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**Bret** 00:09

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse podcast 39th live stream Q and A where we fulfill your desire to see more pets and answer your questions including

**Heather** 00:20

one Superjet question for more cat but so we have primed the pump and put cat but appreciating. No attracting stuff in the sink behind us. And there we have Fairfax's where and

**Bret** 00:36

you put something in the sink? Yes. Okay. That would explain it. Yes.

**Bret** 00:40

Yes, once he's done with what's in the sink, you will presumably be showing his face to us. Aha, yes. All right. We're gonna start with questions from three questions from Episode 38. And then pull a question that came off of the discord that was voted on by discord, and then walk right into questions from today. So number one from last time, given that having gay people in society seems to be adaptive? How did the homophobia and the Abrahamic religions managed to survive?

**Bret** 01:15

Wow, I'm going to have to. I'm going to tantalize you with a piece of an answer without delivering the full answer. Because as I keep saying, there's a

**Bret** 01:23

before you do that, let me just say it's having gay people in a society isn't adaptive, that's to universal acclaim. Right? It's going to be adaptive in particular situations.

**Bret** 01:33

Yeah, what I would say is homosexuality, is going to turn out to be adaptive, which doesn't mean it's adaptive in every case. But I would just say that I believe the answer to your question is that the homophobia is also adaptive, and I'm not defending it. But what I'm saying is that the fact of homosexuality, and the fact of resistance to it being a phenomenon, out in the open is part and parcel of the same explanation, which I hope to deliver. Soon, maybe we will get a vaccine, we will be able to return to the world. We can rent a hall we can. Wouldn't that be nice?

**Bret** 02:19

Being able to travel again? For instance,

**Bret** 02:22

we'd love to do that. Yeah, yep. All right. Sorry. I hate to I hate to put off an answer here. But it just seems like burying it in a q&a is not the way to do it. This is important enough and enough rests on the way the answer functions that I think we have to do it in in a larger form.

**Bret** 02:43

The only real driving factor for men appears to be to have sex. That is until they have children that then the main drive for most shifts to equipping and protecting their offspring. Do you agree that these are the only two drives for men? Could they eventually negate each other?

**Bret** 02:58

Wow, yeah, I think it's another big one. There's a lot in that question that I would disagree with. Right? I would say sex is a major driving factor for men. But there's really two versions of that. There's the Find a life partner version, and the have sex without commitment version and those function very differently. The former is closely aligned with the commitment that men have to their children when their certainty of paternity is high. But I wouldn't say that these are the only drives either. In fact, I would say that one of the things that is deranging society is that men used to be driven to achieve things because it allowed them to partner with more desirable mates, and that that actually created a lot of the value in the world and that as much as I think women being free to participate in society in all kinds of different roles is a very positive thing, that it did have this negative externality, which is that males are not as motivated to move mountains as they once were. And so anyway, it would be interesting to have an adult conversation about how to restore the positives without banishing anyone to unfulfilling work or work they did not prefer and surely there's a solution to that but it does involve us being candid and not pretending that everything is categorical. Good, bad. discrimination. Liberty. That's right.

**Bret** 04:38

And you know, we explore we explored this in the book that we are writing it'll be out next year and I explored this in an essay on the evolution of sex and love. That should be out any day now. That we will perhaps talk about just a little bit once that is out so you'll get you'll get more on this soon. In this space, watch the space final question from Episode 38 that we are Going back to in your AB political trough model, could the A and B peaks increase or decrease control laterally during societal well being contraction and expansion? Have you both caught? I'm not sure. Not sure exactly what contra laterally means, but I take that to be sort of if they're on if they're on a line with one another. So as one increases, the other one decrease,

**Bret** 05:25

they increase or decrease contra laterally during societal well being contraction expansion, meaning that you are more likely to drop over one than the other. Yeah, yeah, I see no reason to expect that they are equally tall peaks at any moment. They may pass through it. But

**Bret** 05:50

yeah, would they oscillate? I'm not sure. Actually, I'm not sure what increase decrease control hourly might mean, but I sort of read it, as you know, oscillate in some sort of inverse correlated matter. manner. And I'm not, I don't know, image, you cleverly didn't define a and b, you know, this will work as a model that would work for a number of different situations across a number of different moments in time. So

**Bret** 06:16

well, I kind of did, I at least did a prototype version, which involves a, a Marxist failure mode and fascist failure mode. That's right. He did. And so I would say, yeah, the danger of those is not inherently equal. It may equalize over time. Because basically, it's a question of which accesses Are you more depth to at the moment, you're more likely to go over the piece that you can't see, yeah, than the one that you see. Because recent history has informed you about it. At any

**Bret** 06:49

one moment, clearly, there is going to be a greater risk of one than the other, although one thing that is interesting about this moment is how is how loudly, some on the fringe left are yelling about the possibility of one outcome, when many of us actually find the other outcome much more likely.

**Bret** 07:09

Yeah, so I would say this is I think, a case where you don't want to over instantiate the model, the model works as a loose metaphor, and it tells you sort of roughly what the dangers are. But if you try to map it onto the world, and be precise about the height of the peaks and things, you are liable to lose the value of it and turn it into something that will inherently be false, because the map will be imprecise.

**Bret** 07:32

All right. This question from the voters on discord? Let's see, I got one of them that I'm going to hold off for for next time, for reasons that I talked to the guy who said to me about so we are left with what might explain the success of the Sabbath day of rest strategy used by religions. Perhaps it's a hedge against the harms of transitioning from hunter gatherer lifestyles to agricultural lifestyles? Or is there a deeper reason and do any other animals take Sabbath?

**Bret** 08:03

I think I deployed an answer. In one of my very early videos that right after the Evergreen thing happened my talk about Yeah, so the model I've had for Sabbath for a long time is that it is a an instantiation of a it is an adaptive state that risks a game theoretic failure and Sabbath is the way to resist the game theoretic failure. And so the way it works is this. Let's say that it is better for society for everybody to take off at least one day, a week that working seven days a week, it causes you to distance yourself from your family, and it results in all sorts of externalized harms that aren't good for anybody. So there needs to be a rule that says take one day off a week. But if you take a day off a week, then you're in a puzzle, let's say that you're a shopkeeper. And what you want to do is you want to figure out the day of the week that everybody else is taking off and the shop is closed, and then you open your shop up and you clean up because people who are looking to shop on that day come to your shop. And so what that does is it puts everybody in motion trying to figure out whether or not a given day is the right one to take off in order to take advantage of the fact that everybody else is not doing the job on that day. So this causes another problem, which is, it may be that if people are playing that game, trying to find the day on which their shop will do best, that actually you will cheat. And what you will do is you will not close your shop because actually you want to clean up from the day that everybody is

**Bret** 09:40

and run around. it's it's a it's a formalized prescription to avoid the tragedy of the commons.

