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**Bret** 05:58

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse podcast live stream q&a section number 44 where we meet your cues with our A's.

**Heather** 06:08

Sounds lewd.

**Bret** 06:11

Only if that's where your mind defaults? I don't think so. You don't think so? No, I think. Yeah, a little bit lewd. I didn't intend it as lewd. Just so we're clear.

**Heather** 06:21

All right. We will Oh, hello. Hi. We will start with a few questions from the last episode, and then pick up question from Discord server, and then get to your questions from the last hour. All right. Hi, Breton. Heather, Thanks for answering my last question. Last week, you mentioned that humans aren't the only species that expresses gender one other species also do it and how please. So I thought this just warranted a a quick mention that the way that I've been defining gender and the way that it fits for me, with all of the manifestations that I've seen people use it is that it is effectively the behavioral expression of sex, and that in every animal that's non human, and all the non human animals, that what we call that is sex role. And so there are, there are sex roles, that species from, you know, anemone fish, to the sea, horses, to antelope, to elephant seals, to dolphins and umbrella birds, you know, have, and they are sex specific. So we don't call it gender in other species, but it is it is if it if if gender is the behavioral expression of sex, then then you're going to have, you're going to have that happen anytime you've got behavior, which is certainly all mammals and birds, and probably all vertebrates, and a tremendous number of inverts as well, tremendous number of insects.

**Bret** 07:59

So I would I have been defining gender differently. I've said it is the software of sex, in which case, gender will be found in birds and mammals to a substantial degree. But but different degrees within those clades and not much found outside of them. So I guess there's a question about which definition of gender we're going with now.

**Heather** 08:27

I think that's I mean, that's, that's interesting, because those, I like both of those definitions. Behavioral expression of sex, which is the one that I've been saying for years, and I've, you know, written into pieces that I've written, and you're saying the software of sex, and they are overlapping, but not completely. And, man, so they do they do have different ramifications for how you view, say, the stereotyped lordosis behavior of a female lizard. You know, is that is that gender or not? It would be by my definition, but not by yours. But it but the overlap, I think is pretty much perfect when it comes to humans, like we write over no variances.

**Bret** 09:06

So just so people know why we're the differences immense between these two definitions, because most critters will not have gender because most critters don't meet their parents and therefore, whatever sex role they have, will be programmed in at a genetic level

**Heather** 09:25

behavior is stereotyped, that it doesn't count as gender by your definition,

**Bret** 09:30

right. And so the point about it being you know, if you accept that it is the software of sex, and the point is software is vastly more flexible than hardware. You know, in a lizard that doesn't meet its parents and exhibits the stereotyped behaviors. You know, there isn't a lot of flexibility because in order for the creature to be functional, that stuff had to be written in and the fact that it is written in is amazing in so many creatures, but but the vast majority will have nothing that we would call software. It's much more like you know, maybe firmware it's programmed by the genes and all but on alterable

**Heather** 10:09

next question is a reference to Holly math nerd wrote last time, which is what's your favorite Star Trek series? And why is it Deep Space Nine. And this person writes, I am paying you $20 to watch the magnificent for engi for mg, just for me, is it Frankie? episode of Star Trek Deep Space Nine, season six Episode 10. So I'm sure it's better than cuties. I'll give it that sight unseen,

**Bret** 10:34

I feel confident that that will also be my job.

**Heather** 10:37

Now we've actually we've heard indirectly from a lot of people now that that you were wrong. The idea that this was just sort of a workplace drama is exactly wrong. And actually one of the analyses I saw reminded me of that sounds I know nothing about the show. I literally know nothing about I've never seen one. But that it reminded me a little bit of what she Bob rivers had told us with regard to why when we went to grad school, we should go to a place a museum, one of the reasons being that when you're at a meeting a big an important research Museum, people from all over the world with different research questions and different backgrounds, and different biases and expectations and hypotheses come through. And so the idea of a space station workplace drama is as a place where all the rest of the world comes through and you get to interact with them. strikes me is potentially the reason that it could be exactly as good as many people including polymath, nerd and perhaps Ragnar of the desert. I think it is,

**Bret** 11:30

I don't think I said that Deep Space Nine was a workplace drama. I think maybe. Maybe the next generation is workplace drama. I said that Deep Space Nine suffered from nothing ever happening. Oh, but in any case, and I guess apparently things do happen enough that people are captivated by. Alright, this series. Okay, so there it is.

