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**SPEAKERS**

Bret, Heather

**Bret** 00:07

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse pod cast live stream q&a number 32, where we were just talking with the dog, we were talking to the dog and he was howling like a moose. Alright, that was it was both of you. All right. I have a correction right up front. I apparently said Bibi's when I was talking about what it is that in Tifa protesters and riders are launching at officers. What was that it's ball bearings which coming a variety of sizes. So imagine these things as projectiles. I don't know why I said babies. I didn't think it was babies. But somehow that's the word that came out of my mouth. That's the mystery of being human, I guess. Yeah. Um, so anyway, ball bearings, ball bearings. All right. Sorry about that. All right. Let's just launch right into it. Yeah, let's say the queues. Yeah,

**Heather** 00:59

we got two from last time that were particularly good that we missed, and then we'll launch and the ones from last hour. My parents are longtime democrats open to hearing about unity 2020, they have asked to clarify what is wrong with the democratic party? Can you point me to a podcast? And would you go into this here so I can send them the clip?

**Bret** 01:19

What is wrong with the Democratic Party appear? I'm not an expert, but it appears to be some kind of a psychotic break.

**Bret** 01:27

It's not helpful. It's

**Bret** 01:28

not helpful. All right, oh, what's wrong? What's wrong with the Democratic Party is that it took up influence peddling full time in the Clinton administration. And at that point, it abandoned the interests of working people, at which point it started peddling pure symbolism as a replacement for actually bringing policy to serve people, which now has become implausible. And they are now groping for a new explanation for why you should deliver them power that they can peddle to others. And the new explanation is that they are going to redistribute well being from some working people to other working people, and there's not a whole lot you can do about it. So basically, the Democratic Party is now proposing in effect the invention of America, and we must stop them. Unfortunately, the Republican Party offers us a very different catastrophe, but nonetheless one that we cannot afford, and therefore we have to do something different. So you want to send them the clips when it says,

**Heather** 02:39

Can you point me to a podcast where what's wrong with the Democratic Party is discussed or? Or she can just send to her parents the clip that you or he that you just give? That's the point. Yeah, well, which is why I thought starting with their psychopathic was not helpful and not likely to get voters. Oh,

**Bret** 02:57

right. You might want to clip that part off the front. I guess that was just me being glib. I will say that I've been trying to get the Democratic Party to wake up and behave itself for decades, and I've become frustrated. So that's where my intemperance came from.

**Heather** 03:14

Next question, Game Theory question. How does the likelihood of a COVID vaccine affect how we should behave? Now? If the entire first round of vaccine candidates fails? Will lockdown still make sense? Should schools stay closed for 10 years? There's a lot of questions. But we haven't been talking about COVID. Nearly I would spent the first 18 episodes or so talking almost exclusively about COVID. And we talked about it very little. So I thought it warranted. Yeah. Returning to this topic just a little bit here. It does.

**Bret** 03:42

I would say, first of all, we don't know enough about this disease yet to know what to do about it. Because let's say for example, that it does not create immunity that is durable. That is to say one person can be infected multiple times or alternatively, let's say that once infected, it keeps recurring on you. And the damage to organs is cumulative, let's say. So these are both possibilities. Probably neither of them is likely to be right. But we simply can't

**Heather** 04:12

rule them out. Yeah, the first one, there seems to be increasing evidence

**Bret** 04:16

for people getting it twice.

**Heather** 04:20

Not so clear. The evidence that people are actually getting at twice is less robust. The evidence that people do not have enduring immunity, and thus could theoretically get it twice. There seems to be greater evidence for Yeah,

**Bret** 04:33

I must say I'm a little dubious of that because I would imagine there would be at least a handful of absolutely unambiguous cases.

**Heather** 04:41

I think I think there are although I have not looked back into it in the last probably two three weeks.

**Bret** 04:46

But in any case, these things have a a substantial implication. Now as we have been saying for weeks, there is a pull off the band aid now approach to this in which facing a disease that we will have to manage over an indefinitely long period of time, with potentially very large cost associated with catching the disease. We could, at any time institute a lockdown that would drive it to near extinction and then manage the flare ups. And, you know, take care of it that way. We should have done that in the beginning, when it would have been easiest. But I don't think it's a matter of doing this for 10 years, I think it's a matter of At what point are, you know, are we ready to address it properly?

**Heather** 05:33

Well, and that strategy is agnostic with regard to vaccine. As you know, as as everything we have said pretty much has been because we began back in March, by saying, we hope that a vaccine comes. But none of us should assume that it will soon or even ever. So we cannot make strategy based on the assumption that we will have a vaccine a time soon, because there's just no guarantee of that at all. So the second question here, if the entire first round of vaccine candidates fails, will lock down still make sense? I think there's a there's a causal relationship between these two phrases that doesn't quite match with our sets, you know, well, lockdown still makes sense. It like Brett just said, an actual rigorous hardcore lockdown that really reduced this thing to almost zero would put us in a very different situation. That is that is just a separate way forward from depending on vaccines. And then should should school Stay close for 10 years? No, you know, humans are going to live like this for 10 years, humans humans can't, we can't we would, we would fully destroy a whole generation of children and down their families. You know, there's a lot of families that can't do this economically, much less psychologically, or, or, or mentally at all. It's just, it's just not sustainable in any way.

**Bret** 06:54

And as you and I were talking about, let's play that through fully. We've got some countries that have done away with this thing. We've got other countries who will be able to do so if we're going to simply shoot ourselves in the foot and not deal with it. We will be isolated by the world. And we can't have that either. So yep. there's every reason for us to get serious about this. And it's, you know, it's just like quitting smoking. The fact that it's difficult doesn't mean this isn't the time to do it. It means this is exactly the time to do it, because it's only gonna get harder.

**Heather** 07:28

Okay, questions from Episode 32. That just ended a generous donation that says this is for your kiddo handling the technical jobs, your podcast. Thank you. And Zack, I'm sure says thank you. He does he does he does. girlfriend and I think that's what GFC stands for. Right? No gluten free. Gluten free and I love the cast. No, it doesn't work, but Okay,

**Heather** 07:55

maybe I was wrong.

**Heather** 07:57

girlfriends. I love the cast. But girlfriend is annoyed about using this SJW term Asian fetish. Asians are attractive and competitive, fair and square, not a fetish. 100%. But that's not to say that there isn't also a niche group of people who treat people with this particular demographic as a fetish. Yeah, both both things are true.

**Bret** 08:18

Yeah. Is it fair that if you're googling on that basis that you that you were fetishizing? I think that's a fair standard?

**Heather** 08:30

I don't know. I'm not sure about that.

**Bret** 08:33

Not sure. It's obviously not technically a fetish. Yeah. But I think speaking colloquially it might be.

**Heather** 08:41

No, I'm not I'm not sure of that. But I'm not sure. I'm ready to talk about that right now. Regarding linguistics and thought, a word categorizes things into and out categories and semantics relate those categories, yet, presumably meaning semantics, shifts thinking from holistic to categorical. It doesn't define thinking but shifts it. What are your thoughts? So semantics shifts thinking from holistic to categorical? I'm not sure I'm not actually sure I follow. I think I mean, I think semantics does, I think semantics shifts, thinking for sure. And this is in response to what we're saying about the Savior Wharf hypothesis last hour, but seems like a word creates the categories. And yet the argument here is that semantics is shifting thinking from holistic to categorical when it's that's the words that are being claimed to have done so I think that claim is right that words are these categorical bins. But semantics would seem to create the connections between those bins rather than reducing them further. I think it goes the other direction is shifting thinking from categorical to more holistic to more connected.