**Bret** 09:45

Exactly. And so you might say, Well, God says, take a day off every week and you can This is the day and this is the day and the thing is what that allows to happen is that people can infer Worse, God's will. Because if you open your shop on the Sabbath, then you're being sacrilegious and people will shun you so that they are not co stigmatized for shopping on a day that you're not supposed to be selling them stuff. So anyway, that's the basic point is game theory explains a formulation in which God picks a day, and everybody adheres to it. And anybody who doesn't adhere to it is obviously in violation. That's the way to frustrate the race to the bottom that otherwise unfolds.

**Bret** 10:26

Yeah. And with regard to any other animals taking Sabbath, we don't know of any other animals that managed to avoid tragedy of the commons, race to the bottom, etc. So, so you know, without any external, metaphorical enforcement, like, God will frown on this behavior. I know I know of no such thing That said, there are regular intervals of rest, but they tend to be imposed by a biotic forces external a vital forces like winter.

**Bret** 10:53

Yeah. I'm wondering if there's not some example somewhere because in Elinor Ostrom work, she demonstrates how culture after culture avoids game theoretic failures through essentially informal agreements that are often enforced through religious belief structures. And so what that says is, these things evolve, which means there's no bar to them evolving in some creature in which the same bases for such an agreement exists.

**Bret** 11:21

So nothing nothing we know of as religion exists outside of humans, but superstition certainly does. And so something that some superstition that evolved that was that was adhered to by everyone could look this way,

**Bret** 11:33

what you really need is a penalty mechanism. Because the problem is that a free rider that recognizes the opportunity created by everybody else, adhering to a superstition, is an advantage, which is why the game theory works the way it does. So what you need is a mechanism in which collective policing serves this function. But that's not out of the question in something like, chimps, dolphins, elephants, elephants, maybe lions, wolves, that kind of thing. So anyway, yes. It may occur to us later, or somebody may message us with an example. But it's certainly not. There's nothing about the evolutionary dynamics that prevent it. It's just that most creatures won't have the important feature that lets it work, which is the mechanism to penalize a stranger. penalize a stranger without a cost. That would be prohibitive. Right.

**Bret** 12:31

Okay, first question from last hours livestream. Girls I meet are divided into those who have intellectual interests, like sensitive men, but are very woke, and the less woke who are not very intellectual who seem to be consumerists and prefer traditional gender roles. As a young man, how can I date today? Well, that's a really bleak binary picture that you have painted. And I don't envy anyone being young and entering the dating market right now. I guess I'm, I'm a little devastated by that description. I know there are people who young women who are both intellectual and not woke, but I don't know where they hang out, particularly used to hang out in our classrooms. But those don't exist anymore.

**Bret** 13:21

Yeah, but I think the thing is, we even know that many of the young women who were in our classrooms, you know, continue into the world, some of them remain single, and some of them are not. But I think the thing is, they suggest a fact, which is, many, many people are finding something very troubling in the mating and dating market. And my recommendation would be, you figure out, the mechanism you're using to figure out who to date is directing you to people who fall into one of two categories that you don't resonate with

**Bret** 13:56

the keypad to figure out how to define and maybe create that that third, fourth, fifth, whatever it is category, that will have people in it who can work more interested in? Yes. Where

**Bret** 14:07

would those people tend? I mean, you know, if they are decrying the lack of men whom, yeah, fit with their model,

**Bret** 14:14

we certainly, I mean, this is now a couple of years old, but we certainly would hear from students of both sexes, straight students from both of both sexes, that they were having a very hard time finding people with whom they're interested in having relationship. Yep. And, you know, for the most part, this wasn't about their standards being ridiculous,

**Bret** 14:31

right? No, I think, in large measure, it has to do with almost everybody below a certain age, having been sold a false bill of goods about what is valuable, and that in some sense, you're looking for the people who know that the description of what they're supposed to be pursuing, is hollow and, you know, largely driven by people who want to sell you something rather than people who are actually looking out for your interests. So my recommendation would be figured out how to escape that you're looking for odd balls, you could be a very rewarding relationship or search for a relationship and when you find the right person,

**Bret** 15:11

where do you find the advice? Like what depends on what kind of eyeballs you want. One of my first guesses would be look for people who are doing something physical, you know, backpacking clubs, or bicycling or you know, sports teams in the summer leagues pickup pickup games of something that are co Ed, Ultimate Frisbee being particularly responsive to co Ed sport. Just because as I've said many many times and you said as well engaging with the world physically makes it really so much harder to accept a lot of the the work of garbage that requires that you sort of have no feedback from the world. And you know, physical engagement with the world gives you that feedback. And so you get to you hone your insight and I think this is now hypothesis. But given that I've seen so few people who are, you know, rock climbers, or carpenters, or you know, otherwise engaging the world in a real way, who are also really buying into the bulk stuff. I think that it basically hones your brain such that it's harder for you to accept that totally socially created conclusions that intersectional bullshit provides.

**Bret** 16:20

What the thought of a a shirt for the post modern rock climbing club in which the shirt depicts a cliff, rising above the cliff is the sound of somebody falling. Because that's what would happen in postmodern rock climbing. Yeah.

**Bret** 16:42

I mean, it could even be postmodern rock. I'm glad we could have the coyote suspended above. Cliff not really recognizing

**Bret** 16:50

gravity yet. Yes. Oh, that too. There we go. That's that's the point

**Bret** 16:54

that the idea that it doesn't, the rules of physics don't apply to you until you recognize that there there is super amusing when it's a cartoon coyote, but not so amusing. When you're actually contending with these people, for over issues of whether or not to defund the police.

**Bret** 17:09

I thought that cartoon was about market failure as depicted through the Acme Corporation.

17:14

I think they were doing pretty well for themselves. were they? I guess they were in the hole? Yeah. All right.

**Bret** 17:20

Well, I would actually suggest, though, this is just a proof of concept. But you say that you are encountering girls, I would suggest you start searching for women. And you are finding women who have intellectual interests. They like sensitive men, that's a little suspect. And they're very woke. Well, here's the thing, where would you find intellectual women who have no patience for woke? I would say, the rationalist community would be one place, you would find such people now those people are certainly quirky, but they tend to be quirky in a kind of delightful way. So if that's the dynamic you're trying to break, seek out a community where that formulation doesn't make sense. Okay. Right.

**Bret** 18:12

I, it seems to me that maybe it's not all that numerous. Well, my guess would also be that the sex ratio is rather skewed in the direction that this person writing in would not prefer. But that's those are, those are the stereotypes I hold in my head.

