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**Bret** 00:06

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse podcast live stream Q and A section where we provide as to the cues that you present us. Right? Are you ready? I'm ready. All right. So you are going to read the questions. And we are going to cogitate and pontificate and whatever else comes to mind.

**Heather** 00:27

That's right. All right. So we're gonna start as we have before, with a couple of the ones that we missed from last time, too, that we plan to come back to we did not have time to look at so we're going to save them for the next time. So we have one from Myers one from Ryan Swift. You guys know who you are. We will come back to yours next time. Sorry about that. There's also a question, our opinions with regard to in this together america.org organization? Excuse me, we've just we've looked at it just a little bit. Not too much. You want to show that? You could show that yes, I won't be able to read any more questions until it's unshown. But so this is this is the organization we're being asked about. And I just looked at this a tiny, tiny, tiny bit. And yeah, I was I was, I noted this declaration of interdependence, which is part of why I went looking for what you had written back in 2011. It is, you know, it's not the same. But it looks it looks good. And frankly, we're seeing a lot of these sorts of sorts of coming together coming together. Yeah, I'm not sure across a number of domains at the moment and I don't know a ton about this particular one, it does seem to be it appears to be what it appears to be. And I'm not sure there needs to be a single movement like this. I think the fact that they are popping up and flourishing all over the place is a good sign that a lot of people are noticing that the current moment has proven divisive, rather than inclusive and it denies things like our interdependence and it moves away from unity. So I do not think that this particular website is proposing a political solution right?

**Bret** 02:15

Which means that they actually have no reason not to join forces if they find us mission aligned which probably we are so anyway, I don't want to vouch for them I don't know who they are, and upon reading I hope to be impressed and delighted and if so, why don't you reach out to us in the unity 2020 cause because maybe this would be the quick way to get we're all of us are trying to get us

**Heather** 02:42

good. Okay, the last two questions from livestream 28 The first is a comment Brett, the parking meter has been expired for too long you need to move your car to me like you need to move your workbench

**Bret** 02:59

that parking meter actually is more interesting than you realize and for lack of coins i don't know i certainly I could have dug up some coin we have coins but anyway yes one could fire it up with coins and then have the light go off of its own accord at the point that meter expired would also

**Heather** 03:21

be making that classic old parking meter sound as it as it ticked down right yet which would be in the live stream and probably not optimal probably

**Bret** 03:28

not optimal probably not optimal, but your point about my car is well taken.

**Heather** 03:34

Recently I'm mostly including this for the final the hashtag recently saw a Facebook meme that people who wear glasses are smarter because they trade graphics for processing power thoughts also hashtag just lane Maxwell didn't kill herself

**Bret** 03:50

she will not have killed herself. That's right. That's right but you know I definitely will not have I would so I saw Eric tweet about this and I was very much glasses

**Heather** 04:01

no just a maximum Yeah.

**Bret** 04:05

Prepare yourself that what you expect to happen it's not going to happen yeah, something else will happen. Yeah,

**Heather** 04:11

it will be it would be too obvious if it was it was that again? Yep.

**Bret** 04:15

So anyway, the question about glasses Yeah, there Well, first of all, there is a a set of trade offs involved in frankly reading and what it does to your eyes, as you will soon discover about your teeth, your teeth are suffering from modernity, your eyes are also suffering from modernity and in fact all of you is suffering from modernity even as they are all profiting from modernity as well you know who's benefiting from our journey this time Yeah, is a thoroughly modern animal. But anyway, yeah, there is a certain trade off. How did you specify it it was trade graphics

**Heather** 04:53

for processing power. That's not gonna that's that's not going to be it. I think I think that often people who were glad do wear glasses because they did read a lot as children, and therefore they may have more information in their heads. That's from books. That's about as far as you can go.

**Bret** 05:09

I like it. I think that fits the trade off. But you you optimize for taking in the information in a very direct fashion at some cost to your ability to see what the hell is going on in the world at a direct level, it seems to me it is the trade off being specified. I don't mean that I'm not being snide, I'm just kind of what it is.

**Heather** 05:29

I don't, I don't even know I'm not sure how you, you get there? Well, because what it is, is allowing, allowing people who have you know, there are many other reasons to end up with glasses, but allowing people who have had their focus be too close at a critical developmental period to also see far away means that it would it would be it would appear to be trying to do an end run around the this or that straight off,

**Bret** 05:59

it is reducing the cost side of the trade off by restoring vision with an obvious Cluj. Now the interesting thing is you walk down the street and you see people with glasses, and you don't think twice about the fact that they're wearing glasses, the oddity of people wearing these pieces of perfectly transparent glass and plastic shaped in a laboratory to correct for the distortions of their own eye is really funny. I mean, imagine that instead of being in a frame, which we've gotten so used to somehow they were hovering this far away from your face in order that wherever you look, the photons were corrected before they hit your retina. So

**Heather** 06:41

well, I gotta say, I mean, witness. So you alluded to a podcast that you're gonna drop soon. What about orthodontia? Which sounds like it could not be less interesting, but it really it really would have a hard time being more interesting. You actually. I would love I don't know who the relevant person over in Ireland would be to the guy that you talk to about dentistry in orthodontia, but I would love to have that conversation. And if we don't, if there is no such person, I would love to have that conversation with you. Because I know that, you know, just again, anecdotally, I started to lose my ability to see clearly far away when I was 13 or so. And it quickly went completely off the rails and I was at like 2800 with by the time I was 15. But I never worked glasses, I work contacts. And having the experience twice a day of like, I'm going to put in my eyes like I'm actually going to put in my eyes now. And now I can see and I take them off like I can't like I know you're a person, but I can't actually tell who you are. And I'm wearing glasses on the livestream because I started and now it just seems like the thing to do, but you know, not wearing glasses most of the time in mice in real life. wearing contacts instead. It strikes me as not at all weird to walk around and see people with us because it is absolutely 100% a necessity to move around the visual world.

**Bret** 08:01

You are of course solving an internet mystery of how I ended up with you. And the answer is your vision is not what. That's not. Here's the thing. Look internet. her glasses are excellent. So yeah, it may be that without them she can't see. But she wears those things she can see.

**Heather** 08:21

I'm corrected to the I'm corrected to better than 2020 with the 2015. I'll see all of your flaws. Sorry. And here we are. That was

**Bret** 08:29

not as comforting as it might have done. Here we are. And here we are. Yeah. All right.

**Heather** 08:33

Okay. First question from today's live stream. Wow, this comes in with an amazing donation to us. Thank you. And it's just a comment. Thank you both for being voices of reason in the middle of a sea of misinformation. This is one of the most important podcasts on the internet from Matt Gee, thanks, man,

**Bret** 08:51

I really appreciate it.