**Bret** 09:55

Well, I think at some level, I see the the point of the question, I think it happens. But I also think that language naturally allows us to deal with this. So, you know, we have things like, you know, liquid versus a solid, lots of things are easily categorized that way. And so we tend to over believe in those two categories when there are things that defy them. And, you know, likewise, you know, we tend to see the sun as, you know, fire, right? Even though it's not combustion that's happening there.

**Heather** 10:30

Okay, but where's the semantics what you're saying that's all words, that's all categories. And categories are, almost always have fuzzy boundaries, especially the more complex the system. And categories can be hierarchical and embedded and have nested sets and all of this, but none of you know, liquid, and solid, and fire and sun, those are all words, which are categories. Those don't have anything to do with semantics.

**Bret** 10:52

Well, I mean, you're right, and I can't defend it at the level of the semantics. But I do think you would find if we extended that that way, and we, you know, spent a couple of hours playing with examples, I think we would find ourselves limited to belief systems that actually blinded us to certain things as they highlighted other things. But the basic answer is, once you discover that your category has a, you know, a breach in the boundary, language allows you to deal with that too. So yes, it's a tool and it has its limits, but it's not surprising that there there ain't anything you can't say. Right? It may take you a book to explain the meaning of some thing that then becomes a sentence. But but you can get there and once you've done it, then language allows you to convey that thing to Absolutely.

**Heather** 11:42

NBA games, played on BLM floors with BLM slogans will soon be aired in China. Will this not a Chinese anti us propaganda? Do how I don't know how to pronounce eager Uighur? I always mispronounce that do with our lives not matter?

**Bret** 12:02

I mean, those are really two very different questions.

**Heather** 12:03

Yeah, very, very, very different questions. Let's take them as separate. So the observation which I didn't know that NBA game while presumably I thought about it, NBA games are aired in China. Fair enough. And the NBA has decided that the floors in at least some places, I think not all, but are going to have BLM slogans, Black Lives Matter slogans on them. And so China will be seeing Chinese people will see that and that that may basically provide aid to the Chinese Chinese Communist Party in creating anti us propaganda. Yeah, I see very little to argue with there. Yep. And then do we got our lives not matter? You know, it seems to me that the relationship that is being implied by putting these questions next to each other is what is wrong with us that we cannot see outside of our own borders, to actual, real ongoing genocides that appear to be imminent, if not already underway, and are important, our own, not what it appears and not as it is named protests into the homes of people who may actually be wondering how it is that they can resist an actual genocide.

**Bret** 13:20

And if we can connect the two things, as we hobble ourselves, we enable the people who are engaged in what is pre genocide against the Uighur Muslims. So you know, why? Why would we empower them? Right, we're going to reduce our own power, empower them, and then they will inevitably export that insane and despicable belief system globally. So it's not acceptable, we have an obligation not to do this to ourselves.

**Heather** 13:50

And it's actually really easy to make the claim then the what we're doing is in fact, increasing the legacy of racism and genocide in the world by by doing this. That's dog. I was wondering if you have an opinion on quadratic voting, as presented in the book radical markets as a solution to rent seeking and politics. Thanks and keep up the good work. I have not read read radical markets, nor am I familiar with the concept of quadratic voting.

**Bret** 14:21

I can only say that I've heard the term quadratic quadratic voting and if I didn't know what it was, I have forgotten so I guess we have to look into that before we could say anything intelligent, fair enough.

**Heather** 14:33

dog bite on screen now. Oh, no. Good Explanation of this phenomenon in our culture. This phenomenon I don't see if this is I don't see what this is relating to. A good explanation of this phenomenon in our culture can be put into historical perspective by reading Ray Dalio, I think it says book called principles which summarizes the economic decline of previous government over time, the US Following the same trend?

**Bret** 15:03

No, I don't I do think that there's a lot to be said for these large scale patterns in history. Being predictable. You and I have talked about the strong possibility that long lasting cultures, especially temple building cultures knew something that the rest of us don't about how to avoid these kinds of patterns, or at least stave them off for 1000s of years. So anyway, there's a lot to be said there, but I can't speak to the specific seven.

**Heather** 15:29

isn't the problem not so much that the feds are there, but that they are not identifying themselves as such. This is a tactic used by security forces and undemocratic countries like China and Russia and is being challenged legally as unconstitutional. I think we have a motte and Bailey situation here. I think that is one of the legitimate challenges that is being levied against against those officers who are not, in fact, identified themselves as such, but is clearly not the only argument against the feds being in Portland.

**Bret** 16:03

Yeah, clearly not. And now I'm not sure why they are not labeled, that presumably has a tactical meaning. In other words, it might be impossible for them to do what they are doing. If they were clearly identifiable, though, it sounds to me like they are clearly identifiable based on the fact that they're in fatigues.

**Heather** 16:23

Yeah, I gotta say this, this part of this, this story I have, I do not even really have a sense of which side of the various stories that we've heard is accurate. I have heard very clearly from from both sides. They're absolutely not identifiable. You can't tell their police. There's no there's no markings at all. And other people saying they're clearly marked in a couple of different places. And you know, the few videos I've seen, I feel like I just can't tell I see, I see both, you know, so is it possible that some people aren't marked at all? And some people are clearly marked? Like, I honestly do not know what the truth is here?

**Bret** 16:59

I don't know. Yeah, I certainly see a problem with it, in the sense that if somebody who is not clearly labeled is dragging you into a car that is not clearly labeled, you actually have a right to defend yourself. Yes. Right. 100%? I mean, or, you know, are they identifying themselves verbally? In which case, can't anybody identify themselves? And you know, that

**Heather** 17:18

something at least got to be able to flash something? Yeah, it seems

**Bret** 17:21

like an ambiguity that can only create a disaster. So I'd be very curious what the rationale is, I should also say, I don't think we can be 100% certain about whether or not what we are seeing is the mechanism that was described in the first hour, or whether this is one of these terrorism, things? I don't think we know, but I think it's important to know that there is a rationale, whereby the federal government might not be invoking that and still be behaving this way, which I would still expect to be challenged in court, if courts still even functions. And I think we're going to find out very quickly, that court is going to come apart based on the fact that the same wrong ideas are going to pervade courts and whether or not something is legal is going to depend very much on who has been accused, and of what, rather than it being blind, which it must be. But nonetheless, the expected route would be to pursue it in court and to find out what the rationale is, and to see whether it's constitutional.

**Heather** 18:22

Yeah. How might those under the microscope of protesters assuage the perceived lack of justice in cases like George Floyd and Brianna Taylor, in time to prevent outcomes, such as mass rioting? I feel like there might be a word missing here. Those under the microscope of protesters switch to perceived lack of justice to prevent outcomes, such as mass rioting.

**Bret** 18:48

Oh, I think how could this arresting thing be done such that there was the expectation that injustice was not occurring?