**Bret** 18:26

That's true. But it's also like it's a community nested within some other communities. Right. And so anyway, all I'm saying it's really it was just a proof of concept, which is there's a place in which that formulation wouldn't add up. Yep. So it's also there will be others and and, you know, I'm not suggesting you take up with the rationalist community cynically, it's also an interesting community. I think there are some ways in which there are some things that I don't think they get as well as they might. But you know, we all don't get something as well as we might and would be an interesting place to, to spend time.

**Bret** 19:05

Please expand on religion as extended phenotype. If it is an innate human behavior, how do I meet that need without feeling like a hypocrite? or causing cognitive dissonance? Can we use open label placebo? We know it's not real, but it still works. So open label placebos is I presume his request for a label for such a thing?

**Bret** 19:28

Yeah, open label placebo,

**Bret** 19:33

though, which is, you know, which is literally false, metaphorically. True. That's, that's the the same category.

**Bret** 19:39

Yeah. I mean, look, how do you meet the need? This is in some sense, going to be a personal question. And I think it depends a lot on who you are and what need your meeting. Some of us do not find that the absence of a metaphysic A goal, ultimate level explanation robs life of meaning others do find it kind of frightening. So really depends on what thing you know, you it's like a bit like buying a house, you need to figure out what it is that you absolutely require and which things that others require are places that you can borrow from to get what you want. And I don't know, I mean,

**Bret** 20:27

uh, you know, I know you're out what your values actually are. Yeah, and what you know. So I guess the thing maybe that you're struggling with slightly pushing back against and this question is the idea of an innate human behavior, right? So I think we see that religion or religious like tendencies are universal across all human cultures, where it has been sought by anthropologists seeking such things. So the universality of an evolved cultural thing does not inherently mean innate, and you know, you won't find us actually choosing usually to use the word innate, because it, it does raise these questions of Well, then, you know, do you even have a choice? And more to the point, it raises the question for something as complex as religion? Which is, what's What's it for? What, you know, what is the purpose of it? What is it that all these religious and religious like beliefs are actually doing for people? And, you know, you pointed out one of them in your answer, you know, I believe in metaphysical being that created and or is looking out for all of us. But of course, we know that they also bring together community and acts as a kind of social safety net. So you know, part of the reason that, you know, we are likely seeing a growth in the government social safety net in the mid 20th century is as religion declines as one that people can rely on. And, you know, do we want? Do we all want to have a social safety net of some sort in place? I think, I think the vast majority of us do, but should that be in within a religious community that might also might also make demands of you that you would not otherwise want demanded of you? So you know, what are all of the needs that religion may meet? and figure out which of those things are your top five values and priorities? And, and then figure out from there what you want to do? Yep. What are your thoughts on the origins of life? Small questions today? By the way, thank you very much for your podcast, I'm thrilled by an opportunity to ask questions, world class scientists, are all professors in the US like you. Yes, all of them. You're the precious I wish I would have had. Thank you for that. Very nice. So the first question was, what are your thoughts on the origins of life?

**Bret** 22:51

Yes. Well, I'm foreign. Yep. And I think it happened. I hate to be late to the party. But you know, I'm here. You're here. My drinker?

**Bret** 23:01

I do actually. Yeah, it's a tough question. Look, we get asked this with some regularity. I think people are fascinated for understandable reasons. In, you know, origin of life questions, in some sense. It's one. It's outside the realm of what we actually study. It's like, you know, if you find a cosmologists, and you ask them, well, what's outside the universe? And it's like, well, you just hit the border of where my expertise is relevant. And so here's the thing, I'm not worried about whether there's a good origin of life explanation, I'm actually quite convinced that life straightforwardly arises from certain dynamics, it was very interesting,

**Bret** 23:51

therefore, will have done so many, many times across the universe.

**Bret** 23:56

Yeah, I find it almost inconceivable that it would be rare, given conditions that are conducive

**Bret** 24:04

on planets that are within certain constraints, etc. Right. But or large asteroids, the details,

**Bret** 24:11

and large afterwards, not so much. Probably.

24:15

I think it's possible. Now, not not on but not in our solar system.

**Bret** 24:20

But anyway, I'm not I'm not sure quite what to say about it. I thought, you know, back in 1976, Dawkins, proof of concept that there you could lay out a narrative of essentially nonliving chemistry being selected by wind blowing things across a dry landscape, and something sticking and something's not sticking. That was unselfish Jean. Yeah. And you know, he didn't present it as this is the answer. Yes. Like, there's a story like this. It's a powerful story. You know, I'm not sure it was his to begin with, but I think the basic point is Life is the extension of a deeper pattern of selection, that is selection, plus heredity that gives you adaptation, which eventually gives rise to things that you would automatically recognize as living. But selection happens in the inorganic world all the time. And it results in all of the patterns you are capable of detecting, that are outside of biology. So that same process happens onto a pathway that leads to something we call life at some point, but it's not I don't think it's in any way surprising that it does that with some regularity. So I guess the thing that I'm getting at is people, I think, mistake, the difficulty for isolating what the exact pathway was for the difficulty in establishing that there is a pathway by which it would happen. And I think one of these is a very low bar, and one of them is a very high bar. But the fact that it's hard to know what happened here because the evidence is gone, is not, in and of itself daunting.

**Bret** 26:10

Teaching an environment after X number of years doesn't produce Mozart or Bach, studies like brain differences and gifts in sport and science. Jordan Peterson talks about IQ and life success. Why does nobody talk about inequality with regard to talents and iQ? Is it because of political correctness and social justice? Thinking? Couldn't we help find early talents, and so reform education?

**Bret** 26:37

I think there's a hidden assumption here that I think is just dead wrong. IQ is real. But people tend to assume that IQ is genetically encoded, which I think there's much less evidence for than people think, because what they find is that it is hereditary. But hereditary can mean all kinds of things that have everything to do with external influences, rather than a blueprint for how to do cognition that exists in the genome, which it can't. So anyway, I think people assume too much from the fact of, they hear the word IQ, they assume that that's a parameter that you are given, like, you know, your structure for hemoglobin, and they proceed from there. And in fact, IQ is much more plastic than people imagined. And that we will eventually figure that out. And it does mean that the chances that we are similarly cognitively capable between populations are much higher, I would rate them as much higher than other people would tend to, but in the end, I'm just betting that's where it'll end up.

**Bret** 27:47

Alright, there's a ton more to say there. But maybe in the interest of getting through more questions, we'll stop there. Consider the idea that much, if not all. Motive Power of current social disharmony is a symptom of the four new kinds of radiation coming to us around the Sun since 1993, UBC among them, and increasing in magnitude affecting humanity's evolution. I don't know anything about this.

**Bret** 28:15

I don't know if this is true. 93

**Bret** 28:17

Yeah, I don't this this I've never heard this. It strikes me off top my head is as something I wouldn't believe if you said it to me. But

**Bret** 28:25

for new kinds of radiation coming to us around the Sun since 1993, so if you have any reason 1993 shouldn't be special. Nope.