**Heather** 08:53

And another one Keep up the good work. So you know, we're not reading a lot of the wonderful comments that come in. But when they come in at such a, such a high dollar amount we do regarding unity, to sway those who are worried about the greater evil instead of using a coin flip, let's declare the center right person would be president first. This would ensure that of the vote splitting that may occur, most of it will be taken from the right.

**Bret** 09:17

You know, I like this. I toyed with an idea like that. But I think the problem is this really needs to be everybody's plan. This isn't a party. It's not. You know, it is a patriotic solution to a serious problem. And in order for it to be patriotic. And for it to be all of us. It kind of has to be balanced. But I agree. The problem is, there are those on the Right who don't want the election spoiled in the other direction. And you know, I can't even say to me, we are so far gone with a system that is so broken that in the middle of COVID-19 it has delivered us these two utterly feeble candidates that we have to we have to go at this, in whatever way allows our collective interests to override the interests of the duopoly, which have been so thoroughly the focus of policy for for at least three decades. So in any case, I like the idea that there are structural biases you could build in to defeat the lesser evil paradox even further. But I think the point is, we defeat the lesser evil paradox in two different ways. One, the structural balance, which we now know from the data of our volunteers, who split evenly between former Trump former Biden's supporters and 25% of our volunteers are people who weren't planning to vote in the first place, they're going from not voting to so interested in this process, that they're willing to volunteer their time, that's an amazing solution to a problem that we didn't even know we were going to solve. Right. So it's, let's just say it's working so well at the structural level, that I don't think we need that third tier of solution, because we have two tiers that are sufficient in and of themselves. But anyway, I like to style up your thinking it does show a high quality game theoretic mind.

**Heather** 11:11

Please discuss the difference between the narratives enforced by the daughters of the Confederacy that created our Boomer and Gen X k 12. History, education, and the natural desire for contemporary lives to push back.

**Bret** 11:24

Yeah, I mean, I like this look. The problem is really simple. History means two different things. Okay. History means what happened? What actually happened? It also means What's our myth, our origin story. And the problem is that we mix these two things in the classroom. And so you get lessons about how you know, Christopher Columbus discovered America. And No, he didn't. And no, he didn't, there was no such person. And America was already inhabited by 50 to 100 million people, you can't discover something like that. As I said, prior, in the prior livestream, he discovered America in the same way that I have invented the light bulb by screwing went into the socket. It's just not right. So basic point, we have to separate these two things, we actually need to study history, which means what actually happened, the good, the bad, and the ugly. And we need to stop mythologizing inside of our history discussions. Right? That has to happen. Now that doesn't, it's not going to be a comfortable process, because history is not a comfortable process. And to know what actually happened is going to be a rough ride, you should buckle up. But I would suggest, look, we're already getting here. guns, germs and steel, the right approach, right, a scientific approach to history. Peter turchin, and cloud dynamics, same thing, what are these big patterns about? They're not in general, about individual people and their individual mindsets? They're about bigger processes. So we're now learning how to do this. Well, let's keep going.

**Heather** 12:58

The role of central banking and us monetary policy has been largely absent from your analysis of the present situation. libertarians have much to offer here. Will you bring them into the conversation?

**Bret** 13:08

Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely. No, this is central to the conversation. Yeah, I

**Heather** 13:13

will say it hasn't been part of the public conversation. It's not that it hasn't been part of discussion.

**Bret** 13:17

It's been implied in the political solution making discussion, because the point is, if you took patriots, and you put them in a position to govern based on what's actually going on, and their ability to hash it out between them, you don't think they would get to this topic? I think they'd get there very, very quickly. So, you know, in some sense, we are trying not to advance policy proposals or positions, because that's counterproductive. What we're saying is look, smart, courageous patriots, that's sufficient to get to all of these big things that we haven't been able to address in the corrupt system.

**Heather** 13:53

Yeah, I mean, I would say that, you know, some, some of the issues that I find most pressing are things that don't show up at all that we really haven't we haven't talked about, and I think don't show up, in part because it's not about policy, it's not about deciding in advance what interest groups you're going to speak to and which ones you are going to automatically get rid of, by virtue of your position on something so you know, things like things like protecting the environment and habitat loss and such, aren't aren't anywhere on the docket? Because that's not the kind of movement It

**Bret** 14:24

is, yeah, they don't need to be because you know what, good people who don't have a conflict of interest are going to protect the environment, right? It doesn't necessarily mean that they're going to do what any group is advocating, because these groups have conflicts of interest, but protect the environment. That's something we should all be able to agree.

**Heather** 14:41

Hello, do you have an evolutionary account for spirituality and mysticism as opposed to specific sets of religious beliefs? Thank You bet. Heather and Zach for the podcast.

**Bret** 14:51

Yeah, that's a great question. Yeah, that's a great question. I would say the explanation is the same which is that there is an advantage to Both a set of understood prescriptions that are delivered in a religious format. And there's also an advantage to a kind of openness to things that do not necessarily derive directly from the analytical, you know, from introspection. And so, I mean,

**Heather** 15:16

it also seems like sort of a step, a step that has often happened within lineages, where you start out with something that is explicitly polytheistic, and then move into monotheism and then move into something that is, you know, does not, does not proclaim a single human like God, but is something a bit more ethereal, less anthropomorphic. And, you know, all of those are related to one another. But they do tend to go in that order. You know, a lot of the polytheistic belief systems that preceded sort of the Judeo Christian tradition, are imagined to be sort of, you know, spiritual, mystical, but they're very formalized, polytheistic things and, you know, some of what people are calling spiritual and mystical now is just a scattershot. I take what I like, I like to imagine that I'm a mystical person, and don't actually probably aren't actually descriptive of the honorable parts of mysticism and spirituality.

**Bret** 16:20

Yeah, I agree. I do think it's necessary that we open you know, it used to be that spirituality was sort of captured by religion, because everybody had a religion. Yeah, in an era where people are increasingly, either not formally aligned with a religion, or their religion is a grab bag, the necessity to separate out spirituality, which is basically in some sense, license to suspend the analytical in order to figure out a kind of maybe it's a should part of the dynamic, you know, in the Izzat dynamic, the art separated from a rigorous obligation to is is important to the extent that you cannot derive the art directly from the IRS, which many of us believe you can't serve people like Sam Harris might argue otherwise. But but that but some license seems to be necessary. Yeah.

**Heather** 17:17

Next question easy, which is, say Kanye West Yang as the end ticket for 2020 or 2024. Question, Mark?