**Heather** 18:57

Well, but to prevent outcomes, such as mass writing, because what's happening now, the mass writing has long since begun. So how, you know how I

**Bret** 19:04

think they're saying, in principle, how would you structure it so this didn't happen again, right. And you know, things like body cams help write, they at least allow us a there's the expectation that if you behave badly, it will be captured, and then it might come back to haunt you, you know, legally, for example. And in this case, though, we see something else, which is, as we described on the last live stream, we have the transcript and it has not been widely discussed, even though there's stuff in it that's directly relevant to the question of what sort of injustice happened to George Floyd?

**Heather** 19:36

Well, I mean, this is a this is an issue that we've brought up a lot of times is that the, you know, the visceral anecdote is more powerful than any kind of statistical population level analysis. But even even more pointed with regard to this thing is that visuals are always going to be more powerful and more able to change people's minds and wreak havoc with their emotions than words unless the words are seen being spoken. by someone who's themselves emotional, but a transcript, without even any indicators of like, being able to match it up with videos that that we all have access to, is much harder to make sense of an all you know, all we could say from reading through the transcripts was there's nuance there's complexity there. That wasn't clear from the video. And, and that's that's all we could do. Right? Brett lamented his physics and guitar skills. Eric mentioned rote doing things by rote. Heather told us of gatos, truant who did rote tasks for businesses. What would it take to convince each of you that wrote can be part of a healthy learning diet? It's an interesting question. So I would, a, I would defend wrote in some, in some circumstances, for some styles of things. But before I do that, I would say that God knows what would ever stand was fat,

**Bret** 20:56

something, something Oh, that is, the student who didn't come

**Heather** 20:59

to class didn't come to class. And he was every day that he wasn't in class, he was helping one another, his uncles or aunts, running their businesses. And, you know, running a business isn't inherently read, don't think he was working factory factory jobs so much. But you know, he wasn't solving new and complex problems every day, he was he was doing work that had been done in some form before, but that's not inherently rote. Still, the kind of work does need to be done, still in this world. I think there is simultaneously a role for rote and it and because it is reductionist, because it can be counted, because it can be measured, because it can be quantified, it very quickly becomes the tool that is used. I saw this very clearly, anecdotally, in my own musical training where I was, you know, I, I practiced the piano two hours a day, six days a week, 50 weeks a year, for 10 years or so. It wasn't two hours a day for the first five of those years, maybe. But I became very, very, very good. But what I didn't have as a result of that training really was nearly as much sense of the music as I would have had, had there been some combination of Yes, you're going to spend a quarter of your practice time every day, doing scales and arpeggios. And, you know, basically work on your fingers and knowing where they go and where the keys are. And you know, today is going to be your state is going to be a major and G minor. And tomorrow is going to be just like going through all of these things over and over and over again, that stuff needed to get into my head in order to do the kind of play the kind of music that I was playing. But it also seemed to shut doors to other kinds of improv and, and music production such that you know, when your brother and I sit down together, and he knows of my musical background, and we try to do something together, he's flabby, he thinks that I'm kidding, I'm like, I can't do what you do, Eric, I just I don't have it, I don't have the ability to do what he does. And in part, you know, he, he as entirely an autodidact musically. Yeah, you know, he has just genius at it that I don't, but also, no avenues were cut off. So the practice was absolutely 100% valuable in some regards for me. And it gave me a sense of understanding that you get up and you do the thing every day for a long time in order to get things with really long time horizons done, which is a skill that is very lacking in a lot of people now. But it also closes doors to improvisation and creativity. So we need a balance, we need to be able to do both.

**Bret** 23:54

So I'm going to take a little different position, which is that when we say rote, we mean the isolated version. And the isolated version is almost inherently garbage. And that there are certain things you have to memorize, you know, SOHCAHTOA, right. socoto is necessary for trig, there's not really a good way to get there short of deriving everything, just have to remember it. But in the context of trig, it's not so painful, because it's so immediately useful. And the, the road thing is really an economically expedient way of occupying students and, you know, plausibly passing on something valuable, but none of this should look this way. It should all look integrated with deep lessons that bring you know, how many things in the world involve a certain amount of chemistry, a certain amount of physics, a certain amount of biology, a certain amount of math, you know, it's integrated, and that's the way it sticks in the brain. So if you want to make geniuses, that's what you do to schooling. The rote thing makes

**Heather** 25:01

Yeah, and I will say, I mean, I think SOHCAHTOA is the right example in math space. But with regard to math, so much of math is taught by rote, in part because it is deemed, and I don't know where the scissors decisions are made, but it's deemed the best way to do it. But it's also in part because most math teachers don't have an intuitive and deep understanding of math, they just aren't mathematically inclined enough to be doing the job. But we don't pay math teachers enough to get the people who really understand math at a deep level to go into teaching, as opposed to going into, you know, highly quantitative fields where they can make a lot of money and make some sort of a difference in the world. But I would bring, because I had a mathematician, and computer scientist for a father and I loved math, and he loved math. And the way that his brain worked was coincident with mine. I would bring my math homework home, and he would look at it and I don't think he ever literally ripped it up. But he would say this is this is stupid, this is ridiculous how they're teaching it to you is going to make you dumber, and we're not doing it that way. We're going to logic through it. And we're going to, you know, we're going to do it right. And I kept my math brain, and most people didn't. And I had the same teachers as everyone else, except that I also had my father who said, No to the rote mnemonics memorization stuff. We're going to talk about why it is the way it is, because this is math and it's just true. Next question, if I can figure out where it is, public intellectuals, like yourselves exist across the US, UK, Canada, Australia, you all have similar values, but different beliefs, you're all functioning in silos, why have you not union unite? Why have you not unified efforts? Is there room for an official ITW forum?

**Bret** 26:45

You know, there's room for all sorts of things. I don't know that we have functional silos. I don't know that we're continuing to function in silos.

**Heather** 26:52

I mean, I can I can think of people in each of those countries. I mean, those are all English speaking countries. So sorry, I interrupted you, you going first?

**Bret** 27:00

Well, all I'm getting at is everything's on the table. Just question about how you do it. And what failure is it reveals and things like that? So you know, I mean, black intellectual roundtable was a bunch of people not functioning in silos, briefly. People liked it doesn't catch on and become something I don't know. But

**Heather** 27:19

I mean, this this presumes a different kind of silo which is English speaking, which of course, is you know, something we've now been talking about that we're limited by language, but you know, that we there are lots of us in the US and the UK, Douglas Murray and Canada, Jordan Peterson, Gad, sad at Australia. Lots of people at Colette. And you know, and many others besides who are talking and and making a difference, so it's I don't know we are talking to one another. Yep. Next, one weary birds weary bird lands on a branch of sanity. And that's it. That's the comment.

**Bret** 28:01

I get. Yeah. Is that it's not a haiku. Now it's too short. needs another line. Weird, labored lands on the branch of sanity? Yeah. Okay,

**Heather** 28:13

maybe maybe they're asking for doesn't fall. Some of us not enough to more syllables down so we can get

**Bret** 28:19

more syllables. No place.

**Heather** 28:24

What's the go with astellia? What does it mean? What is its purpose? What's the go with nostalgia? What does that mean? I think it means what's the deal in the selja?