**Bret** 28:35

But if, if the person who wrote this has a reference that you would send to? Is it dark horse moderators? Zack, is it dark horse butter at or@gmail.com? Where the moderator is 1993 going to be ozone? hole? Maybe it's around around then.

**Bret** 28:57

Yeah, I don't know. My guess would be very unlikely. Yeah. To be an A biotic influenced like that. I mean, you know, the only way would be complete disruption of cognition, significant enough to derange

**Bret** 29:15

right. Although, you know, it's it's not unprecedented. Right? You know, we've spoken before about the lead being taken out of gasoline. We see rates of violent crime decreasing rates of violent crime in 1970s in cities was quite high and lead was taken out of gas and late 70. Something I can't remember exactly when, but somehow it tracks really nicely. Like it does seem to be doing that and again, saying that does not suggest that lead was the cause of all violent crime. But that seemed led in the air seemed to both decrease general IQ and people who lived in very air polluted areas and also increase rates of Violence, criminality So, you know, it's not that there couldn't be some a biotic factor that is contributing to something, but it seems to to global to global. And we also just don't know, you know, it, maybe it's, you know, a hole in the ozone layers is what's being alluded to here. Yeah. Which would then be semi unwise to be going crazy first.

**Bret** 30:19

Well, they are just looking how they dress. All the time. All the time. Yeah. But so yes, yeah, you're right, that global use of tetra FLN would cause does seem to have caused some level of social disruption or at least plausibly did. What I'm doubting is for new kinds of radiation. This Yeah,

**Bret** 30:46

I mean, this may just be in precisely written, you know, for for things that weren't reaching the earth before. I don't know. I mean, but certainly given the thing that I got into thinking about UBC in the last couple of weeks, yep. ubc is hitting the earth at higher rates now, since since the ozone hole has been has been growing. So yes, you know, that's at least a possible connection here. Next question, keep up the good work. You once mentioned that market markets are not a good tool for science. Would you consider saying that government is not a good tool, either for science for some issues? Or wait? No, the government is not a good tool for science or the government?

**Bret** 31:27

I think not a good tool for science either. Yeah. Oh, government is a terrible tool. For some things. I would argue that science is not one of them, because science really needs is insulation from markets, which means that somebody needs to fund that which we need done and to be done in sensitively to what the market thinks of the conclusion.

**Bret** 31:48

Yeah. So what we had you know, so the government is an answer that solves the problem of it being done by Rich aristocrats, right science being widely available to people who were sort of landed gentry,

**Bret** 32:00

good government, good governance is a manifestation of the public well being. So in order to get the science done, that is in our collective interest. governance, good governance is able to direct the resources and immunize the process from from market forces. So I would

**Bret** 32:23

say, and it allows a wider swath of humanity access to becoming scientists. Yep.

**Bret** 32:28

So I think this is one of these cases where we've seen malignant government. And so people are distrustful of it rightly. But that isn't an indictment of governance. It's an indictment of the corrupt government structures that we currently have. Yep.

**Bret** 32:46

How would you respond to people whose response to an unpopular scientific fact is that most scientific studies are corrupted by the institutions that are funding them? Are there any means for regular that is non scientists people to find out a reliability of any study? This is an important question. And it's that some of are going to require that you learn some of the both some of the code words that people use in the papers within the fields that you're interested in discerning and become at least capable, you know, somewhat scientifically literate yourself that said, the peer reviewed literature, the primary literature is mostly such a mess, that I really don't want to recommend that to anyone unless you are required to do it. So you know, how do we how do we encourage people to become more scientifically literate, and to actually assess themselves? What a study says give him that, you know, as we have, as we have shown time after time, right here, and we use to all the time in our classrooms. Not only are his most primary literature, flawed to some degree, and written so as not to be decipherable by many people outside of the field. But the media when when individual research is covered by the media, it's almost always done so so badly, that if you just take the media cover of a story, you will end up with some wrong assessment of what the research said. So that's a description of the problem without solution making at all. Do you have any suggestions?

**Bret** 34:17

I think it's hopeless, I think, no, I mean, do you are you going to as a private citizen, be able to unpack the garbage work in some field you haven't studied, you shouldn't expect that you will be able to you unless you have an extraordinary capacity and interest in that field, you're not going to be able to train yourself to do it without spending a huge amount of time. The best thing you can do is find somebody with a track record of figuring out where the work is valid and where it isn't valid. So in some sense, you know a, a Nassim Taleb like figure can be your guide To what high quality work looks like and what nonsense looks like. So you can sort of proxy and of course, not see him has his blind spots, but it's probably he's following him is probably better than it is trying to, you know, reinvent the wheel.

**Bret** 35:18

In terms of, you know, I don't want to say it's hopeless, because this is something that I in particular used to try to help students with is trying to figure out, demonstrate how to become intelligent consumers, unfortunately, of the scientific literature, with the recognition going in, that it's not written to be understood by outsiders, and the scientists view everyone who's not actively doing science in that field for the most part as outsiders. So it's, you know, it's not, it's not an uncorrupted phenomenon at all. So one, one thing, and this is by no means perfect, is to look for the hypothesis, you know, if you if you're actually looking at a paper that was written on a piece of primary literature, meaning paper, a paper written by the people who actually did the research itself, look for the hypothesis clearly stated upfront in both the abstract and the introduction. And increasingly, scientists who are not hypothesis driven will game this and pretend that hypothesis all along and put it up front. But it's also amazing how many papers don't even pretend. And so if you're looking at research that doesn't even pretend that it had a hypothesis, then I would say right away, you can say hi, I just I don't really need to spend time here. And when I, when we were professors, and I was asked to do peer review of papers, for a variety of journals. It was amazing to me how many papers, my primary review that went back was, I see no evidence of a hypothesis here, I can't recommend that you publish this. I was not particularly beloved one journal editors as a result, because the number of papers coming in that just had no pretense of hypothesis was amazing.

**Bret** 37:01

Yeah, right, it is a total failure. But even in the case of the ones that have it, I think you're dealing with a situation. And I've forgotten what the name of this principle is. But you are often where you are an expert able to detect just how bad reporting is just journalistic reporting on something where you know, a lot. And then the reporting, and every other thing looks okay. Now, increasingly, that's not true. But 10 years ago, that was a widely reported pattern. What that means is that the reporting sucks in all of those places, you're just capable of detecting it in the one where you have the expertise. And my point would be science, it's like that. Right? You will find in each place, there's the stuff that's not being said, You know, I mean, you can look at the, the source code to stuff from the beginning about the natural origin of this thing, right? You had to have a certain kind of expertise to be able to spot how nonsense filled this story was. But if you did have it, it was clear and yet, you've got

**Bret** 38:13

one if you didn't have it, you were told you were a crackpot conspiracy hypothesis. Right? for believing in such a thing.