**Bret** 17:25

I sure don't think so. Which is not to say that West is not motivated by similar things that motivate us. In fact, I'm sure he is. I think he is a patriot. He is courageous. And he's concerned. And so he announced his run for the presidency. Now my guess would be that he's going to quickly discover why his run for the presidency is very unlikely to work, and why it could well play into the scenario that we have in front of us badly. And so I do hope you will make contact with us because to the extent that he is trying to solve a problem for the nation, which I believe he is trying to solve, the best way to do that is to come talk to people who've been thinking about this structurally, and figure out if we can't align, you know, that would be ideal. So anyway, Kanye, if you're out there, we are absolutely open to talking and respect.

**Heather** 18:26

Further to my question, last week, regarding UK Labour Party trumped up anti semitism claims party leader now backs, quote, unconscious bias training, your thoughts? Do I renounce my party membership? Or is it? Or is that just letting the nonsense went?

**Bret** 18:42

That's a good question. You know,

**Heather** 18:44

I I, the Labour Party, the Labour Party, and the democrats are in very similar straits.

**Bret** 18:50

It's all the same. And so really, the question is a, what position Are you in? You know, it may be that you can't, you know, that staying within is the key to getting somewhere and that you can endure the what might come back at you as you push back? From within?

**Heather** 19:07

Yeah, I know, I know so much less about the political system in England, I don't know, you know, in the US to declare yourself independent rather than a democrat means that you lose the right to vote in primaries. Yep. Right. I don't know what that would mean, in, in the UK, you know, renouncing your party? Is it? Is it something that you can then say in conversation to people to make the point? And what is the value of that? You know, what, what are the perks that accrue to being a party member? I don't know.

**Bret** 19:35

Yep. I don't know. I confess I don't know enough about the burger system. But yeah, definitely. The thing that you don't want to do is empower your enemies by stepping away from the thing if you have some influence, but maybe you have no influence. That's possible, too. Likely even.

**Heather** 19:53

What do you support a grassroots canvassing of unity 2020 at this point,

**Bret** 19:58

a grassroots canvassing like door to door, grassroots canvassing by unity 2020

**Heather** 20:05

of people are asking, we are we are seeing and presumably the website is seeing as well. The people who are monitoring that a lot of people are saying what what do I do? Like what? So there's no ability to donate dollars at this point. So what what can I do? And we've been hearing some interesting stories about people talking to their relatives and their friends, people who they wouldn't have thought would be swayed from either Trump or Biden. Yeah, we've we've heard stories on both sides. And they seem to be making headway because it actually it actually is. doesn't mean you have to hold your nose, right? This plan does not involve you having to pretend that you're doing honorable thing when you're really not. So this I think emerges from Okay, this sounds good. What now what can I do?

**Bret** 20:52

Okay, so here's what I would say, first of all, get modern. Okay, you live in the internet era. And

**Heather** 21:00

having people show up at your door, if it's not totally not wanted is also very powerful. Yeah.

**Bret** 21:04

Although it's COVID-19. So, yeah. Nice. Yes. How do I get? I'm not

**Heather** 21:13

wearing a bandana.

**Bret** 21:15

So that there is a lot you can do online, including reach out to two or maybe three people who you think have ears to hear. And what you really want to do is understand what the objections are and why they don't apply. We have designed around the objections. And so you want to figure out, you know, people have a tendency to respond to the thing that's similar to the thing you're actually doing. They basically push the thing cognitively over to something they're familiar with, oh, it's a third party, right? No, it's not. There's no, there's no party, this is not a third party run. And it doesn't elect the greater evil because of two design elements. It's got one element that causes it to draw equally from both sides. And it's got another element that were it to be some danger. In some danger of spoiling the election, the plug gets pulled. So you can relax. The great thing about that is you can say, well, who are the candidates? Well, no, this isn't about the candidates, we've told you what characteristics they will have to have, right? That list is sufficient to get good people to do the right thing in office. You don't need to know them yet. We don't know them yet. It would be foolish to try to drag people in now, because the effort is still small. And because the effort is still small, it's a hazard to them. And it's basically the best thing that can happen is the groundswell can come and then we can declare who the candidates are. And if you don't like them, you're not committing to support it. You're committing to support something, should we deliver you good candidates? And should the effort be plausible at the point the election is looming? And so you're not giving anything up? You're not going to do harm in the electoral context. And you're basically just saying, if you deliver on what it is that you say you are attempting to do, then I would support it right? And would you? Of course, you would, right? every reasonable person, would you want adults at the helm? You just simply do all all of us do. This is too dangerous to have whatever else this thing, you know, corrupt children running things, what could possibly go wrong?

**Heather** 23:26

corrupt children, the bodies of adults. Google allows us to submit questions to be answered by leaders but won't allow us to submit them anonymously. Therefore, people avoid asking questions that may be sensitive for fear of retaliation. What can I do? I'm not sure what the context is here.

**Bret** 23:46

Is the context this q&a is the context that because this is going through YouTube, that Youtube does not allow the asking of questions anonymous, I have to have the sense that must be it seems

**Heather** 23:59

like it might be but you know, you can set up a YouTube channel that's anonymous, and it doesn't doesn't mean anything. And then I'm not the reason I'm not sure that that's what the question is, is because the word is leaders. And I'm not, you know, we're not. We might be leaders, but that's not our primary role right here. So I'm not sure what the context is enough to know. More than that. I don't think fear of retaliation should be a problem here. Yeah. But it certainly is in many places of work and other domains right now. And this is a reason for I mean, this is exactly why there is a strong history of being able to submit concerns anonymously. And of course now that's being gamed by some workplaces where people are submitting concerns against their work or against their colleagues, such that they're not traceable, and they're false. So there's there's pros and cons on both sides of that. 2020 and 2024 are both too soon, please wait till 2040 and push forward xev ticket.

**Bret** 25:10

Well, it's an interesting idea. I'm I'm concerned that 2024 may not even be on this timeline if we are not able to divert our course. So think about

**Heather** 25:22

2040. Zack was born in 2004 is F. Zev? Who's Eric second born must have been born in 2005. So they would be just just old enough at that point.

**Bret** 25:32

Yeah. All right. Tell you what, I'll, I'll back that ticket when you advance it then if you go back 2020 now?

**Heather** 25:40

Yeah. Okay, this whole movement of the left is overt attempt to gain control of central government, which consumes $5 trillion of a $21 trillion economy. Maybe? Yeah, I

**Bret** 25:52

mean, it is an overt attempt to gain power. Yeah. Clearly,

**Heather** 25:58

please have an episode. Have you a progressive patriot and a Ted Cruz type constitutionalist patriot and have the illustration of your new system system. You said the Constitution is showing its age, have you to revise it, etc? That's a great idea. Yep. isn't really good idea.

**Bret** 26:12

Here's the thing. I can't promise it's going to happen. But I'm working on.