**Bret** 28:33

Oh, what's the deal with nostalgia? I don't know. It's a good question. Um, what's the deal with nostalgia? Well, I guess there's like, there's two ways we can go with this. There's going to be some nostalgia, which is adaptive, that is to say, a discovery that something that was is actually better than whatever you've arrived at, and some desire to return to it. There might also be temporary, might be that your nostalgia can be satisfied on a relatively limited basis. So maybe you need to go back somewhere to recapture something, right, some mental process that you left behind, and you need to return to some prior state in order to pick up whatever it was to get the value out of it. And then there's also the possibility that there's something maladaptive that the familiar triggers lots of circuitry that can't help but be drawn in. And that it's counterproductive. I would bet the latter happens, but that it is driven by the existence of the first two.

**Heather** 29:42

Have you seen the rebel wisdom episode with Thomas Bjorkman? He thinks that we're approaching a societal shift like the move to cities. Could this equity push facilitate such a societal push with the policies of unity? 2020 facilitate this?

**Bret** 29:56

Yeah, of course. Have you seen the episode I haven't seen I I've seen only the first few minutes of it. I think the fact is we are stuck, our system is stuck refusing to change because the corrupt opportunities are so glorious for those who accumulate power and therefore cause the system to stick permanently. So if you clear that away, what would we find out that we should be doing? That's really the question. That's not a question that will be quickly answered. But we would start moving in the direction to something if we could simply strip the corruption out of the system that chooses where we're headed now. And so yeah, there's something a lot of us think that there's a phase transition that is poised to happen. I've said it would take three generations to get where we are going that we could start very quickly, but it would take a lot of time, just based on the way human development works. To get a new system and a generation that was native to it, we will be experts in that new system if and when it happens for two generations. So anyway, yeah, these things are quite possible. It's not the point of unity. 2020, the point of unity 2020 is to strip away the corruption, but I have no doubt that if you did that, we would find that there was a lot of opportunity that we've been blinded to, and we'd be fools to miss it.

**Heather** 31:17

Next question, we have a similar story in the UK. The lefty BBC screened a documentary on the fact that the countryside is racist. They claimed there was a campaign in the UK to defund the BBC, which is funded through a household tax, should they defund? No, I would say not. But the BBC, like in the US, NPR and PBS, clearly has a political bent, and a publicly funded organization should not be so eager to embrace a political bent. What do you do about it, though? Yeah, the BBC, NPR PBS, aren't going to be unpolitical II bet anytime soon. On the other hand, I know less obviously about what's how the BBC has shifted over the last say 20 years. But I certainly have found that NPR became unlistenable for me, by the early aughts, where I had been, it had been a primary source of my news from your sort of high school through graduate grad school. And by the time probably by 911, pretty much it was it was becoming so patently political, such that you could predict what its take on the story was going to be before you ever listened, that there was very little reason to listen. And that's I mean, that's the thing you need to get your news from some from a place that will sometimes surprise you, hopefully often. So if if the BBC is is doing that as well, you know, it's and we were the target audience for NPR and stop being any audience for NPR A long time ago, even as as far as we understand it, our politics did not shift. So as these publicly funded organizations continue to go farther and farther in either direction, and of course, in this case, it's it's towards the left, something needs to change but defunding them I don't think it's the right answer. Just like defunding the police isn't the right answer.

**Bret** 33:17

Well, society can exist without its public broadcasting. But the BBC, BBC is a very different entity than NPR, it plays a much larger role, and it functions better, or at least has historically in recent times,

**Heather** 33:34

well, it's at the very least, it's both it's both NPR and PBS together. And that's bigger than that still.

**Bret** 33:39

But I would say, don't get rid of it, fix it, fix it, figure out what the rules are that govern what needs to be covered there. You can't have it, you know, here's the difficult problem, which I think unfortunately, we have to admit, which is your public broadcasting has an obligation to entertain mainstream perspectives, except in the rare case that mainstream becomes morally repugnant. Right. And so what we do in the us is we pretend that the mainstream has become morally repugnant in order not to cover it. And that's false, you know, were you to slide into communism or fascism, then maybe your public broadcasting would have to play the role of resistance. But under normal circumstances, mainstream views ought to be compatible with your public broadcasting and your public broadcasting got to be able to explore what is at the edge in order to figure out what's coming, which doesn't, you know, there are things you can't do, but what it can't do is be an agent of part of your population against another part of your population unless there is a real hazard like part of your population is advocating genocide or something.

**Heather** 34:57

Well, of course, I mean, you have exactly described What the arguments are on the far left for why what we understand to be actually what is believed by what it was at 87% of the 6% exam are not acceptable. Because since since Trump was running and certainly since he was elected, the claim by many on the left has been this is fascism. This is an authoritarian takeover. And so you know, the question, you know, just to steal man their point, how would you know, when it's happening? I don't think it's happening. Well, no evidence is happening. But how would you

**Bret** 35:33

know, let's put it this way. In this case, we know it was garbage. Okay. You and I have dealt with plenty of people who are Trump supporters are decent are not racist. And so the claim was always garbage. What's more, those who thought that this was the beginning of a Nazi regime have an obligation to own up to the fact that they were wrong. Right? They just simply do so whatever process it was that led

**Heather** 35:57

people, it's exactly those people, though, who are pointing to what we're seeing on the streets of Portland, among other places and saying, there it is, there's your authoritarian police state coming. Coming home. Yeah,

**Bret** 36:07

but this makes me so angry. Okay. Because the point is, why are they attacking federal buildings? Because they want a federal crackdown? Why do they want a federal crackdown so that they can claim if this is the fascists, finally arising justice, they predicted they're creating a self fulfilling prophecy, and they are going to claim that it is that no matter what it is, but you and I live in Portland, we have children here, okay, we need police to protect us. We need them to enforce the law, and this theater that is going on in our streets to pretend that everything is hunky dory, except for the fact that the feds are fascist, and here they are. It's nonsense. And I don't care that they're going to claim it, the answer is they're wrong. Are there things about the way the feds are going about this? That are troubling, there are but you know, unless you have an idea of what should happen to enforce the law, if your point is basically these people are on the left, therefore, they're entitled to do whatever they want in downtown Portland, if that's your point, I'm not listening to you, because you obviously don't know anything about how things work. Right. But

**Heather** 37:09

to this point, I'm reminded of something that you and Matt Taibbi said in the early part of your conversation which, if you haven't listened to it, you should everyone watching here, which is, you know, his his one of his points of expertise being being Russia. He said, If I, if I remember correctly, that what he's seeing here now here in the US now reminds him of the Bolsheviks, in part because the Bolsheviks were always fringe even within the revolutionaries at the universities, and no one took them seriously. And that was part of how they got where they were going. And because their tactics were, were effective, and sort of no one saw them coming. So they're easy to dismiss by the people who could have stopped them early. And you responded by saying, okay, but this looks a lot more Maoist than bolshevist. And then butcher bacon a lot. And a lot of regards. And I'm, you know, you and I've talked about this a lot. I think you're right. But that point is one that I hadn't heard before this, this, I think is is very important that the claim by the leftists, by the by the anarchists by the antifa is that we are seeing an authoritarian police state that is fascist coming down to get us on, therefore they are helping all the rest of us see what we cannot yet see. And almost all the rest of us are saying, could you please stop, you know, many of us don't like him any more than you do. And some of us do. But that's not what this is. And meanwhile, we assume until right now, basically that it's going to stop. And so those of us who were on campuses, were saying it's not gonna stop, it's gonna leave campus, and now it's on the streets. And, you know, to the person who wrote on Twitter about not seeing anything like this in there, you know, presumably beautiful and somewhat idyllic Virginia town. It won't look like this when it comes there. But it's going to creep in to the schools, it probably already is in the schools and in the courts, and where do you get your media and, and all of that so that we end up more and more and more polarized And meanwhile, meanwhile, the equivalent of the Bolsheviks gain

**Bret** 39:18

power. Yes. And I think at some level, you also have to put the things that are being said together, you know, if somebody is saying, Yes, men can get pregnant too, and that's a fascist crack down. And the point is, you know what, I think your judgment on what something is might be a little off, right? It's just not credible.

