so far seems good evolutionary Stable implies cannot be displaced by any competing podcast. And while I would like to think that is the case, we do not know what other strategies may be out there. Yeah. So, yeah, I don't know. Did that work for you?

**Heather** 1:10:15

So this is I just checked the previous q&a stream, my question was, will all unite us and I was reading it Joseph Campbell's hero with 1000 faces too. Are there any other interesting books that you guys are reading? So many? And, uh, you know, when I'm asked this sort of question, I never remember the names of any of them. But I will say that one book, this is not gonna seem in keeping it all. But it's the it's one of the books that occurred to me, and because no one will be expecting it. Here. Maybe it will be, it will impress people to go look at it, that I have recently dipped back into it's a book I read in full many years ago, actually, it's it's a twofer here. The book that I read, that everyone will be familiar with, is in the art of motorcycle maintenance by persik. Robert, per se, I think, which just has some gems of, you know, philosophical and scientific thought, running throughout. But of course, it's very, very thick. And then there's sort of a Latter Day update, if you will, to that. I don't think the author calls it that. But Michael Crawford, I believe is his name, wrote, he's written two terrific books, the one I'm thinking of is shop craft as soul craft, which speaks to this point that I've made many times as have, as I view, the not just the virtue, but the value in doing physical work with real physical outcomes as a way to train your mind to be better at problem solving. So shop craft as soulcraft by Michael Crawford is one of the books that I'm thinking about at the moment.

**Bret** 1:11:45

Yeah, I don't have a good answer to this, I'm not reading anything I would recommend, I would say probably there is value in things like watching the movie, Brazil, reading 1984, an animal farm, Brave New World, none of these things are right on the money. But a lot of them will reveal that we have seen elements of this in many different combinations before and people have spotted it, and they figured out how to describe it. And, you know, above all else, you need to be able to keep your thinking straight in an era where people are telling you a lot of false things and insisting that they are so true that no one could possibly disagree. And having an awareness and narrative awareness that that is a common pattern, and that it is dangerous. And that basically one is entitled not to take that stuff in deeply when it comes. Probably worthwhile. So I don't know how useful a suggestion but it's something that's probably if you're looking for something to do, it's probably a good good investment. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:12:52

Do you think a heroic dose of psilocybin might leave Trump with some appreciable amount of human empathy? Something that has been noticeably lacking thus far? I love the term heroic doses.

**Bret** 1:13:04

Yeah, totally with a lot of peanut butter or something else, so he doesn't know what he's eating?

**Heather** 1:13:11

Yeah, it's hard. It's hard to sneak in a heroic dose of psilocybin. Yeah,

**Bret** 1:13:14

I cannot, I can neither confirm nor deny that this is part of the 2020 plan. So I'll just leave it at that. That's what's gonna cancel us. Right. That's it. That's it. That's it. Okay. That's it.

**Heather** 1:13:29

According to the Neanderthal genome project, 99.7% of human in the undertail DNA is identical. According to nature, Asians and Europeans nature, the magazine, the journal, according to nature, Asians and Europeans inherited 1.5 to 2.1% Neanderthal DNA. How do we square these facts? Oh, it's, it's, it's this question. So

1:13:54

the way

**Heather** 1:14:00

I usually think about this, and then have sort of a 12 minute or so description on board, and I haven't thought about this in a while, but similarly, we're 98% similar to chimps. But but it's also true that our son Zack is 50% related to each of us. Alright, so those are both true numbers. And that tells you that those aren't the same percentages. Right? So human Neanderthal DNA is in fact, very, very, very closely aligned. But within that, I'm just accepting your numbers here that you've written out that point 3% that distinguishes human from Neanderthals DNA, I don't know if these are actually based on whole genomes, or if they just do an exon. So it's, there's a whole there's a there's a whole load of reasons to suspect these numbers because modern genetic analysis and genomic analysis is not nearly as good as the people doing it would have you believe but Assuming that the number is close to right, that that still is point 3%. That is clearly and patently different in the parts of the genome anyway that we're looking at between humans and Neanderthals. And you can then look at that part and and look at whether or not and I remember it was Europeans I didn't know Asians, but the Europeans clearly have some of the DNA from Neanderthals that is not otherwise shared between humans and Neanderthals, whereas for instance, Africans don't. So you're basically looking at my my guess is just looking at these two percentages that 1.5 to 2.1% that Europeans have inherited of Neanderthal DNA is 1.5 to 2.1%, of the part of the genome that is not shared between humans and Neanderthals.

**Bret** 1:15:51

Yep, I have very little to add. Other than that, at the end of the process of this genetic exchange, you also have selection which is going to adjust what you see, in other words, your

**Heather** 1:16:00

selection.