**Heather** 11:53

There it is. Hey, Bo, thanks so much for your work. I've been puzzling for a while why there are almost zero woke debates held anywhere you think they would want to get their messages out? Thanks, Tim. They can't do it, though. They'd be terrible at it.

**Bret** 12:06

Yeah, they it is inherently a terrible position. Because the thing is, maybe debate is the wrong term. But a dialectic is predicated on the idea that there is some truth to discover and wokeness is predicated on the idea that there isn't and so it's a it's a mismatch. I will

**Heather** 12:26

sooner want to engage in sword fighting. Of course, they I'm sure they can't do that either.

**Bret** 12:31

Right? Yes, no. Doing things is not their strong suit. No. destroying things made

**Heather** 12:36

doing things and thinking things both not so much.

**Bret** 12:38

Right? So I will point people again to the the braver angels podcast with john wood, Jr. and Bob Woodson, and I don't want to Newsome I don't know. I hope I have it. Right. I hope I have not embarrassingly pulled a name from somewhere else.

**Heather** 12:59

I've done that before here. Now,

**Bret** 13:00

I hope I didn't. But in any case, if you look for Bob Woodson, you will find I think it's Duke Newsome as the counterpart. And there is a very good debate between a an ID W Style person and Bob Woodson and Duke on the other side as a high up in BLM and john wood Jr, as moderator and it does give you a sense for how these things go. And I must say, it goes about as as you would expect. Well,

**Heather** 13:33

I mean, interestingly, actually, our introduction to john wood, Jr. was when he moderated a debate put on by the bridging the divide, I think it's called organization based here in Portland, between us and two people who were representing the the work side, and there is audio and poor quality video of that to somewhere out there in the world. Yep. And I mean, john, it was our introduction to john, he's, he's extraordinary as a moderator and that sort of situation and, you know, doesn't let anyone sink but lets people sink themselves when, when that's what's going to happen.

**Bret** 14:09

When that is warranted? Yes.

**Heather** 14:12

All right. Next question. Last question. Final question from Episode 43. A great deal of businesses or this is more of a comment. I think a great deal of businesses here in Wisconsin seem to be owned and run by Republicans. In my experience, those of us who are left of center have had to tread carefully sometimes even fearful of repercussions for speaking up. Many of us have to listen to far right lib tard type rhetoric by superiors and are subject to them making business decisions based on their and ran beliefs. It's intense and impacts us as much as those who limit being on the right while working liberally on companies. Right. Question mark?

**Bret** 14:46

Yeah,

**Heather** 14:47

yeah, I imagine it is. So this is. I think this is fascinating, actually, because we know you know, as as liberals who were in academia for many years It is well documented that anecdotally there is no denying it. That academia is so liberal, that to be conservative, there would be very, very hard indeed. And I think the same is true of media and of Hollywood and of many other kinds of organizations as well. But that small business might well have the opposite bias. And basically, what is being what Sharon is pointing to here is that anytime you're in a, a tiny minority, where the majority is so certain of the widespread acceptance of its politics, it's, it's hard to sit on your hands, and it can make you stronger, it will make you better at actually responding to the arguments from their side, because you're surrounded by them all the time. I think part of what's going on, on the woke left is that these are people largely, you know, the privileged among them were schooled in colleges and universities, where there has been effectively no conservative presence for so long. They've never heard the arguments against what they're saying. Now, of course, I would also argue that we as you know, actual liberals would push back against the woke nonsense, but they're increasingly silencing us too. And we're, you know, we are ever rarer at universities as well, to what you know, being an exile along with many other people who are just leaving, because there's no place for us. You

**Bret** 16:23

just point to me and say, to wit, to wit, which is for half wits, yes. But so I wonder what's the

**Heather** 16:29

most people have?

**Bret** 16:30

It's not bad, I wasn't gonna complain, I just wanted to point out in passing? Sure. So I would say, I have been trying to catalyze something that I have occasionally called the founding of your other left. And the idea that

**Heather** 16:48

other left, what the other left, yeah, your other left.