**Heather** 26:17

Yeah, I mean, we should probably have announced this at the end of last year, but the end of this series should talk about what's happening tomorrow as well. Is that a live stream? It's not live. Okay. But you're going to release it? soon. ish.

**Bret** 26:28

sooner. Okay. Very soon. As a matter of fact, assuming it's technically difficult, so I have to pull it off first. Okay. And I don't want to promise it,

**Heather** 26:34

let's definitely keep talking about it, but not say what it is. Oh, absolutely. Yes,

**Bret** 26:37

guy. Great. I

**Heather** 26:38

think so. Okay, some say that. Some say that defunding the police means that people want to allocate some of the police budget to other programs and improve the community. Are there say it will cause issues of crime? What are your thoughts? We've talked about this a bit.

**Bret** 26:55

Yeah, it's a catastrophe. And here's why the the cops and the necessity to have so many cops and to have them so well armed. All of that is a downstream consequence of really crappy policy designed to keep people in line after you've frozen them out of the well being that they're entitled to. So if you then reduce the level of policing, and you reallocate, you're not solving that upstream problem. And so you're going to create a problem of not enough police

**Heather** 27:27

going after the symptom, right, going after the symptom. And some people do say that that's what they mean, when they say defund the police. And some people do mean that, but not all the mean that and some of them are quite obvious in what they're saying when they say, I mean, you showed in New York Times op ed week or two ago saying, Yeah, actually, we do mean abolish the police, we mean about, I mean, the fact that there's this one phrase, that actually means two very different things, is part of the problem. I mean, it's it's like calling the whole movement, anti racist when it's frankly, patently not. And saying, Oh, we only mean this one thing? Well, no, actually, some of you mean, abolish the police entirely. And that's a non starter. Therefore, you got to at least stop using that phrase, because some people are using it to mean something impossible,

**Bret** 28:08

it would be the equivalent. It's the equivalent of treating a fever, when the fever is actually your body's way of dealing with a pathogen. So you've got a pathogen, you say, Oh, my God, you've got a pathogen, you've got a fever, the fever is bad, therefore get rid of the fever, well, now you've got a worse problem with your pathogen, right? or treating pneumonia. by denying the patient fluids, right, you're drowning, your lungs are filling with fluid, let's, let's dehydrate you dry right up will dry your write up. It's just nonsense. This is not going to work. So it's not that people like us don't want to see fewer police. We do. But we want to see fewer police by virtue of the fact that they're no longer necessary by virtue of the fact that you solve the upstream problem first, it's the obvious way to go. So

**Heather** 28:53

that's, that's excellent. Simple as that's good. Like, you know, this, this, this fever point is one that began to be being made in the 90s. With as as Darwinian medicine began to gain ground and then kind of stalled out. But you know, the recognition that often a fever is the body's way know the path, the body's response to the pathogen to raise the temperature in which the pathogen exists outside of its optimal zone, such as the pathogen fails, but not so high that the body fails. That's what all fevers are, but that turns out to be what many fevers are. But this the second one, this, well, one symptom of pneumonia is that you appear to be drowning. Let's drive up. I think actually interjecting both these examples. Whenever people say defund the police. It's it is it is the right analogy,

**Bret** 29:40

knee jerk medicine. Yeah, knee jerk, man. This

**Heather** 29:43

is knee jerk social change. On the police, knee jerk social change. We've got

**Bret** 29:47

a whole epidemic of knee jerk medicine, right? For sure. teeth are misaligned. Let's drag them to the right place. Oh, that's a good idea. What could go wrong? Yes. Right knee the person's depressed. Ah, let's Give them something to interfere with the molecules that facilitate depression.

**Heather** 30:04

Do they have anything to be depressed about?

**Bret** 30:07

That's a difficult question. That's too complicated. settle on an easy request. Yeah,

**Heather** 30:11

let's go up to the molecules. Yep. To do Where are we can't Yes, this is it. Can you speak to the concern I and some others have that your unity 2020 strategy, even for the next election cycle might be vulnerable to both entrenched parties injecting their candidates as your nominees.

**Bret** 30:32

We see them coming. We see them coming. hostile to them in all that they do. And we will be hostile to the major parties until they give up evil. That's the thing. So no, I'm not too worried about it, because let's put it this way, you would be delighted to see the quality of patriots who are showing up in droves on our doorstep looking to help and you might fool the occasional Patriot, but you're not going to fool us all. I mean, we want people who are above politics period.

**Heather** 31:10

Yeah, I guess we're at about a half an hour, but I want to get to a few more here before we switch switch over. This made my position clear to a woke friend. Children as a group are sexually abused by adults as a group. Therefore, all adults harbor internalized pedophilia, and he's dial this assertion is pedophile fragility

**Bret** 31:31

is pretty darn good. That's

**Heather** 31:31

really good. Now that's a really good that's a well done. I'm gonna say it again. Because although maybe this should be clipped. But this this is this is Snowden bleep. Who brings us to us. Snowden bleeps strategy is saying this to a friend who has work. Children as a group were sexually abused by adults as a group. Therefore, all adults must harbor internalized pedophilia, and a denial of this assertion is pedophile fragility.

**Bret** 31:58

So good. Yeah, that's really that's awesome. Keep doing that.

**Heather** 32:02

Yeah, that's right. So someone says they made a flatland animated movie and the women are squares. They also made a sequel called sphere land. Please make a documentary on this new mouse revolution. I need something to convince my dad.

**Bret** 32:15

Right? The women are squares like they're nerds or

**Heather** 32:19

do so I did not know that there was a flatland animated movie. I do remember from just rethinking about flatland a little bit today that the more sides you have in 2d land the more elevated you are and you know it's it's classes as well i think he makes like tradesmen triangles. And the anonymous the at the time anonymous author for the first printing was a square, but every either every time you generation will change, I think, if you add a side, so the child of a square is a Pentagon, if he's male, the child of a Pentagon is a hexagon, I have to get an octagon, octagon, etc. So I do wonder if women are just stabilized in squares, in which case they haven't quite solved? No.

**Bret** 33:01

That's not not a whole solution. Yeah. That's interesting point, though. Thank you report enough to

**Heather** 33:07

curious as to your thoughts on the warnings that Yuri baesman off gave us in 1984. After he defected he is an ex KGB agent, and it basically mirrors your experiences and everything you've been saying regarding evergreen? Yeah, I would I I've seen some of his interviews. I think there's like one longish one, maybe an hour and a half or so. But there are a couple. And he just he saw it. He saw it in the USSR. And he came here and he said, Well, you guys have the the glimmerings of the same kind of thing. And I'm gonna predict these these things. And he just got a lot of them, right. So this is URI bezel enough, I think is Yeah,

**Bret** 33:45

so the thing to understand is that this is the canonical failure. And it's a set of canonical failures. So you have what I call the French Revolution moment, which means the point at which the rent seekers have frozen regular people out of wellbeing for so long that the regular people think I know, you know, pitchforks and torches, right. And the next thing, it's guillotines, that's the fringe flare, right, but but the point is, if you've got rent seeking leads, and they freeze people out long enough, what will happen? Those people will revolt. And so another canonical failure is this instinct to, you know, solve everything through redistribution, which then runs afoul of a a, a group selection problem that's got a game theory problem at its heart. Yep, then forces you to authoritarianism. So, the real point is, look, let's just get good at saying. If you do that, the next thing that happens is this, if that happens, next thing happens is this and that's how you end up with that thing that's so dramatic. And everybody says, How could this have happened? But does it

**Heather** 34:49

look like last time? Right? Well, but it does. It's just got new tech.