**Bret** 1:16:03

So you could have had dreams move that then went extinct because in the place that they moved to that they were disfavored. So anyway,

**Heather** 1:16:10

which is part of why these it's these are estimates are best, right? Yep. Okay, we're an hour and 15 minutes, we're gonna do four more questions. Okay. Okay. But two of them are just comments. I am looking forward to your talk with David Sloan Wilson. I'm emailing your mod with a link to a paper that explores a theory of human evolution, which modifies Hamilton's law without invoking group selection

**Bret** 1:16:32

to read. Oh, yeah. Sounds like my kind of thing. Okay.

**Heather** 1:16:36

We don't care about fourth July in the UK do it. Okay, we're doing it. But we're gonna make you care about

**Bret** 1:16:42

it. You don't even care about the Fourth of July. I have to tell you, resistance is useless. And you will? Yeah.

**Heather** 1:16:53

Okay. Okay, I'm gonna read the read the slightly out of order, because what be the last question is a great place to end? It's a good question. Big fan, guys. I'm a well known marketer, but my email list to 40k. Real quick, happy to help you guys. No cost, I have some ways that will work to scale up your list. Real quick. So actually, if you sir, would email, the Darkhorse email, like send that send that email?

**Bret** 1:17:24

Yeah, go to articles of unity.org. That will take you to a medium post. And at the bottom of it, there is a an email link. So add your email and then email the link with your your details. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:17:41

Final question. In I have to interpret this, I'm going to read it just as it is first in culture slash consciousness, consciousness. Progressive is suited for tackling novelty. So this is like a synopsis of our argument with regard to the the dueling dichotomy between culture and consciousness. In heights righteous mind, progressive strongly value the care harm moral foundation is care and harm optimized for novelty. Wow, we may go to one more question after this, we're gonna

**Bret** 1:18:22

feel in a good position, I would have to go review what I'd had said.

**Heather** 1:18:27

I do, but I'm gonna, yeah, I'd have to review the righteous mind, we both read it, but it's been a while, um, this idea that progressives are more likely to invoke issues of harm to others and caring for others than people on the right side of the aisle. Are is pretty robust finding from psychology, I think. And I don't know that there's particular particularly an overlap here. And I don't think actually that this the model that we have presented have written about and presented in our Princeton talk and, and such about culture versus consciousness, culture, being about maintaining exchange extent, values that have been important in the past and may continue to be important, but not in times of great change. And consciousness being what you invoke and need during times of change. And when, when you need creativity. That is about that's about sort of population level strategies that can exist in in minds, as opposed to progressive people who identify as progressive sort of, regardless of whether or not things actually need to change or not, tend to have more focus on on caring for others and harm done to others. And maybe the distinction here is exactly this, that the thing that you've just said, and that you've said many times before, that you are progressive If I believe this too, but you, you've been the first person to say it. You're progressive who desperately wants to live in a world in which you could call yourself a conservative that that points to actually the pot the ideological problem with saying I'm just I'm just a progressive or I'm just a conservative, right. And so this culture consciousness model is specifically an evolutionary model because it identifies the fact that conditions change. And as conditions change, so must strategies if they're going to be effective.

**Bret** 1:20:28

Well, you can get it together two different ways. Yeah, you can either default to listening to the people who are on the side of the spectrum that matches the era you're in. But that's hugely wasteful. Yeah. Right. The better way is for people to recognize what era they're in and to move from whether they are trying to conserve the structure or are up ended based on whether or not it is working or it's come to a dead end.

**Heather** 1:20:55

Let's see. Let's find one more question. A couple of just buying your beer, bro. Nice little something to hopefully help get you out of the gig economy. Just to Brett. Brett. Thanks to you, brother. encouragement. Okay, one last question. Oh, it's a small one. This is easy. No, it's not slightly off topic. But given the state of higher ed, would either of you or other members of the ITW ever consider building a potential parallel educational institution? What?

**Bret** 1:21:25

Yeah, we've been on such a project and a moment it is suspended for reasons but yeah, we would be excited about the prospect of architecting something new, that didn't suck. That's kind of the objective education but not sucky.

**Heather** 1:21:39

Yeah, that's a great tagline. I think, actually, we'll just stop there then. Okay.

**Bret** 1:21:43

Well, thanks everybody. This has been great fun. Don't forget to sign up for the articles of unity Twitter handle, send us your email address, be well Oh, you might also like and subscribe and respond in the comments to the to the live stream here.

**Heather** 1:22:02

And if you want to participate in long conversations with Brett and his Patreon, go to his and if you want to get included in private monthly q&a live streams come to my Patreon

**Bret** 1:22:15

and if you want to be sent to Mars, sign up for Elon Musk's Twitter. Alright, see you all. It's been great.

**Heather** 1:22:22

We'll be back in the fourth of July.