**Bret** 38:20

Exactly. And so, you know, to this day, we're dealing with that outgrowth, which is to see the emptiness of that explanation of the natural origin explanation is to sideline yourself. But I wouldn't expect it's not it's not on you. The fact is, the fields are broken, they're broken because of perverse incentives. It's rare to find a field where that's really not true. And

**Bret** 38:45

so but I mean, I, I applaud the question. So I feel like you're giving the person right in and out, but I don't think I'm gonna guess here, given the name that she wants an out, she's looking for the road forward, right? Like, what what can I do as someone who is not a scientist to interpret scientific findings, and not just have to sit down and shut up and people say, Ah, you can't trust that because institutions corrupt science, is both through the institutions, corrupt science, and the good science is done?

**Bret** 39:19

Well, yes. On the other hand, it's a little you know, if the person said, I'm not comfortable with the fact that the product I buy, result in the misery of the people involved in producing them or the people downstream from the pollutants and making them How can I you know, build my life around products that don't hurt people? And the answer is, you can't it's not on you it this is something we have to collectively solve, because the individual level solution doesn't exist. So you know, I don't like saying that, but I also don't want to lead you to believe that there's a good solution to

**Bret** 39:57

I think it's a little bit different though. Because with regard Two products and taking it on yourself you know minimize your impact you are you are experiencing the personal responsibility vortex the coin that you've termed in your TED Talk years ago term that I coined. Did I say coined that you termed? Yeah, yeah, well, I don't think you did that

**Bret** 40:12

I didn't know I wouldn't

**Bret** 40:15

know you would not have the personal the, I can't get it right. The personal responsibility vortex, a term that you coined in a TED talk years ago, we is is would be the thing that you're talking about with regard to seeking to minimize as much as possible the impact of your consumption choices on the environment, for instance, which, if there are other reasons for you to do so terrific. But if you suffer all the costs of minimizing the costs, other people win, at at cost to you. Whereas in this case, this person is trying to better themselves, and not simply make the collective better,

**Bret** 40:53

oh, I get why this person wants to do this. And I want them to do this. But I also know that you're wading into fields in which you've got reciprocity networks in which people are, you know, passing each other's papers through peer review, because they want their papers pass through peer review. I mean, look, here's the thing. The year before the replication crisis broke in psychology, it was completely obvious that there would be one and it's not psychology, psychology is where it broke first, any place that you've got statistics and P values, it was obvious that there was a perverse incentive that was going to result in the complete derangement of all of the work downstream of this. Because the way you advanced your career was to publish papers, the way you publish papers was to get significance the way you got significance was to, you know, massage your data and

41:46

jellybeans cause cancer. They sure do. Yeah, right.

**Bret** 41:49

Sure. Damn, jellybeans cause cancer. So the point is, look, it was obvious there was a replication crisis in light of a replication crisis, how do you figure out which results in psychology are right? Turns out pretty close to none of them? Right? So what do you do about that? There's just nothing to do you know, and you know, the thing to do I mean, it is the personal responsibility vortex, the thing to do is to demand science that actually works. And the way you do that is you provide an incentive structure that doesn't cause people to publish bad work in order to advance their careers. Now, we do need a drink

**Bret** 42:28

given. So this is very much like a question that we started with. So we may just refer back to that answer. Given one human societies need for religion, and to the winning of religion in the West, might the rise of the number of people who are willing to adopt or invent Bs, see ideologies be tied to their now desperate, innate, need to believe in something? I don't know what BSc is here. I feel like I'm just forgetting an obvious acronym. But so this this, this differs a little bit from the earlier question or questions about religion. And that asks whether or not we we feel a need to believe in something that that belief may be a sort of a human universal desire, and that in a, in a world that is becoming less coherent, simultaneously more global, so that we can see apparently, what everyone else is doing? Even though we know that it's highly curated, if not worse? And we can Well, maybe maybe that, maybe that,

**Bret** 43:33

so I would, I think there's something very much to this idea. We have a need to believe, but I don't think it works the way people think. So it drives people crazy, especially dyed in the wool science types. When I say you can't do science without a certain amount of faith, drives them crazy. Yes. But it's absolutely true. It's

43:55

a little bit.

**Bret** 43:56

It's provable. But here's the thing. It's not much of a claim, right? The fact is, you do not know that this is not all a hallucination. And in fact, there are explanations that could make it one, right. If this was a simulation, maybe it's a simulation to see what a mind like collection of circuits does with certain kinds of information. You can't prove that that's not where you are. So you have to have faith,

**Bret** 44:21

but we can't get very far if we spend time on on such a high bar

**Bret** 44:25

rice worthless. So the point is, what do you do? You got two choices. Okay, we're gonna I'm going to dichotomize I'm going to go I'm going to go even next candy on this right? Oh, boy. But this is a real dichotomy. You have two choices. You can spend your entire life on one question on which you are guaranteed to make no progress, right? Or you can decide that's not happening. I'm going to take on faith that this is not a simulation designed to figure out what my collection of circuits will do with information that looks like this. In fact, I'm real Tables are real, I have mechanisms to figure out that they are if I go into the laboratory, I can run an experiment and it involves actual equipment spitting out actual data that I can then evaluate for better or worse, right? I can assume that I have the ability to detect the actual world. And that that allows me to do science and discover things. And my feeling is say, What? What's the cost? What's the cost, if I just accept, I can't rule out that this is a simulation designed to see what I will do. But assuming it's not, I can do all this other stuff, I'm just going to take it on faith that the universe is real. And if it ain't, the cost is zero.

**Bret** 45:37

Okay, so we need to believe something in order to make progress and whatever realm it is we're trying to make progress in, right.

**Bret** 45:43

But the thing is, that thing, once you do that, once you accept that first little bit of faith, and you're going to enjoy it so much well, and I mean, that was the ultimate bargain, I'm guaranteed to waste everything for nothing, or I get access to everything based on a kind of faith I'm not going to worry too much about

45:59

so you're gonna give ibram Kendi credit for this. No, I'm just gonna go dichotomous,

**Bret** 46:03

because it's actually dichotomous in this case. But But the point is, okay, you accept that. And it's such a, you know, it's such a rush to actually believe that the universe is real, and that you can interact with it, right? It's such a great reward, then you say, well, maybe there's some other bargains not quite as good as that one, I get everything for nothing. But I get a lot for a little, right, all the heuristics that make your visual system work, you are taking on faith that things end where they seem to end, right. And generally they do. And then occasionally they don't you know, what happens when they don't you plummet to your death? No, well, sometimes, sometimes they're trying to do that. So okay, you're working on it, you can get this all from like a couple of subreddits, right? You got the sub reddits that focus on, you know, optical illusion. And it's not always optical, but optical is a very compelling one, right? Where your heuristics mislead you, and you see something that isn't, right, right. And then there's the subreddit, what could go wrong? If your favorite site, what you can learn all sorts of things, sometimes