**Heather** 39:42

Yeah, no, that's that's, that's right. And that's why I mean, I keep coming back to this I and I hate that I have to because we have trans friends and we had trans students and why do we always have to start by saying that but even some people, we know have now just a couple approached us and said, Can you be kind? Can't you just accept that if someone says they're the sex that they weren't born to that they are and that it's fine and that it's all going to be okay. Like, no, this is actually an indicator. This this is that Canary stopping its song in the coal mine. This this thing when people start saying, If with a straight face, you can't tell me that men can get pregnant and men straight and uterine cancer, then you're a fascist? No, there's something wrong with you. Yeah, me and not me. It doesn't

**Bret** 40:33

come down to the trans thing either, right? That every single claim here is nonsense, right? all white people are

**Heather** 40:40

racist, racist, black people can't be racist. All men are sexist, all men, all men are rapists. That

**Bret** 40:46

if we eliminate the police, it will be like a well heeled white suburb. That's what it looks like when you don't have to. Think AOC said that one, if I'm not mistaken about the video I saw. But in any case, the point is, look, when somebody keeps saying things that are patently stupid, and then they say something that you maybe have trouble evaluating, because you're not in Portland, right, then the answer is actually they've established that they're not good at describing things in real terms. Yeah, I don't have to listen to them when they say that the fact of the feds are in Portland is an indication that Trump was Hitler.

**Heather** 41:24

Now does this this is good. Tell me for the other things that you believe to be true. And let's see what kind of reality test they pass. And you know, if they do that I'll listen to you try to back up your claim that we're in undergoing of fascist authoritarian regime change that needs to be pushed back against with violence in the streets.

**Heather** 41:45

40 minutes. Okay, well, we'll do one more here. And two more here, actually. And then we'll switch to the other

**Heather** 41:54

q&a, the other Super Chat COVID-19 What can we infer about the virus by virtue of being a Coronavirus? HIV is largely asymptomatic at first is asymptomatic a concern. So I did want to get to this one because we talked we talked a tremendous amount about SARS, cov, two in, you know, episodes, one through 16 and 18, basically. And I think specifically talked about it being a Coronavirus, and what the implications of that were and what what we can do right now, no, yeah. what the implications of that were and like episodes two and three. So those those conclusions that we came to, I don't think I've changed the sort of the broad level understanding of what it being Coronavirus means about the likelihood of us generating for instance, a vaccine, it's going to be hard, it's not impossible. asymptomatic carriers seems likely. And that is also consistent with what we're seeing now,

**Bret** 42:55

maybe not asymptomatic long term. In other words, oh, yeah, I have an asymptomatic case. But the thing with HIV is there's a very

**Heather** 43:01

Yeah, not nearly as long term as HIV.

**Bret** 43:03

Yeah, there's a there's a very comprehensible reason why you have that period of asymptomatic HIV infection, which has to do with the attack on the immune cells themselves. So HIV pulls a trick on the immune system where it attacks activated T cells. And by attacking activated T cells, it basically digs a hole in the immune system. And then there's a kind of arms race that can unfold over the course of a decade when the arms race is lost by the immune system. Suddenly, full blown, AIDS emerges. The Coronavirus isn't functioning this way at all. Now, I do think that there are some concerns we have to have about its nature, which may owe to the fact or to the likely fact that it emerged from a laboratory and passaging experience experiments that gained function for it, which would be its high diversity of symptoms, and its high transmissibility, may have been the consequence of those experiments designed to create an ideal study organism. But I think the parallel to HIV is limited. There's some parallel but it's not a strong one.

**Heather** 44:15

Okay, one more here, and then we'll switch over this is just an observation. I don't know if it's true, but I'll read it. Another educator in Michigan was fired for tweeting, quote, Trump is our president. How are you? I think that all they did was tweet Trump Trump is our president. The question continues, how are schools businesses and government agencies legal, a legally able to fire people for free speech issues?

**Bret** 44:44

When I testified in front of the House Oversight Committee, I was asked whether or not you could say Trump was president in a free speech zone. And I mean it is it's the same question, right? The fact is, this is just simply factual matter. You may not like the Trump is president. I don't like to be president, but he is president. Yeah. So

**Heather** 45:06

now when some of the This is This is that same as read only activism again, because I'm reminded you saying that reminds me very much of when I made the outlandish claim that men are on average taller than women in that Auditorium in Portland with James d'amour. And a bunch of activists turned out and took the sound equipment out with them. Yeah. But as it turns out as ludicrous and frankly, bad for their causes, their timing turned out to have been, they weren't responding to me. They just timed it because they knew in advance of anyone ever opening their mouths in that room, that things are going to be said that we're going to be unacceptable to them and they're fragile years. And that's the same thing with the claim that Trump is president. No, I don't want it to be the case. Therefore, it can't be therefore if you say it, you are somehow part of the problem. This is once again it's childish. These people need good parents and they need them fast.

**Bret** 45:54

Oh, but if we can steal man their point. If you if you say on average, men are taller than women. How do we know that's not your internalized diminutive stature?

**Heather** 46:09

Well, I've never stood up here you he has no idea. No idea. No, you're sure. Yeah, right. I might be sure to them the dog you. It's possible. Yeah, I might be standing up right now.

**Bret** 46:20

That's not the best job of steel Manning I've ever done.

**Heather** 46:23

Usually, but then you're usually trying harder.

**Bret** 46:27

That's also true.

**Heather** 46:28

Yeah. Okay, I'm in the order in which they came in some super chat questions from this hour. Regarding the human enjoyment of birdsong. Could it relate to our ancestral reliance on bird language to alert us to danger? Some birds and primates react to each other's predator alarms? Song mean? means all as well. That's great. Yeah, that is that is beautiful. In most places where humans have done well, there are songbirds. And yes, we would have begun to listen to them. So you know, we're effectively part. The hypothesis here is that we're part of their mixed foraging flocks. And that even though we aren't contributing anything obvious to them, maybe we are listening for their song just as they are watching for our signs of alarm, and we will all be alarmed together if something happens.