**Bret** 16:53

So the thing is, I'm now seeing increasing awareness on the right, and amongst many people I respect on the right, a relief and a happiness at discovering that there are people who will proudly proclaim themselves as on the left who are making sense that are not crazy. And so in any case, I do think that this is a slow battle, but that what really needs to happen is those of us who are part of this, this old, intellectual left tradition that still you know, has pockets of of life, that those of us who belong to that need to be clear enough about who we are and why we are there, that it does begin to dawn on all of those who have been dismissing the left, you know, with this mind numbing, lib, tard rhetoric that they are they become aware that it actually it is not so simple. And you know, many people Ben Shapiro, Greg gutfeld, and Tucker, Carlson, all of these folks have registered that actually, there's a necessity of the left, and what I'm hoping

**Heather** 18:05

Oh, and that's not totally absent. Right?

**Bret** 18:08

The the vestiges are there, it's just being drowned out by something that isn't left at all, it's quite illiberal. But ultimately, we need to have a discussion about what the left got, right? What the right got, right, and how we are now living, the benefits of the tension between these two things. And frankly, I think people will be surprised if they do an honest accounting of just how much the left has been correct about historically speaking

**Heather** 18:41

now and one of one of the things and what you said that's so important is the idea of tension that one of the many reasons that utopia is a, a dangerous fiction and can never happen is that any versions of utopia I've ever heard of, imagine a life without strife a life without tension. And tension is the thing that both provides meaning and a force to strive against and and allows things from descending into total chaos on either side of the spectrum. And that's what we're seeing as the you know, for instance, as the the protests in the street are allowed to do whatever they want with no pushback at all from the would be leadership it's just revealing itself evermore with every week as more insane and you know, it's not that it's I think, becoming more insane it's just able to reveal itself as more and more of the insane thing that it's always been

**Bret** 19:33

Yeah. And in fact, I did not get around to showing in the first hour that data was collected by actually a an organization that's based here in Portland has a washington dc office. data was collected that reveals that there is essentially very little support out here we have it. Do you

**Heather** 19:53

want to share it? Sure. Zachary

**Bret** 19:58

All right. So no entity d h m research. Scroll down take a look at some of the charts. That one can't go on. Okay, so approval of the protests is a you need to show that you need to scroll up a little more. There you go.

**Heather** 20:19

So this is Oregon, Oregon, Oregonians who were surveyed disagree. 51 51% of Oregonians who were surveyed disagree that President Trump has done an appropriate job with regard to response to the protests. But 39 our disagree strongly rather. But if you include disagree strongly and somewhat disagree, a majority of Oregonians feel that Trump, Governor Brown and Mayor Wheeler all have done a pretty

**Bret** 20:47

poor job, pretty poor job and the

**Heather** 20:49

response in terms of Portland Police officers is far more far more varied. Yes,

**Bret** 20:54

it is. And it's a confusing one I wouldn't know how to answer that because I don't think the Portland Police have done a very they have a bit allow it but they haven't been allowed

**Heather** 21:01

to do more. Yeah, keep going. Some of these are hard to interpret at first pass.

**Bret** 21:09

So scroll up a little more. Oh, sorry. Yeah. Yeah. prove a level of Portland protests in Oregon 52% strongly disagree with the protest.

**Heather** 21:24

Yeah, so Tri County is basically the Portland metro area. It's gonna be what melanoma, Clackamas and Washington, yeah. Okay.

**Bret** 21:33

Even in the Willamette Valley Valley, which

**Heather** 21:35

is the bigger bigger area that we live in. But you know, when you include strongly disagree and somewhat disagree, you have a strong majority, even in the Tri County area that are saying, Yeah, these protests are not anything that we are interested in. Yep. playing along with anymore. More gone. Okay.

**Bret** 21:52

Oh, ongoing protests are helpful or harmful to black Portlanders.

**Heather** 21:58

Now before so this is black Portlanders answering, isn't it? Or no,

**Bret** 22:03

no.

**Heather** 22:04

Okay.

**Bret** 22:04

I think this is too Okay. Yeah, to race relations, right. So there is 31% believe that the protests are very harmful to black Portlanders 17% say somewhat harmful. 38% believe it is very harmful to race relations. 15% say somewhat harmful. efforts to make police reforms 32% very 17% somewhat so a lot of skepticism about these protests keep going. Here we go. Are the protests and violent

**Heather** 22:42

riots ended the choice

**Bret** 22:45

56% of people think they're mostly violent, which I would agree they are if they reliably turn to violence, they are mostly violent.