**Bret** 47:07

late at night, before you go to bed, you're scrolling through that, like, dude, how do you sleep? Do you know how many dreams look like, we'll

**Bret** 47:13

never know how many deaths I have avoided, because I'm a devotee of what could go wrong. And I learned about these things on my phone, rather than by making the error. So anyway, the point is, heuristics are like an algorithmic kind of faith, right? They trade on the fact that your system for using photons bouncing around a room to assess where objects are and how you can interact with them actually work. And in general, it's such a good deal, you don't even think you're making a deal. And then every so often, you get one wrong, and it becomes Oh, yeah, it was a heuristic. And every so often, you know, one and a one and 1000 times the heuristic fails. So anyway, my point is, yes, we need to believe things because we're structured to use heuristics, because it's such a damn bargain. And then sometimes you pay the cost. But the question is, how much does this have to do with our need to believe in something like a being above who gives a damn about us and all of that? Yep. And I think it differs a lot for different people. I don't need there to be a God above. Yeah, some people do. But I think it is a mistake to assume that our need to believe in something is synonymous with our need to believe in purpose in the universe, because some people have that need, and some people don't.

**Bret** 48:26

Yeah. 15 minutes of work. Let me just say, to defend you against the idea that you're spending your last waking minutes looking at what could go wrong, and I can't imagine how you sleep I tend to spend my last waking minutes reading about well, if the last week is any indicator, either North Korea or 20th century China, which also does not exactly make for wonderful dreams. So I suppose to each their own, with regard to how to play their own dream space.

**Bret** 48:57

In fact, in both those cases, the only reason that China and North Korea are not on what could go wrong is it's hard to know how to photograph the whole thing.

**Bret** 49:05

Yeah. I there's so many good questions, and we're not going to get to most of them. Let me do one more here and then. Then we'll go to the Super Chat from this hour. Should unity promote platonic dialogues annually for the public to read and incorporate into presidential speeches? This is going to recover lost fundamentals and deploy the best of ITW long form resources. For instance, mcraven something on true court courage latches, is that a name or a I don't know what that means.

**Bret** 49:41

I don't know what the latches means. But anyway, look, to be honest with you, I think unity 2020 is a manifestation. It is a version of something of which there are many versions in many different realms. And frankly, they have to Get together, right? I think unity 2020 has a lot to do with blockchain. And I think it has a lot to do with open source. And I think it has a lot to do with game B, and Id, W, and that all of these things are proof of concept prototypes that have solved some canonical problem in some zone. And the point is, we need to stop recognizing them as separate projects that we need to recognize that really, is the overarching project we are about, which is, how do we take all of the various failure modes, learn from them and build around them for the next phase of humanity? Because if we don't, there ain't going to be a next phase of humanity. So yes, to your point, but maybe we can expand it a bit.

**Bret** 50:45

So we're switching to the next Super Chat. But I want to make read one more comment from this one. And then we will come back to some of these questions in Episode 40. suggestion, turn defund into refund, the police refund doesn't make sense in terms of normal policing, and lends itself to better unpacking conversation. So I read that because I actually had exactly this thought earlier today and thought, you know, how it rhymes it's such a match otherwise. And, you know, I think I think what we really want is, is more funding than we had before in order to start fixing the problems and then potentially scale back but it's at least potentially an interesting linguistic starting point.

**Bret** 51:27

Yes. Two problems. One, the word refund and refund are two different things. But you know, maybe maybe you can get around that. Because, you know, in a defund the police world refund seems to be the opposite. But the other thing is, I really want you know, I don't want to be characterized as somebody who thinks we need huge police budgets. Yeah, I just think that the police budgets are large, because the police are being used to solve a set of problems that are not best solved by the police, which is not so far from a credible version of the claims that are being made. But the point is, that argues for doing it right, you know, to the extent that the police are dealing with a mental health crisis, because we have no solution for people who have crippling mental health issues and therefore end up on the streets involved in petty and worst crime. That's not an elegant solution to this problem at all. The police don't belong in that equation, except very rarely and so figuring out how not to use the police as a cheap solution to problems is the key so at some level, I want enough I want people to be imaginative enough that what we're really saying is render the police less necessary, right? Let's get them out of the jobs they shouldn't be doing and let's have them do the jobs they need to be doing. And you know, there's a lot a lot a lot is possible, but not if your point is let's go after the police and let's be personal about it.

**Bret** 53:01

On a scale from unicycle to 18 Wheeler, how tired Are you have the kleptocratic duopoly

**Bret** 53:06

say kleptocratic?

**Bret** 53:08

No, it doesn't. I made that up. I lucked out kradic on a scale from unicycle to 18 Wheeler, how tired Are you of the kleptocratic? duopoly? I like klepto crap to

**Bret** 53:19

say, I am Panamax boat tired of the klepto crap deck duopoly.

53:26

They have no wheels at all. We're

**Bret** 53:29

simply measuring wheels. I've

**Bret** 53:31

cycled 18 wheels that looks like a wheel continuum to me. It does,

**Bret** 53:34

but it was also a size continuum. And so you know, Panamax boat. Panamax? I'll tell you what it's about wheels and some of the Panamax boats these boats that are the maximum dimensions to fit in the locks of the Panama Canal. They're big, they're very big and some of them if I understand it correctly, actually have basically factories in them that finish automobiles in transit to basically smooth out the supply chain so that you're not wasting time you know, the cars are sitting idle on their way they could also be being finished on their way. So anyway, a Panamax boat full of cars that are in the process of being finished has six wheels per average car that's a lot of wheels. Six, I think you got four plus a spare plus a steering. Wow, okay. I feel good about it. So

**Bret** 54:37

this is a logistics question installed zoom tried to click into Saturday's meetings with no success in the future. How can we be certain to get access to meetings to contribute apologies if this was already answered, just getting home so this is going to be about the campfire. I don't know if you want to just take that to campfire. ellipsis

**Bret** 54:52

This is campfire

54:53

I think so that's there was a Saturday

**Bret** 54:55

marinating, right? Well, I don't know if they're talking about I don't think it's campfire. I think this is this is about Patreon discussions. And I'm dismayed to find out that anybody is having trouble clicking into the meeting. There is estimates

**Bret** 55:12

to contribute. Okay, well, there's I mean, there's so you only do you do this, he does it once a month, the first Saturday and Sunday of the month, and then we do our private q&a on the last Sunday of the month. So it may be that you? I don't know. So maybe, if it is about Patreon. Send a message into that Patreon. I don't know if you'll see it, send a message to a dark horse moderator@gmail.com with more specificity around this what this was, yeah,

**Bret** 55:47

we will take care of it, but be as specific as possible. While what happened. It is possible that you missed a password associated with getting the meeting, we'll get it figured, yep.