**Bret** 34:53

Yeah, it's Yeah, well, it updates and you know, for one thing, the things that you're easy that you're easily going to spot those things are on understood to be deal breakers. And so it learns, you know, fascism isn't gonna go step again. Hitler, it's learned. Yeah,

**Heather** 35:07

right. Yeah, these these people who are like did you say he did a he did a Heil Hitler, like, only a true moron would make that part of their movement at this point, right? Like it's not gonna look like that of course it's not do you think CRISPR biology question do you think CRISPR maybe needed to stop COVID if it mutates too fast for traditional vaccines? What are the major concerns you have with this technology? Thanks and keep up the great work. Hmm, I don't know if CRISPR can be. I'm not, it's been a while since I've thought about CRISPR. I don't know how it can be used to, to address COVID if it's mutating really fast.

**Bret** 35:48

So it can be used. It doesn't, it doesn't need to be used because we have other techniques to do the same thing doesn't mean it's not the most efficient way to do those things. But the thing to understand about CRISPR is that I have analogized it to we have a typewriter for the language of genes, and that typewriter is CRISPR. But we don't have is the Rosetta Stone.

**Heather** 36:10

We the humans have a typewriter, the genes themselves have whatever they've got

**Bret** 36:14

is do their thing. And we now have a typewriter that allows us to make any sequence we like, right?

**Heather** 36:19

We know what the letters are.

**Bret** 36:20

We know what the letters are, and we can assemble them at will. But we don't speak the language of those letters yet. We're learning things about that language. But without the Rosetta Stone, we don't speak the language, which means we can't sit down and say, let's write a gene to do X.

**Heather** 36:34

And we've got so much hubris. You know, the molecular biologists are so sure that they've they've got this nailed in so many regards. That changes are often done without regard to things like Chesterton's fence. Yeah, unintended consequences. It's It's dangerous.

**Bret** 36:51

So I would say I've seen efforts in the neighborhood of vaccines. And one of the efforts which is currently being suppressed, it would seem by our top level journals, makes the following point in their manuscript about vaccine technology, which is these pathogens have high variability in terms of their rate of change. And that a vaccine that is targeted at something that changes rapidly is obviously a short duration phenomenon. And one can systematically go through the, the, the genome and the structures, and you can target things to change less frequently, which seems a very obvious point. But nonetheless, there are Oh, it also makes another point, which is target things that are as far from human sequences as possible, right, to the extent that the pathogen, in part profits by disappearing against the backdrop of a human, you target the parts of it that are most different, because those parts then do not confuse the immune system and attacking itself and creating an autoimmune disease. That's good. So there is a way to play this game. And the idea that we are going to, because the vaccine in question is being developed by people who, through their research have discovered just how probable it is that the virus emerged from a laboratory after having been modified that we are going to shut down that discussion. And thereby slow, the progress on that vaccine is appalling, because frankly, that could very easily lead to a great many needless deaths.

**Heather** 38:31

One more question here, then we'll skip to switch to the other live stream, Super Chat. Are we in the it's just the flu phase of public awareness of the horizontal revolution? I like this framing very much. Me too. I mean, I don't like it, but I think it's apt.

**Bret** 38:48

I like that. Yeah, I like it. I like it a lot. Yeah, yeah. And you know, you can tell, in some sense, this is drawn out because some of us have seen the horizontal resolute revolution, obviously, in microcosm. Before and we've been talking about it, we were long dismissed. And the point is, if it is true, that we were right, that the thing that we saw in miniature has now emerged at a much greater scale, and we told you it was going to, then what are we saying now? Yeah, we're saying, Oh, my God, that's a threat to the overall power structure. And the worst thing that can happen is that it can partner with half of the duopoly right, and that's bad, just one, if it partners with half of the duopoly, what's going to happen well, a you're going to get this massive transfer of well being based on nothing like justice whatsoever, that is going to cause misery and the whole point of it is to distract from where the opportunity was actually concentrated, or equally bad, or maybe worse, is that that's going to activate people on the other side to fight back and we're going to find ourselves in a, a another race based Civil War, which doesn't even happen have the advantage of having a geographical description that could possibly tell us how it might be resolved. So this is this is why the alarm bells are going off is that the duopoly and not Donald Trump, the duopoly, its long standing conspiracy against the American public, the way it conducts well being and concentrates it with rent seeking elites, that thing has created the problem. And now it is giving us no viable solution that does not result in disaster for the country. So yeah, I agree. It ain't the flu.

**Heather** 40:36

Sorry. Might males be selecting for fitter offspring when imposing additional burdens on females during mating through biting or hurting so weak females can't live or carry offspring to term? Thanks, love you guys.

**Bret** 40:49

Can you help me I didn't quite get

**Heather** 40:52

the proposal is that male aggression against females during mating is a way of increasing the fitness of their own offspring. This is probably isn't it, because females are always limiting for males. And, you know, assuming we're talking about a species in which there's no paternal care and basically in which males try to mate with as many females as possible and females are stuck with whatever the the, the they have the monopoly on the parental care such that there is any the females are a resource that even if there's a, there's a group of offspring that get produced that aren't as high quality as they might be, they're still offspring and conditions change, and what doesn't work now might work in the future. So in general, killing males killing females is not going to be a viable strategy and not one that evolution is going to see as viable either,

**Bret** 41:54

especially females are mating with them, which is I realize included in what you just said. But yeah, there's nothing down that road. So you know, why does that thing exist? A How much does it exist? We don't know when this is, well, this

**Heather** 42:07

is the calls that comes to mind in nonhumans. It's like lions. Cats end up sort of biting the male cats end up biting female cats and the nape of the neck.

**Bret** 42:16

Yeah, scruff.

**Heather** 42:17

Yeah, yeah. the nape set different. I don't know it's the scruff for sure. You scuffle

**Bret** 42:25

right, anyway. Which I mean, in the case of cats, I think it's straightforward. If you take a an adult cat, and you scruff them, it causes them to relax and, and not struggle. Right.