**Heather** 22:54

It really i mean this is gonna sound clintonian, but it kind of depends on what your definition of mostly is. As you know, as all of these things well, right. I agree. But like if you're if you're doing a kind of like, ether gram and you know every 30 seconds looking and going like I'm gonna record violent or not not violent, Okay, next 30 seconds violent or not, not violent. But then you get then you get garbage. You get the 93% peaceful 93% peaceful so what is mostly violent mean, you know, but if you take it by day, it depends on your, your, your interval of recording, right? Like, how many days of protests have been violent? Oh, mostly violent, actually. But yeah,

**Bret** 23:27

this is a test of something different. So I agree, you can define these things, and you can get any answer you want. But that's part of the point is that that's exactly what's been done to us. And when you ask people, you know, common parlance is this mostly peaceful or mostly violent? 56% of average saved mostly violent by whatever the intuitive definition of this is, and I think they're absolutely right. So anyway, we don't need to go all the way through this report. And we

**Heather** 23:53

should probably get back to the questions Yeah.

**Bret** 23:55

So let's let's do that.

**Heather** 24:00

Okay, next question from the discord server, and then we will get to the questions from today. you've discussed historical examples of fascism and communism, Mao's China, the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Venezuela, Chile, etc. are there historical examples where the madness was defeated before became catastrophic from these what lessons can we learn and apply to our current circumstances?

**Bret** 24:26

It's this is a very hard question

**Heather** 24:28

to answer they knew this was going to be hard apparently Douglas Murray was asked this question recently on trigonometry and yeah, also at are done with it.

**Bret** 24:36

I think I think the reason that it's hard is that if something avoids being what one fears that it is going to turn into, then there's no way to distinguish between whether it was never headed to be that and people were catastrophizing or nothing or whether they successfully beat back the danger,

**Heather** 24:55

the history, it will be hard to write the history that says we beat this thing. before it got bad, yeah. And there will be at least as many histories written that say it wasn't the thing they thought it was going to be.

**Bret** 25:07

Yeah. And you know, there's also the possibility in some cases that something that was headed to someplace very bad went somewhere bad, but it could have been way worse. And so how do you rank that? So I don't know. I

**Heather** 25:20

don't I mean, just in terms of the actual question, I don't I don't know enough history to come up with things that might might look like what we're describing now. But I imagine that there would be lessons to be learned. Yeah.

**Bret** 25:34

It's a great question. Yeah. The methodology is the tough part.

**Heather** 25:39

Okay. religions and secular faiths, such as social justice are subcategories of one socio cognitive phenomenon. narrative. dog was dogmas, United group against others. Excuse me. dogmas, United group against others was shared epistemology and morality and central narrative. Thoughts?

**Bret** 26:03

Are some categories. socio cognitive phenomena? darkness. dogmas. United group? Yeah, I mean, I think loosely speaking, that's about right. And you know, it's true.

**Heather** 26:16

I'm not sure it's i guess i wonder dogmas, United group against others was shared epistemology, morality and central narrative. I wonder that might be the the three things that are actually defining. I'd want to think more about whether or not you could simplify those leaders that collapse to one or two variables? Or is are there more things that define what a dogma is? That are not on that list? I'm not sure. Yeah, I'm not sure if anything is missing, or if it can be simplified.

**Bret** 26:45

And it may also be in some sense, overdrawn? Because we see the same phenomenon inside of scientific disciplines. Right, a particular school of thought will take over. And it's not entirely clear to me that it doesn't actually share morality with the schools of thought that are driven out that it just wins temporarily. Some, some game over publications or something.

**Heather** 27:14

Well, but maybe I mean, the argument then I think, would be that that doesn't, it's not. No, no, it's actually right. I was gonna say that's not a secular faith, but this person is defining a dogma as a bigger group than religious and secular faiths. that's those are subcategories.

**Bret** 27:32

Yeah, yeah.