**Bret** 47:21

Yep, I like it. And by inducing you to pay attention to birdsong it could cause you to know when birdsong has changed and you know you can hear lots of things squirrels for example will alert you to something you know that they regard as hazardous yeah

**Heather** 47:37

so usually not the same thing as a person regardless hazardous no in

**Bret** 47:40

general now lower bar for I do remember trying to remember which student it was, I had a student write a paper on the concept of weather, there's this pattern of people, hunter gatherers, keeping pets, right taking forest creatures in hand raising them and the question was, whether this was providing them basically access to the sensory systems of these creatures that by developing an empathic bond that that creature then provides them an ability to see into the world the way you know, dogs provide us the ability to detect sense that we can't ourselves smell so anyway, yeah, there's something to it. Also, it might explain some of the really weird behavior that every so often somebody will post a clip of. I saw one just a couple days ago, there was a magpie was ushering might have been a hedgehog across a road and it was clear that this is what the animal was doing that the magpie was coming up behind the hedgehog and urging it across the road. Right and you know, well, the interpretation is up for grabs, but

**Heather** 48:46

yeah, it's magpies I think, corvids. So corvids being crows and Jays and a few others and ravens super smart, you know, just more theory of mind than, you know, other corvids and parrots and then a smattering of mammal clades have theory of mind. And they seem to be able to empathize outside of clade apparently, helping a hedgehog Well,

**Bret** 49:11

it's possible to bring it to a call me to dinner thing. Yeah,

**Heather** 49:15

but you'll be the guest of honor.

**Bret** 49:17

But you know, there are examples of partnerships between creatures, you know, honey guides and people are good example. There are natural examples of this where there's a partner and in fact mixed foraging flocks if you're foraging on different things you can afford to have, effectively a school of birds as it were, that's larger than it would be if they were all your type and competing for the same food resource

**Heather** 49:41

or even I mean, I think it's a boy like chickadees and kinglets in the Pacific Northwest that engage in these winter mixed foraging flocks in which I don't remember which it is, but one of them, they feed on very much the same winter berries actually. But they're very passionately distributed and one of the speeds disease is much better at finding and the other species is much better at having centuries and watching out for predators. And so they actually are competing for the same resource. But together, they're both specialists on something that each of them need.

**Bret** 50:12

Yeah, yeah. Yeah, that's cool. Yeah.

**Heather** 50:15

Any plans for a discussion with the Sultan of anti woke satire, God said, Would love to see the explosion of evolutionary thinking and gallows humor? We've both been on his podcast it was one mile ago at this point. 2017 2018. He's good. We like him.

**Bret** 50:31

Yep. Yeah, maybe we should talk. Yeah.

**Heather** 50:35

Red Bull fire to executives who are pushing diversity inclusion. And what does he say? Oh, equity nonsense. Sorry. When I see the DI E. acronyms, I forget what it means. Redbull fired two executives for pushing the inclusion, diversity and equity nonsense. I'm calling it taking the Red Bull. Have you heard of any other camp companies standing up? I have not

**Bret** 51:01

very one publisher. Actually, it's JK Rowling's publisher. Leave still running a very small entity.

**Heather** 51:10

But well, but they've got JK Rowling.

**Bret** 51:13

Yeah. But in terms of the number of people, I believe it's a smell out yet. But yeah, very few and far between these examples, and we'll see how they do over the long term.

**Heather** 51:23

Yeah, I mean, everyone is, is feeling pressure to put up there don't hurt me. walls. Yeah. Whether they are storefronts, or if they're not storefronts, then you'll put out a letter that explains how they've been failing, and they promised to do better. And most of those are just empty words. And they're hoping this passes. And really what we need are more people doing doing this, I don't I don't know the Red Bull story. This is news to me. And you know, just selfishly, I wish it were a company that I can get behind. But yeah, more power to them. And maybe they can then being an example for a diversity of kinds of companies so that within each of the sectors, we can begin to see some of the stopping. Do facial musculature and expression on both sides of one's face correlate to how one uses their associated brain hemispheres? Can we derive Big Five traits from still or moving faces? And are we wired to do it? Thanks from echo?

**Bret** 52:26

Well, so here's the thing. It's interesting, there is a lot that you do not want to allow your adversaries to know about your thought process. Right? And so we're they're readily detectable patterns, we would probably learn to detect them. And so there's pressure to conceal that stuff. And there's certain places where we don't we're not very effective at it like bluffing. Right? Why would you want to convey that you're suddenly feeling the way one does when one blushes? Well, you don't want to convey it. But here's what you'd also don't want. We don't want your brain to overheat. And so what happens if you're suffering? No, I don't think you want your brain Okay, especially if you're standing up. dog has a comment to make on that. But But the thing is, if you suddenly have to think very hard, let's suppose that you're suddenly very embarrassed, and you're calculating all of the change in value that your reputation has, because something has just been revealed about you in front of people, and you want to know who knows it and who they're going to tell and all that your brain is working very hard, which creates a lot of heat, because the same way, if your computer is working very hard, it generates a lot of heat. And so how do you get rid of that heat, you shunt the heat to the capillaries on the surface of your skin, which causes your skin to turn red, which is why you blush? So the point is, is it good for other people to know that your brain is suddenly working really, really, really hard? No, it's terrible for them to realize that for one thing, if they caught you in a lie, and you're suddenly blushing, and that's why you're thinking so hard. That's very compromising. Absolutely. But it's better than the alternative, which is overheating, right? And there's some ambiguity to you. Nobody knows why you're thinking so hard. Could be because you've been caught in a lie. It could be for whatever reason, so.

**Heather** 54:09

So I mean, there's the first finish.

**Bret** 54:11

All I'm saying is the idea that we are accidentally broadcasting stuff through facial musculature, certainly we are broadcasting some stuff, it is below the threshold that most people can detect it, you might be able to train yourself to detect it. To the extent that it's detectable, it's a vulnerability, so you should expect it to be backed off to sub threshold level. And so like that, no, I don't expect that you can. That there are reliable characteristics broadcast in that way.

**Heather** 54:43

Yeah, I don't expect so either. But to the first question, in particular, do facial musculature and expression on both sides of one's face correlate to how one uses their associated brain hemispheres? This is testable. And this it won't be as easy as just going to handedness because you don't have a switch of what 10 has to happen on the left side of the brain and right handers is now happening on the right side of the brain and left handers. But some fraction of left handers does have a reversal of where the dominant stuff happens in which hemisphere and a much smaller fraction of right handers do as well. So you could actually test this by by looking at whether or not there are different fluctuating of symmetries. For instance, in those tiny fraction of people whose brains are organized in mirror image to how the rest of ours are organized. I'm not sure it's wouldn't be the top of my list of things to investigate, but could I be I'd read the paper if it was done. Next question. Do human males and females experienced the same intensity of selection pressure given polygyny and gender disparities and the number of ancestors and average number of offspring produced? Are the sexes becoming more dimorphic? As generations pass? This is a lot of question.

**Bret** 55:59

So we experienced very different selective pressures. Yeah, in other words, the asymmetry, especially of pregnancy, and obligate early child rearing by females causes an asymmetry. The asymmetry, is partially substantially neutralized by monogamous mating. So monogamous mating makes the interests of men and women more symmetrical, though not completely symmetrical.