**Heather** 42:39

But then this raises a different question about why any coercion is necessary. Right. Right. I mean, that's that's a different question, though. That it's not there's not harm. Being there's no intentional harm being inflicted there. Yeah. Okay, please talk about the h1 b issue and how it related to Eric's theory of minorities in STEM or the Princeton faculty letter. I have to admit that I haven't fully spent time with the Princeton faculty letter yet. I've seen it. But I don't.

**Bret** 43:11

Yeah, I think probably you could direct this at Eric. I don't think I want to wade into it without being fully well versed.

**Heather** 43:22

Someone offers their support, saying it isn't very much, but they're poor. Well, thank you.

**Bret** 43:27

Yeah. Thanks. And if you're poor, probably save it. Yeah, I would say. But thank you.

**Heather** 43:36

Regarding the spoiler issue, guys, you can't turn a cruise ship on a dime, and you can't do anything but spoil an election in four months. You're being naive. I love you.

**Bret** 43:44

Well, we love you, too. I don't know what you're talking about. The thing is designed not to spoil the election. What are you worried about? I mean, it's designed this way. In two separate ways. We've got a by design that we now know, is working mechanism whereby it draws equally from both. And it's got a failsafe, it's, it's it's safe twice over. So

**Heather** 44:06

if religion is inevitable, doesn't it make sense to use science to carefully design a new religion such that as negative externalities are minimized rather than let harmful new religions crop up in the wild?

**Bret** 44:17

You know, I've been in this battle multiple times, people who think carefully about how to fix the problems of civilization that put us in so much jeopardy. Always go through the question, somebody will always raised the question, do we have to invent a religion or is this doomed to failure? If we don't do that? I think it's the wrong question. First of all, there's a problem with building the sin at the religious level, which is that the religious level because it is inherently metaphorical, does not have a mechanism for telling you when the facts on which the thing is predicated have changed sufficiently, that the myth is no longer viable. In other words, the way religions change is by those who ascribe to certain you know, you've got sex. We're in fact checking. Yeah, it's it is specifically resistant to fact checking. So what you've got is sectarian disagreement over what the true nature of the religion is. And then the groups that have it closer to right out compete the groups that have it less, right. We can't afford that we have to have something that's self updates. What does that scientific worldview, but you don't want to narrow empiricists scientific worldview, you want a broad minded systems theory mechanism that tells you which of your you know what is stacked on top of which beliefs such that, you know, this belief may not be very if it's wrong, it may not be very important, because there's nothing stacked on it. Whereas this belief, if it's wrong, is a terrible vulnerability. And so you need to have some understanding of what's predicated on what and therefore what needs to be checked at what rate and what level of accuracy it has to have in order to retain its nature and what would cause you to change something in order to avoid something downstream. We know how to do it, it's not that hard to figure out how to do it. And I just think it's incompatible with any system that claims absolute truth. Right? Now, the scientific method will lead you in the direction of the truth, but it doesn't claim absolute truth. There's nothing that we know that you know, for one thing, you hear people talking about the simulation hypothesis for the universe, virtually everything we know about what's in the universe isn't true. If the universe is a simulation, right? Nothing is true. Does the earth go around the sun? No, not if it's a simulation. Right? So. So the point is, look, we're open to all those things, I don't think you have need to worry that the universe is a simulation. But everything is on the table in science all the time. And that's the way it needs to be and unfortunately, that's the Achilles heel of all religions is that they don't do that.

**Heather** 46:55

I wrote an essay on the importance of cymatics redefinition, redefinition and broadening of terms like racism, violence and self defense. Do you agree that semantic distinctions drive much of the current confusion? And how best can we deal with it? I don't know where I'd put it in the pecking order. But it's certainly a tool that has been used. And it was recognized by the academics who are driving the sort of revolution in, in academia that helped get us into this mess. redefining language was a primary mode of dissemination and of confusion.

**Bret** 47:29

Yeah, I think the the flaw is that there is a mindset that mistakes the truth for social, right, there is a truth. And then there is a social layer at which we engage the truth. If you think that everything is social, then the world is effectively like the internet. And you can, you know, on the internet, can a man become a woman? Yeah, he can sign up for new account and say, he's a woman, and he's a woman. And it doesn't mean that the person sitting at the keyboard has changed who, what they are. But it means that in an online world that has no physics that has no conservation laws that has no absolute logic, you know, the underlying code has an absolute logic. But online, you can set up a world that does anything. And so if you were raised in that world, and you don't really understand that the world outside is of a different nature, that it doesn't really care what you think, right? That it is a set of processes that happen, irrespective of whether or not you understand them, then you will tend to fight your battles in this social layer. Because the point is, look, you who say that a man cannot become a woman by saying that he's a woman are standing in the way of people who want to do exactly that. Why would you stand in the way because it's as simple as us all agreeing to this. So if you want to liberate people, let's all agree to it? And the answer is, No, because you've just said something that interfaces with biology and medicine and the prison system and the courts and all of these other things and, and sport. So you know, there's no escaping the fact that those realms have a physical reality. When they put you in prison, you can't just identify as somebody who's not in prison, right? prison is a natural place, we take away your freedom, and we do it on the basis of facts established in a court that tell us that you violated a law sufficiently important that it warrants prison time. Right? Those are, yes, there's a social layer. The court is a social layer, but the bars of the prison are not social. So I would say to people who have seen much happen in the social world and have not fully engaged the boundary between the social world and the physical world. There is a confusion and that results in US fighting linguistic battles, as if they are the same thing as reality. And of soapbox.

**Heather** 49:55

On your fourth of July question, in a podcast, tenants of Christianity were mocked and below Call texts were superficially interpreted. See Dr. Peterson's Genesis series. Where's the unity in that approach? Let me say first, I have no idea what you're referencing to with regard to tenants of Christianity being mocked. I don't I don't think either of us have ever done that. Well, no, there are there are mythical portions that while we don't mock, we aren't going to pretend to ascribe to. And then biblical text being superficially interpreted. But we're not biblical scholars. And we don't pretend to be we're evolutionary biologists. So I have not watched Dr. Peterson's Genesis series. But I imagine that in that as in everything I have seen of his, he does a really bang up job.

**Bret** 50:41

Yep, I think are now recall what they're talking about. Okay. I think we talked about virgin birth.

**Heather** 50:49

So the mythical aspects of questionable aspects of Christianity?

**Bret** 50:52

And the answer is false, metaphorically, true. This is not something for which there is a good solution. On the one hand, we are biologists, the idea of virgin birth, that's an empirical claim. And the fact that that claim is in there, I find very unfortunate because what it means is that there is a an empirical barrier to people seeing the wisdom of things like the golden rule and the story of the Good Samaritan, which we'd be much better off if there were no barrier to seeing the wisdom there. Because those aren't empirical claims.