**Heather** 27:36

No, I actually I think you're I think morality at least, is a sometimes variable, but not always in one dog is

**Bret** 27:43

another. Although it's possible based on the way the question is written that the morality is don't have to differ, right? You can be united with your, your foes

**Heather** 27:53

in a dog, it doesn't have to be the thing that defines you against others. It just has to be the thing that helps you define in group. Yeah. Yeah. Okay, next question. accepting that the plural of anecdote isn't data. What role can or may anecdotes play, if any, in analysis, particularly repeated and are highly translatable anecdotes, or analyzing qualitative rather than quantitative circumstances? I wanted to pull something up actually, if you want to reframe and I want to pull something out or if

**Bret** 28:22

the, the sense of the danger of anecdotes is way over drawn, and in some sense, it is designed by the same people who are constantly wielding, you know, the data is king, what did the data say? data driven research, these sorts of things, which sound right, you know, it sounds sophisticated, to be skeptical of anecdotes. And it is It sounds very sophisticated to say that the multiple of anecdote is not data. On the other hand, first of all, in a complex system, when you do observation, you are observing anecdotes, that's how you get to a hypothesis that's worthy of test. And so let's just say if anecdote exists in the observational phase of scientific research, it's perfectly legitimate, and it just simply travels by a different name. So in any case, there are certain things that are deployed to keep a powerful group powerful, and this is one of them. So I would say correlation implies causation when it's preceded by a properly predictive hypothesis, despite what you've been told. And anecdote is a very important source of information about a system it is not in and of itself a test of a hypothesis. Though it can be used as a spot check, right? You can have a hypothesis for some reason. And then you can check it against the anecdotes in your head and say Actually, I don't believe that hypothesis, because I know Six instances in which they would have gone a different way, each of which were anecdotes

**Heather** 30:04

you can falsify with anecdote. Yep. So yeah, what I wanted to say I can't find the actual paper. But there's a reading that I used to give from Barbara Smuts who's, who was on my doctoral committee. And one of the important researchers in baboon behavior and specifically, who focused on female baboon behavior. And in her book sex and friendship and baboons, she wrote a bit about basically, the the kinds of data that you take in the field. And so I just went looking into my methodology, behavioral methodology lectures that I would give to students before I sent them out to try to start to become animal behaviorist, I don't find it there. But there, she has a sort of a taxonomy of, of course, the kind of thing that you can see over and over again, between individuals. And also keep track of the context on what you saw them are the things that we look for when we are going to apply statistical analysis to the data. But there are two other categories of things. And I don't, I just don't have in my head, and I can't pull it up here. Some of which happen occasionally. But under such dissimilar circumstances that you couldn't that even though you might have 10 instances, you still can't apply statistics to them, because you know that they're the same, but they're not the same enough. And then some of what you may actually just see once or twice, and so there was no expectation that you would actually be able to apply statistics and therefore, you know, you can and if you can't apply statistics, we basically don't call it data, except that and you know, if it's only one offer too often, we tend to call it anecdote, but over in trying to understand behavior, land over and animal behavior land, the rarest things are often the most explanatory and certainly the most exciting. So, you know, we know that chimps sometimes wage war on one another, because Jane Goodall saw it happen once over an extended period of days, but it's one, I think it was a, I think it was a visioning group, that then drew a line in the sand effectively and fight it with one and fight it, fight it, and then and then fought with one another. And similarly, you will find, you know, just other kinds of territorial takeovers, or sexual takeovers, or either the entrepreneur groups or the replacement of an alpha or, or defense by females, by usurping male against infanticide. You know, these sorts of things happen rarely enough that you may not have enough data. But once you see it, if you're out there trying to understand animals, you then have a very different model of what it is that's happening and what's driving them. It's the rare event that often is explanatory. And no, we can't plug it into stats, but it will be the thing that informs our understanding, maybe more than, and today, they've forged again,

**Bret** 32:50

right? Once upon a time, back before we became so stupid, we used to know this, right? used to tell you about us know, we are trying to opt out of stupid, it's sometimes a full time job, but but you know, it used to be that natural history was understood to be a scientifically valid pursuit, and in fact, a very important one. And the fact is the, you know, the data driven science people have, among other things, they've driven out theory, and they've driven out natural history. So used to be you saw something remarkable, like, I once saw what I believe to be a woodpecker riding on the back of a crow. What was amazing were deeply lake in, in some legs in eastern Washington. But in any case, right, but I also saw a moose there, right? In the desert, right? So here's the thing. There used to be a thing called a natural history note where you saw something was unmistakable what you saw and you documented as much about what it was that you saw and then you just simply reported it so that everybody would have the benefit of effectively having seen the same thing. Well, actually, I