**Heather** 56:28

Sorry, I was reading the question, What did you say makes the interests more symmetrical,

**Bret** 56:32

monogamous guiding, which means that it's very high stakes for both parties, rather than being very high stakes for one party and very low stakes for the other,

**Heather** 56:38

which then means well, but the monogamy as monogamy becomes more and more common, we expect the sexes to become less dimorphic, rather than more dimorphic, as the generations pass,

**Bret** 56:48

although our dry morphism is weird. So yeah, the just the fact that the interests of males and females are both elevated by monogamous high stakes. reproduction does not mean you know, for example, you know, breasts are an indicator of basically, physical presence of resources sufficient to produce offspring. Now, you'll get a lot of pushback on that claim. But painting with a broad brush, it is an indicator that indicators, obviously a focus of straight male attention for the obvious reason, and you do not expect it to become symmetrical. Because a female does not have the same interest in a male having those resources, you may have an interest in a male having different resources, could be cognitive resources could be physical strength. But the point is you expect a dimorphism. But you don't expect expect a yin yang situation rather than a augmented party and a drab party, right.

**Heather** 57:56

There's also a common error in the question that I think needs to be addressed. Which is that, well, it's assuming of polygyny, which is not an error. And we certainly have a lot of polygyny in our in our past and still in our present, although we seem to be moving towards towards greater monogamy. But even with under conditions of extreme polygyny, we there are no gender, I would say, six disparities in the number of ancestors. So this is a this is a conflation of two things, which is, which is why the error is made. And I think it's actually really worth getting it right, because I've seen pushback against the true point many times and it misunderstand something important. All of us have an equal number of male and female ancestors, because we all have a mother and a father. And our mother had a mother and a father and our father had a mother and a father and back and back and back and back. So except in what under every circumstance will have been a very rare case of incest, such that your father was also your grandfather or something. And yes, that has been rare throughout human history. We all have basically equal numbers of male and female ancestors. It is also true though, the reason that people are confused about this is that in a highly polygynous situation in which all females have mates, but many males don't ever have mates, there are many males who do not reproduce. And therefore at a population level at any one moment, there are many more women than men who will leave descendants and therefore many women women than men who will become the ancestor to which we can refer back to now. But what that doesn't mean is that any individual has more male or female ancestors looking back, it's a it's an individual versus population level analysis. And it's it is the seems probably trivial, but it's actually an important distinction to be made.

**Bret** 59:45

Yeah, definitely.

**Heather** 59:48

Okay, please differentiate ball bearings being used in slingshots from the BBs that are common and BB guns, steel marbles being launched with rockets. Alright, you started out the top of the hour by saying

**Bret** 59:59

I'm going to use is an experimental method for time travel to go back to the beginning

**Heather** 1:00:03

of this timestamp here. This is from before you got to it. You obviously

**Bret** 1:00:07

have not spent enough time with Bill and Ted's Excellent Adventure to know how that timestamp was arranged.

**Heather** 1:00:13

It's possible I haven't spent any time I think you watched it with the kids. I think I was out of town or something bill and Ted's I know it's a Gen X thing I

**Bret** 1:00:20

want to do over on like the last three decades.

**Heather** 1:00:25

That's the thing that did it. Amazing. Want to make sure that we're like, what guys really? Oh, watch it with you.

**Bret** 1:00:33

When was that? Bill and Ted? Yeah,

**Heather** 1:00:35

it must have been early, mid 90s. ish.

**Bret** 1:00:37

Okay. Yeah, yeah, it's important stuff, especially if you want to get your time travel stuff, right, I say,

**Heather** 1:00:42

more important than then back to the future.

**Bret** 1:00:46

You know, back to back to the futures. You know, it's it's a more standard approach. It's not as much as George Carlin, you know what I say? Okay.

**Heather** 1:00:55

Do you have any wisdom about Huntington's disease? Is there anything you can say about it from an evolutionary perspective and about potential for treatment? I would what I'm going to actually so you say we're going to say, but I'm going to plug this and think about it a little bit, because yeah, I have had some thoughts about it. But nothing is at the forefront of my mind right now. Actually. Could you highlight that? The one I've got almost highlighted. Thank you.

**Bret** 1:01:19

Yeah, I mean, I think there's not too much to say except that it is a tragic case in which it's deleterious, recessive trait, I believe, and that the catastrophic consequences of it happen somewhat late in life, not all that late, but late enough that a lot of reproduction happens in advance of it, which explains in part why it is resistant to selection, have eliminated it. Now there's a question also about whether it's tied to something positive that might account for it being even more resistant to selection, but I don't know. And it's been years since I thought about it.

**Heather** 1:02:02

What is the game theory of alternative voting methods like rank choice voting and approval voting? Do you think we should switch to a new system?

**Bret** 1:02:09

Yeah, I would say we do need a new system. Because first past the post is part of the the flaw in our system that is making it so hard to solve problems by defaulting to a two party arrangement, which tends towards incoherence. And I would argue corruption, so yes, we do need, we do need to rethink this. But that's not to say you couldn't graft something onto the system that would work with the current structure. That's That's the question.

**Heather** 1:02:37

Could the differences in COVID infection rate across the world be explained by stronger or weaker immune different defenses in different regions? Is there any data focusing on this? seems very unlikely, because humans need an immune system regardless, and you can control for any factor that I can think of, you know, it's not like it's the developing world for the developed world, or ethnicity, or age, or any number of the things that we imagine might have some variance in immune system between. So you know,

**Bret** 1:03:14

you know, I don't know and it's gonna depend a little bit on where you draw the lines. There could easily be major histocompatibility differences that matter just as there are apparently, surface antigen differences on red blood cells, which are not strictly speaking immune. This is a blood groups, types Anyway, there's all kinds of opportunity for Molecular differences or differences in the proteases that do the cleaving. There's all kinds of places that there could be biases. I don't think we know what they mean, nor nor do they necessarily mean anything. It could just be idiosyncratic molecular features that make some cells easier to invade than others.

**Heather** 1:03:54

Yeah. I mean, I guess one thing that occurs to me is that very early on when we were talking about when we were seeing the emerging horror in Guayaquil, and Ecuador that was you know, we we just previously to that sort of been like early April noted that is it a blood type that is somewhat more resistant to COVID-19 and b that is somewhat less resistant? I can't remember or Oh, I thought it was Oh, that was more resist Oh, that's more resistant a that's more subtle. That's it? Oh, that's more resistant, a that is more susceptible. And oh, blood types, I believe I think I'm going to this right are actually more common in Latin America than anywhere else in the world. And so you know, those those two observations run in opposite directions. Yeah. Suggesting that even with the some underlying immunological explanation that would appear to be protective, we have quite the opposite result. So that that's merely a sort of vague verification, just approach to myself. sense that this is going to end up having been political rather than underlying anatomy or physiology sociological, yeah sociological. That explains the very different results that different countries are getting our in five minutes. Okay, let's do five more times you five more sure. First Wait, did we just do yeah. First thank you so much for being a sane voice in these times. Second. For a future solutions episode, there are a couple of guests I wonder if you might be able to have on Sunday, Andrew Yang, and Professor richard wolf, you know, richard wolf,

**Bret** 1:05:38

richard wolf, don't know him personally. Okay. Good suggestions.

**Heather** 1:05:43

Okay. How do you guys think about meditation and mindfulness from an evolutionary perspective, related to finding ourselves in different circumstances, from our ancestors question mark, or making us more able to achieve flow states?