**Heather** 51:21

Well, I mean, it's actually it speaks to what you know what you call the soapbox in the last question, you know, we are we are no more going to agree that Jesus was actually the result of a virgin birth from his mother than we are that men can literally become women by declaring themselves so they're, they're equally empirical claims, and they're equally wrong.

**Bret** 51:38

Well, and interestingly, the the version of this, that you have picked somebody who ascribes to a biblical literalism enough that that virgin birth is important to them, is very likely not to like the idea that somebody simply changes sex by saying so

**Heather** 51:55

well, that so that's why I picked those two, these are at opposite ends of a like, No, you can't go after my cherished beliefs like Well, sometimes cherished beliefs are wrong.

**Bret** 52:02

Well, not only are they wrong, but the point is, it's certainly wrong to say this cherished belief is sacred, you can't touch that one. And this one is blasphemy, you have to touch that one. So at some level, I hate to say it, I know, I understand how it gets heard. And I get in trouble for this. But I have gone way out of my way to make the point that these texts are full of wisdom, and it is intermingled with other stuff. Some of the wisdom is out of date, some of the wisdom is abhorrent, and some of the wisdom is beautiful. It is time that all of us come together, we live together in a cosmopolitan civilization, I don't think there's any other honorable thing we can do, we must come together. And when we come together, we can't all be asked to treat everybody's Bible as true. They can't all be true because they contradict each other. So if we're not going to do that, then what we have to do is back off the claims that Oh, mine mines literal. Yours may be metaphorical, but my Bible is literal. So consider it, how much do you give up, if you just simply recognize virgin birth is a story. And it comes with a lot of wisdom, some of which is incredibly important, and has been widely discovered by many populations. Many populations have a version of the golden rule, couldn't we get to the point where we recognize each other's humanity and each other's discovery of that principle, and then figure out how to instantiate it so that it actually is globalized in the way that frankly I believe the Buddhists are ahead of everybody else in truly globalizing.

**Heather** 53:40

I cannot support any campaign that does not make the media enemy number one, not left not right, not the center will unit you will unity 2020 fight the media. So this is this is going down the same route, that the both parties in the duopoly have gone down, they start with policies, and they care about issues that they care about. And they start courting those interests, which some will argue are not special interest, but global interest, but they start courting them, and then those become Central. And then the the party, whatever it is, or the movement in this case, changes such as that is its focus is is what is happening to the media a problem? Yeah, I could pick three things that I would focus on before the media, but the B is a problem. But all of us would pick, you know, would have a different ordering. We could probably agree many of us on the top 20. Let's call it issues that are facing our country 20. We could probably probably agree on a list of 20. But ranking that list. Boy, that's going to be tough. I don't think that we're going to get agreement on a ranked list. I'm not even sure you and I would agree on a rank list. We'd come we come really close because I don't think we'd exactly agree. So the idea that it's got to be your issue or you're not on board. That's going to be a problem. That is the opposite of you.

**Bret** 55:00

Yeah, I would say the other thing is they're trying to figure out how to how to come out. The question is this one, there are bound to be people in all of the layers, including media, who are of the following three descriptions, you're going to have people who will serve themselves, no matter what the harm is to others, you're going to have people who will do the right thing, irrespective of the harm to self, and then you're gonna have a lot of people in the middle, who are going to do what makes sense relative to the incentives that they find. And many of those people would prefer a system that worked, they would prefer to feel good about their job. And they don't have the option to do it because of perverse incentives in that layer. And so here's the question. Suppose you put aside your let's go after the media first position, and instead you thought, how do we build something that those people in the media who actually would be aligned with us? If they could find that if they could find the opportunity? How do you create the opportunity, a groundswell will do it, right. And you will still have people in the media who are really just there to serve their own interests, but I don't think they're going to be the majority. So imagine that every one of the things that we might prioritize has those same three layers in it, and figure out how it is that you are going to liberate those who are trapped in the system, who would prefer something that actually worked? How do you liberate them to join us so that we can get to a place where things function again?

**Heather** 56:42

Okay, we're coming up in an hour, but we've got a lot of what looked like really good questions, we'll get through as many of them as possible and answer a few more at the top of the next live stream, which will not Incidentally, we'll say this again, be Saturday, but will be the following Tuesday, a week from today. Oh, someone says how everything is going to be okay. The Holy Spirit is here for you stay strong, God's children will be victorious. I think that belief is not helpful now, because by putting it into someone else's hands, it means that change is not likely to happen. How right was JK Rowling when she wrote called him, Voldemort, Harry, always use the proper name for things. Fear of a name increases fear of the thing itself.

**Bret** 57:26

I've always thought it was a very strong element in Yeah, in in those books, I think the fact that airy doesn't use the fancy spells. It doesn't prefer them is a very powerful message. And the fact that he is alone, unafraid to speak the name of Voldemort that both of those things actually suggest a kind of deep understanding of how things really go wrong.

**Heather** 57:51

Speak the true name. Yep, yeah. How can the silent majority in quotes that is not aligned with BLM, anti police, defund the police agenda, protect their communities from becoming criminal havens? So much depends on the particular context. Right?

**Bret** 58:10

Well, one thing that as people approach us, and they say, Well, okay, it's happening at my institution, what do I do? Or it's happening in my city? What do I do? At some level, you can tell by the lack of diversity and how successful people are at fending off these things, the fact that the same belief system is spreading across the landscape, and that basically, you can be earlier or later, but sooner or later, it's going to wash over you and people are gonna start saying the same thing about, you know, about white supremacy being everywhere, and white fragility being the only explanation for why anybody would not agree that because that does wash over everything, you can tell that the solution isn't at a lower level where How do you protect your community? Well, what's the likelihood when nobody's successfully protecting their community or their institution that you're going to pull it off there? Therefore, the solution is to do it at a higher level? In other words, how do we address the thing that is causing people to be vulnerable to this, this ideology washing over them and causing them to say a lot of untrue things? So I think the thing is, unfortunately, there's no solution at that level. Join us at the higher level. And let's solve the whole thing once and for all.

**Heather** 59:25

Okay, couple more questions. According to ballotpedia, filing deadlines for independent candidate ballot access have already passed in several states. Does your plan have a way to get around this? Yes. regarding a spoiler, why not aim to influence the vp pick for Biden, get one of our candidates installed as VP it will be a substantial way to put us on the map and not risking spoiler and Trump version two.

**Bret** 59:45

Well, first of all, again, Why does everybody think we're risking spoiling, right? It's twice, twice safe, right? That said, if the democrats want to play ball or the republicans want to play ball, and start governing, right? If they want to give a strong indication that they are interested in leadership and they have given up their influence peddling racket, we're all ears. So yes, there are things down that road. But boy, are we going to take some convincing that they've actually come around because you know what? The signs are quite the opposite. That's right.