**Bret** 55:58

Have you heard of Ralston college. It's founded on enlightenment values of many great intellectuals like Jordan Peterson involved, and maybe the last place offering a real humanities education. We were actually one of the many things that we weren't able to do because of lockdown was go to, I think it was to be their first big weekend long event that was supposed to be heavy in Savannah. This last spring. As I understand it, it's not actually operational yet and I doubt it will become operational in the near future given that so many colleges are failing to figure out how to operate. But yeah, Jordan Peterson is on the the board or the founding people. There are a lot of good people associated with it. But I do not think that it is yet happening. But yeah, for people who don't know about it Ralston college, or a l s t o n, which I think is actually to be happening in Savannah, Georgia, they have a website and you can learn a little bit about it. In Game of Thrones, the unsullied are an army of Unix. Would Unix make acceptable soldiers in the real world? Or is it fictional, fictional nonsense or woke upon? What would such an army strengths and weaknesses be? Thanks, Rebecca?

**Bret** 57:10

Um, well, geez, I don't know. I mean, the thing about the Ansel aid in Game of Thrones is that we don't know by what mechanism, they were trained. And so we actually don't know what incentives drive them. We know what incentives have been removed from them. But Game of Thrones explores this trope in multiple places where it basically I mean, the on grade joy gets remanufactured as a mental slave of I can't remember when Ramsey Ramsey's. Now Yeah. But anyway, the idea that you could rebuild somebody by altering and various others, so I wanted to bring up various because but Okay, so we but before

**Bret** 57:55

you speak, so you're you're focusing entirely on incentives and whether or not it would sort of work coherently as an army behaviorally. I suspect given some of echos previous questions that she is at least as interested in the question of anatomy and physiology. And so it really depends on At what point this would be army had these unfortunate surgeries done to them that little boys who are castrated are not going to become warriors who are able, who are going to be able to actually win against actually intact male armies, right? If they were castrated after they'd gone through male puberty, they would have, you know, male anatomy and male male physiology and physique and, and body mass and all of that. And yes, it would change somewhat, at the point that they were no longer producing much testosterone on their own. But they would, they would be belt like men, whereas you castrate a little boy, and he's not going to end up being built like a man. And so it wouldn't be an effective army.

**Bret** 58:56

Right? And so in some sense, this goes back to your distinction between organizational activation effects, which I think is if you wanted to invest somewhere in a piece of knowledge that would liberate you from all sorts of scientific nonsense, this would be a great place to do it. But then, you also have the technological question, which is okay, if you get the advantage of the organizational effects that make a masculinized army, and then you get presumably the control that you this question is predicated on a, someone who wants to control an army, they're wondering if Second Army would work. So that's what we're talking about. The organizational effects create the masculinized body which is better for fighting the lack of the androgens being produced, increases control, but then, technologically speaking, you can introduce and remove androgens at will, which allows even greater control. So if you imagine

59:55

the unsolvable

**Bret** 59:56

in modern times, right, exactly. So the last thing I was gonna say on this topic is that Martin No, the author, George RR George RR Martin tells us something about what he actually thinks about this castration stuff because he says, as people are talking about various in early seasons, that nobody trusts a unike which is ironic because in some sense a unit could be more trustworthy by virtue of the fact that they're not being jerked around by their gonads. But Martin's point, if it fits Martin's point, I assume it is, is that the lack of this distortion of maleness it makes the person less reliable because you don't know actually what they're after they've got no clue as to motive, right men can be relied upon to be after certain things, and a man who is not after those things is a mystery and therefore dangerous. So anyway, I don't know unsullied

**Bret** 1:00:56

army? Could you know if, if they had masculinized bodies sufficiently enough to be adequate warriors could actually be more confusing and surprising and therefore more powerful against intact male armies?

**Bret** 1:01:11

Yes, although in the case of the unsullied, they are so well trained that even liberated they are not the least bit liberated, right. So anyway, I think Martin does a pretty good job of exploring this in Game of Thrones that you know, you have the full range from a completely free agent, freed by the lack of gonads to completely subservient agents by virtue of the training regimen that accompanied castration. Yep.

**Bret** 1:01:39

Hi, Breton. Hi, there. Thanks for all you do. My wife and I are expecting our first child in January. Congratulations. As successful parents, do you have any recommended readings or general advice for raising successful children? Thanks. We have we have a list of things that we put into the book that we're writing in the chapter on parenthood and relationship. And in part, because there really isn't that out there. You know, evolutionary parenting isn't yet a field, there are some, you know, halfway decent things that I feel like I read occasionally, but mostly, it was us figuring things out, as we went alone, from an evolutionary perspective, watching as these amazing little critters quickly started trying to game their situation. And us, and we responded with, with love and putting a stop to their gaming.

**Bret** 1:02:38

So I'm gonna try just general framework. general framework is kids are designed to be parented, they are designed to be raised, the purpose of childhood is to make highly functional adults, the purpose of life is not to be satisfied It is to be functional. And all of this amounts to a system that works pretty well by intuition, except for one fact, which is, you live in the modern world. And the modern world is not the one for which children are designed. And it is not the one for which parents are designed. And that means that you need to be hyper vigilant about the distortion that comes from modernity, short of modernity, this would be I would not say an easy job, because it's very expensive in many regards. But it is a straightforward job in normal circumstances, and a very confusing job, when, for example, your children will face market forces that are attempting to manipulate them into doing things that are not good for them. Because it's in somebody else's financial interest. That's not something a hunter gatherer would encounter. So be very on your guard about novel influences that potentially disrupted the processing that your kid does. But in general, trust your intuition. When psychological experts tell you You must be very careful not to love your kids too much. They have to cry themselves to sleep or they'll become dependent. They're full of shit and that's obvious and just go with your gut on this one, right? Yeah, kids are designed to be Barrington, you're designed to have the right feeling if you're normal, you're designed to have the right feelings towards them. To the extent that you want to embrace them, you probably do to the extent they're driving you crazy there, you probably need to tell them so it's straightforward but for modernity.

**Bret** 1:04:40

Okay, let's do a few more. And then we'll stop for today. In the age of functional, mostly 3d printed semi automatics, will gun control remain even possible for much longer?

**Bret** 1:04:51

No, yeah, well, that's already a matter of limits amount more to people's limits of imagination then to any practical detail.