**Bret** 1:05:57

Well, I mean, I think this actually fits into our model pretty well. You have a border between what is conscious and what is below conscious, but that border is set based on what has on average been useful to your ancestors. And there's nothing to say that it is the right border for the circumstance you're in, or for modern life or any of those things. And so, by concentrating on that border, you can transgress it, and you can discover stuff, which is, you know, mindfulness is one way to do this. Humor is another way to do it. Music is another way to do it. hallucinogens are yet another way to do it. And so basically, there are lots of hacks that allow you to see what's just over that border, and the better at those hacks you get the further over the border, you can go, and whether you can drag something back across it, that is useful. Depends. I would also say that we do this in sleep, where most of our dreams are not accessible by our conscious mind. But especially if you you know, take a hammer to your alarm clock or your phone or whatever it is that wakes you up and allow yourself to wake up normally we'll find that sometimes your subconscious mind, hands stuff over to your conscious mind at waking, and that oftentimes those things that are handed over are not preposterous nonsense. They're actually useful insight. So something like that.

**Heather** 1:07:21

That's good. I'll leave it at that. How can scientists advocate for lockdowns when they didn't say anything about mass rioting and protesting for the past month and a half, zero credibility? Well, we have talked about this in in some in some depth, the soundbite being that is simultaneously, deeply hypocritical on the part of you know, especially the well over 1000 healthcare professionals who signed a letter saying that racism was a greater public health credit threat than COVID-19 currently is, which it's, that's an absurd, absurd claim, as you say, gives zero credibility. On the other hand, the protests, at least when they were protests, are likely to be less dangerous with regard to contract and COVID. contracting SARS, cov. Two, then they would have been had they been endorsed, that is not a justification, it is not me saying it's just fine. But certainly the protests that were outside during the day when the sun was shining, would have had less chance of transmitting the virus than anything indoors, even in smaller numbers. Or those protests that continue after dark when the sun is no longer enabling you to make vitamin D, which is protective against the virus.

**Bret** 1:08:44

Yep. And I would also say, I don't care what people are saying there's some right thing for us to do. And if the right thing for us to do is get serious about lockdown and other people's hypocrisy is neither here nor there. Right? Yes, they should have been much more responsible about talking about protest, and its interaction with the epidemiology and all of that. And so screw him for not being clear about it. But if we had locked down for our children's well being going forward, that's what we should do, even if people that are wrong.

**Heather** 1:09:16

Yep. As a three quarter Mexican one quarter white with a first name of Kurt, should my three quarters decolonize myself from my one quarters and change my name to one of Hispanic origin. Any suggestions? Yes, yeah, yes. Can you film it?

**Bret** 1:09:32

Yeah, I mean, look, this, this raises the absurdity of all of this right, the right thing to do is to make sure that the opportunity is as broadly distributed as possible and not try to parse the particulars. But yes, at the the idea that there are white people and there are other people and the white people or the other people it just is simply not. It is deaf to the obvious fact of so much hybridization making any such policy just completely impractical.

**Heather** 1:10:00

Now it's not the world we've lived in for ever. And it's not the world we ever lived in. Yeah, I'll just stop there. The next one is supposed to be our last one. We may go one more. Brett, how certain Are you of the fact that the virus emerged from a laboratory setting and not from the wet markets? As we were told originally?

**Bret** 1:10:21

Well, even the Chinese say it's not the wet market at this point. So nobody thinks is the wet market? I

**Heather** 1:10:26

didn't know that. I know they reversed.

**Bret** 1:10:29

Yeah. Oh, yeah. It's not It's not the wet market that that much we know.

**Heather** 1:10:33

So you should you should watch the breads conversation with Yuri Begum Dagon.

**Bret** 1:10:38

Yep, yeah. And I will say there's been a bunch of stuff that I'm eager to cover. Since we talked a lot about COVID. And I talked with Yuri, another lab leak hypothesis emerged this week, which I found fascinating. I think it's crazy. But another version emerged a very good paper, which argues that the missing period of time that is to say the time when the virus would have evolved to get good at infecting humans, which is absent from our current time series, and conspicuously So, their claim is, it's a hypothesis as well presented, your hypothesis is that that period of time was accelerated and took place, depending upon how you read the paper, either in the lungs of one of the six miners who got infected in eunan, in 2012. Or, conceivably, I guess it could have gone from one minor to another, but it can't have been more than a couple of them. But the idea is that there's a long period of time of evolution, or this long sequence of evolutionary steps that we would expect to see took place in the lungs of these minors, which would have been an odd place for Coronavirus to be, which would have accelerated the rate of change. And that basically a tissue sample from one of these miners made it to Wuhan, which is why it emerges there at the Wuhan Institute or on its doorstep, because that tissue escaped. So the point is natural virus intermediate as a human. And it then gets transported to Wuhan, where it accidentally escaped. I think this is nuts. I can't imagine that this is the right explanation. But let's put it this way.

**Heather** 1:12:18

We are plausible alternative lab escape hypothesis is now also circular.

**Bret** 1:12:22

It belongs on the map of various possible hypotheses. And what I would say is the number of people who are now carefully ready to explore the idea of lab leak gain function, this landscape is growing, and it's about time. So that's good. The question was, how certain Am I not certain, but I would say at this point, I would say 90% chance is conservative, I think the chances are very high. It emerged from the lab and also very high that it was enhanced in that lab. And then the last part of the question was, oh, the Yeah, not the wet market.

**Heather** 1:13:01

Last question, why do adjunct professors get paid so poorly?

**Bret** 1:13:06

Because we over produce PhDs. And that allows colleges and universities to hire people without committing to them because there is always a dozen to take their job, should they decide to demand more.

**Heather** 1:13:20

And for those who don't know what, probably almost everyone has heard the term adjunct. But if you don't know what it means on the ground, what it usually means, especially at research universities, where a lot of the money that is used to run the university is coming in through federal grants, is those professors who are largely doing research, and it's the money they bring in doing the research that funds the universities are supposed to be teaching as well. You're supposed to be doing research and educating the undergraduates and graduate students at your university. But most people aren't very good at educating. And they don't want to do it anyway. Because it's not what gives them credibility in the world for the most part. And so what universities can do is hire extremely cheap labor, which are called adjuncts, which have who have no job security at all, and often have to work three or four different three or four different colleges universities at a time teaching the undergraduates even at elite institutions. Now the more elite the institution, the lower the ratio of, the fewer the adjuncts they're supposed to be. But there are adjuncts everywhere. So you have very poorly paid people with no health care, no job security at all teaching even even at the Ivy's and, and you know, the big elite state schools, because what that does is it frees the tenured professors to spend their time asking for money from the federal government in the form of NSF and NIH grants.

**Bret** 1:14:53

Yep, well, that's helpful. Yeah, good stuff.

**Heather** 1:14:55

Yeah. All right. All right. So once again, I guess we're done. discord is available, access through both of our Patreon for the $5 level. We'll be doing a private q&a for the Dark Horse members, which you have access to through my patreon next Sunday. There's the Dark Horse clips channel where you will be able to get clips of various things and more stuff coming on unity 2020 soon soon, yes,

**Bret** 1:15:28

yep. All right. I think that's it. Thanks so much for watching. Like, Subscribe, share, comment, and be awesome. We'll see you next time.