**Heather** 1:00:19

Well, I bet batshit crazy and not say catch it or bird shit or any of a wide variety of you know, droppings? Well, a lot you take this? I mean, I mean, I can I can refine it to it's good question. I'm

**Bret** 1:00:31

gonna leave it I'm saving something. Oh, this front? Oh, really? Okay. I am. But as it turns out

**Heather** 1:00:37

to be a deep question, you're only going to get the tip of the iceberg. That's

**Bret** 1:00:41

Well, that's have kind of a PR problem. I mean, they just don't Yeah, especially now. Right? And also, I don't know the answer to the question, but it could be the bats fly.

**Heather** 1:00:56

And it's the first day in caves, isn't it? It's,

**Bret** 1:00:59

well, they have a bigger problem that's in part based on their cave Enos. And

**Heather** 1:01:04

your problem is based in part on the reality that because guano of all sorts is which tends to be I think, only really what we call it when it's bad somehow, or I guess, aerial Yeah, when it's when it's when it's something shooting from the sky. That pathogens are concentrated in it, and they can become aerosolized. And that's all very fine and good. If you're a seabird on our rock, it's going to dissipate in the air, just like being outside, you're much less likely to be contracting COVID. But if you're in a cave, all of that is, is concentrated, it doesn't really have any place to leave. So if you enter a cave where there are a bunch of bats roosting, you're actually much more likely to get exposed to something that might actually make you at crazy, then if you walk into a cave without such bats, or if you're just walking through some, you know, cave landscape without actual caves. Yep. Good like that. What about cognac? What's the question? Could Kanye West play a role on the 2020 plan? Well, think of his vision announcement, we already went you already? Yeah, of course, you

**Bret** 1:02:07

could play a role and we would we would welcome him playing a role. I don't think the role is president. just doesn't make sense. Yeah. You know, he's got amazing skills, but I don't think it's at all indicated that his skills are of the kind or that he would even want the job Really?

**Heather** 1:02:22

Yeah. Okay, let's take one more. One more, and then we will stop for now with a few announcements to end, thank you for your work, I am a person of color. Working in a religious private school, I just signed up for a book club to read white fragility with colleagues who are mostly female, white, upper class, etc. Any advice?

**Bret** 1:02:42

what I call up?

**Heather** 1:02:44

Call up? Yeah, first of all, your description of the demographic descriptors of the other people who are in this book club, is, is telling and is typical, it does tend to be pretty much middle class and upper class white women who are promoting this particular book, this particular screen that is so filled with hatred and ridiculous thinking. And that you know, why that might be as a conversation not for right now, but, but for another time. But, you know, I would say at one level, you know, you play the idiocy of the book to your advantage in order to get them to listen to you, if if you were the person of color in the room, and you are listening to us, and therefore, at least have some suspicion that the book is not what it claims and is divisive, rather than unifying. If they start disagreeing with you point out that they actually have no leg to stand on this room, because you are, you are the person who is suffering rather than rather than them, you I just don't see anything dishonorable in playing their game on them at the point that they would insist on winning, regardless of whatever else is true,

**Bret** 1:03:57

I might come at it slightly differently. But in part, we don't know what you mean by PRC, because let's say you're Asian,

**Heather** 1:04:02

and we also don't know from blamed, sorry, but from your name, I can't tell if you're male or female. And so that's going to be probably probably more effective if you're female, although frankly, a woman pushing back against other women is going to play very difficult, you're gonna have to use different strategies than a man pushing back against a group of women.

**Bret** 1:04:19

But I would say, if by PRC, you mean that you're black, then maybe it's a marvelous opportunity. Now, it's certainly not an opportunity without risk. But imagine, for example, that the approach you took was, I read the book, I don't believe in and as people in the room are trying to insist that they are racist and are trying to come to grips with it and that it is the kind of problem that must be addressed and can't be addressed and all of the other contradictions that these people espouse. You might just call them out in their own interest and they might hear you trying to liberate them from this set of circular idiocies, right? If they heard you saying, You know what? I hear you asserting that you're definitely racist because you're white. In my experience, that's not how it worked. I mean, that's just not the nature of it.

**Heather** 1:05:15

So now you began with a caveat. And basically, unfortunately, if your lineage making you a person of color is East Asian, and they This doesn't show up in white fragility, but it's certainly in the ideology. Probably what will come back at you is well, Asians are a tool of white supremacy as well. Yeah. Which is a line that we ran into at evergreen and you know, it's quite common it's it's absurd and ridiculous and offensive and all these things, but you know, you're you're most protected against the idiot ideology. The I guess the darker the skin here is the darker your skin is worst case. It's ridiculous.

**Bret** 1:05:59

You don't imagine that the if you are black, do not imagine that because you're black, you will be safe? I would say it depends on one of two things. Or maybe it depends on one primary thing. Yeah, it is. If the people pushing the ideology are really in the room, rather than people who are a victim of this ideology. That is to say they're being forced into admitting things that aren't true. If the people who are leading it are there, then you're in for special punishment, because claiming that you don't see it is going to be viewed as very damning.

**Heather** 1:06:32

But he or she has said book club. So maybe not maybe not.

**Bret** 1:06:35

Yeah, the chances are that you're dealing with basically people who are engaged in embracing a zombie ideology, but the the people who are selling it, aren't there, in which case, you might be able to liberate them.

**Heather** 1:06:48

Yeah. All right, I think I think that's it. You want to put up the end screen while we talk, just so we will not be here on Saturday for logistical reasons on our end, but there will be one, two, maybe three podcasts up between now and next Tuesday, when will when we will be back live at 1230 I would remind us yet again, remind you guys about the darcars membership at my patreon at the $5 and up level about the discord server that's available at either the link to that available on either of our Patreon. Or the darker is clips channel, which is now alive and on which you can find, hopefully, whatever your favorite clips that you were hoping to share from the last few episodes, and they'll be keeping current for now on. And you wanted to say something about what you're going to be doing tomorrow? Or do you want to keep that a surprise.

**Bret** 1:07:48

I will just say God's willing. And by God's I mean technical, God's willing, we have an awesome podcast headed your way. I am certain of it before it even landed on the sensors in our cameras. So anyway, keep your eye out for that. But I don't want to promise it because the technical issues are daunting. And Zach is hundreds of miles away. So in any case, like Subscribe, comment, and please join unity 2020 find us announce your presence and find two or three other people and tell them hey, this plan. It's not what you think it is. You've heard of third party plans. This isn't the third party. It's not going to spoil the election. Give it a chance. All right. Thanks, folks. See seamless outro