**Bret** 1:05:03

Yeah. What role do you believe that xenoestrogens such as BPA, phthalates and analogs are playing in the rate of transsexualism given their established high occurrence and human bodies? Unknown effects on the Iron Age three, the human SDN? I don't recognize those last two abbreviations, but the the larger question is, basically, we've got estrogens entering the water supply entering the environment at rates that are far higher than they ever have before from things like phytoestrogens, which is to say that estrogens and their analogues exist in nature. But we have been synthesizing them and then releasing them through our trash and our urine into water supply that then effectively feminized his boys. And absolutely, that's happening. Yes. You know, it's it's your how explanatory is it? How many? How many hypotheses are there each of which have some role to explain in the actual legitimately increasing rates of transsexualism? I don't know. But it is certainly one factor.

**Bret** 1:06:15

Yeah, it's certainly one factor. There's also clearly a cultural contagion factor, which dovetails with a general general disruption of normal environments. so

**Bret** 1:06:31

sure. I mean, I think there are there are many, many things going on with regard to the rise in trans. And this person specifically writes transsexualism. I think that's intentional, right, like transsexualism and transgender. You know, you know, as I as I asked him my recent letter to to Abigail Shroyer, in our letter wiki about specifically the contagion aspect of the rise in in, in teenage girls declaring themselves transgender. At what point did we stop calling him calling it transexual and started calling it transgender, this is a modeling of the issue at best, and frankly, transgender, you know, acting in ways that are historically more likely other sex would act? Should war it's certainly nothing remotely or surgically and probably nothing at all, you know, at least within some confines, whereas, you know, trans transsexualism, like actually legitimately feeling like one of the many manifestations of your sex is out of whack with the sex that you that you are usually it's your it's your brain telling you for sure, that the sex that your chromosomes, and your gametes and your anatomy and your physiology, say you are is not the thing that you say you are, you know, is our, our xenoestrogens contributing to basically a broader array of intersex conditions effectively. Yeah, I think I think they are. But yeah, but there's also some social contagion, which may have nothing at all to do with that. But it's really a different evolution of, of transmis.

**Bret** 1:08:03

But what I wanted to get at was the interaction between these things. I think that there's some gateway, which looks like, I feel like something's off. Right? I feel like something is off, and I want it not to be off anymore. And so I'm looking for the thing that's off so I can fix it, right? Yep. And the point is, okay, one of the things that will be off is that you are getting a lot of estrogens that you're not supposed to be exposed to, if you're a boy, or you're not supposed to be exposed to them. Sure, anybody. But if you're a boy, it has a particular effect, which is making you feel even more off. And then somebody says, You know what, a lot of people who are feeling off are really just fine. They're just facing a kind of oppression where civilization is telling them that they are something, it's denying who they really are. And sounds like you know what, maybe that's it, maybe I really am something else. And I would feel fine if I was that thing, but I'm being told him this other thing. And that's why everything seems so wrong. And so people embrace it. And then the point is, well, that didn't work. Because everything is still crazy, right? You're still interfacing with a world that is not well suited to you. And so no

**Bret** 1:09:14

wonder that this is largely happening at the point that these kids are teenagers when guess what you're doing as a teenager as you're trying to figure out who you are, and why you no longer are the kid you once were and are not yet the adult that you might become hoping to become or haven't yet even imagine what it might look like to become that that age, that era in your life is exactly about it doesn't quite feel right. This isn't fitting, I'm trying to figure out what it is that I'm going to be doing. And so to have a political ideology, move in and say we've got the solution for you. It involves going under the knife and taking hormones that are going to change your life forever. Well, that's that's child abuse.

**Bret** 1:09:52

Yeah, it is. I mean, at the same moment that you frankly have cardi B telling you what But, you know, the cool sexuality is, which is insane, then you have Joe Biden sitting down with cardi B for an interview, because the Democratic Party is, of course, you can't make this stuff. The point is everything is broadcasting some message that you can't possibly process normally, because it's not a normal message. It's a malevolent message. And anyway, I think what you're finding is a lot of people looking for the same thing that makes them susceptible to get rich quick schemes and snake oil, right? The sense that there's gotta be some way, there's just got to be some way, tell me what switch I can flip. And now Hey, guess what, we've got the ultimate switch, if you find something off putting about the sexual message you're being expected to interface with, then there's a reason for that. And it's called trans. And here's what you got to do. And so anyway, the point is the BPA and the other estrogens that you may be taking in feed into the sense that something isn't right. And then this other thing doesn't have to be connected to it directly. It just has to be connected to the fact that people for whom things don't feel right, are looking for an answer. And this answer happens to be fashionable at the moment, which isn't to say that there aren't real transgender people, which there are, and there always have been, but the point is, the level of it, their degree to which this has arisen as an issue can just be a matter of lots of things that create a sense of being at ease and a small number of solutions that are becoming fashionable. And there you have it.

**Bret** 1:11:32

Yeah. Okay, two more questions. What are we at sec? Okay, we'll do two more here. The next one is a comment. Although there is a rhetorical question at the end. If the goal is to move toward a polychronic way of thinking, can I discuss my sex life at work since personal and worker combined? Can I have sex at work? I don't think it's well thought through. This person concludes. Yeah. Yeah, it's not. It's not?

**Bret** 1:12:01

Yeah. You make a good point. I mean, it's pretty,

**Bret** 1:12:05

it's far better than they do, right? Yes. Brett, you often refer to rent seeking elites, you offer one or two specific examples to illustrate their behavior and make them tangible to me.

**Bret** 1:12:18

So let's say that you run a fossil fuel extraction company, and you become skeptical of anthropogenic global climate change, because it is politically in your interest to continue selling your fossil fuels as long as possible. And even though it might be in civilizations interest to switch to a modality of moving from place to place or working from home, or, you know, battery driven cars from solar power, whatever it is, so you become motivated to obstruct the new mechanism, because you're profiting from the old mechanism. So you are externalizing the harm of fossil fuels in an effort to maintain your profit stream, you have not you have contributed something to the market, you've contributed fossil fuels, which have a value, but they also have a cost, which because it's externalized, rather than internalized, you don't experience directly. And so anyway, this derange is our conversation about atmospheric chemistry. And you may find research that results in there being more confusion on this issue than there should have been. So that's an example of a rent seeking elite protecting their profit stream. While deranging the conversation in a way that externalizes harm. Well done. Alright, I think we're done. We're there. Yeah. All right. Cool.

**Bret** 1:13:55

So as as always, join us on our Patreon for a variety of of perks including access to a private monthly q&a. At Brett's at the higher levels. He does a couple of two hour conversations among a small group of people on Saturday and Sunday, the first Sunday of the month. And there's a discord that you have access to it, either of them, the clips channel, we'll have some clips chosen by a guy that we trust in life pretty much and he puts them up there and this channel, also this channel, subscribe if you don't

**Bret** 1:14:35

subscribe, comment, and please come join unity. If you haven't done it yet. There's going to be opportunities for you to influence our process upcoming very soon. So now would be a great time to get on our mailing list. All right. Thanks everyone. We will see you next time.