**Heather** 34:05

published one of these I published one of these with regard to let's see, I could have done to which one did I publish Ah, with regard to my frogs in Madagascar at one point I'm sitting there watching this marked population of I've tattooed them so I know who all the individuals are. And I've got a couple of fights going on with a very active, fascinating little poisonous frogs. And up from the leaf litter comes a boa and grabs one of the female frogs I knew I knew the frogs, and this is a female, and all all the talking in the landscape stops all the males stop talking and they all kind of everyone kind of slinks off and this Boa kind of chews on the frog for 1015 minutes. spits it out. This frog then goes on to become a mother because I'm tracking her she's tattooed. I know I see her engage in courtship and lay an egg and feeds her tadpoles and she she she ends up fine and this Boa is no Longer around after that day, learn its lesson but that's one time. Yeah, that's one time I've got one anecdotes fascinating, but it is actually a natural history note and I don't know her but a logika, Journal of herpetology, something. Yep. So these things do still exist, but they're rare

**Bret** 35:15

and rare. They're rare. And they're not looked at with the same kind of reverence that a database paper is, but from the point of view of actually understanding nature, man, give me a natural story, who knows what they're doing any day, right? These these people have understood something deep. And it's Dan Jansen, the famous tropical biologist, who once said, a biologist dies with 90% of what he knows, right takes it to the grave. And this is unfortunate because in some sense, what a biologist accumulates over or a naturalist accumulates over a lifetime of watching creatures is really very valuable stuff. And it's just impossible to record all of the things that you've come to understand by all of the anecdotes you've encountered.

**Heather** 36:01

Absolutely. I mean, it's actually part of probably a small part, but part of why you and I find this situation that's going on outside right now so troubling, that we both create sense of our world by going out into it and reflecting on the changing of the seasons and the plants and the birds and and you know, everything that's happening just in our immediate vicinity, and being really unable to spend more than a few minutes outside even while masked, we don't have any in 95 masks. But even while masked without feeling, you know, white at risk at the moment, puts us at such a remove from an ability to interact with anything that isn't us or what we've created right here is incredibly restricting.

**Bret** 36:47

Yeah, it is it's turned us is turned our world into a all social one, which is something we seek to avoid most of the time, not that we avoid all social stuff, but we avoid

**Heather** 36:55

this we don't like

**Bret** 36:56

each other very much. Now we avoid the elite social pneus of the world in any way. It's been enforced by Yep.

**Heather** 37:06

All right. Do you have any left leaning critiques of Kennedy's how to be an anti racist kids element, my kids elementary school emailed about staff commitment to equity and anti racism. I only hear bad but my feeds trend conservative I want support the ideology with my dollars by buying the book to verify. Yeah, I've I've I've mentioned it a couple of times, and I don't remember which episodes, but it's going to be fairly recent, probably in the 40s. I've talked about some of my objections to his book, and I have not been reading it for the last few days, but I got about halfway through and I intend to finish it and provide more, more formal critique, like I did for the Angelo's white fragility. But the the main one, I guess, is that he sets up a false dichotomy. He coined the term anti racist, he defines it to mean those who seek equality of outcome. And he then redefines racist to mean anything that's not anti racist, which means you are racist in his worldview, if you do not seek equality of outcome, and equality of outcome is, you know, broadly understood, at least it was until yesterday, academically speaking, to be a goal that is neither honorable, nor liberal nor obtainable. So he's setting us up for failure. And you know, what I've said is, I'm anti anti racist, and No, that doesn't make me racist.

**Bret** 38:39

Yep. Yes, it. Let's just put it this way. It's a pity in some sense that you don't have a copy. I understand why I don't want to buy a copy. But yeah, the logic that is apparent as it proceeds is so obvious that you know, it's not a liberal or conservative objection. It's just an objection on the basis that this doesn't add up.

**Heather** 39:00

Yeah, no, and I mean, I should save this for when I when and if I do do the formal takedown, but there's a there's a point in chapter 10, where he reports on himself in college candy does as, frankly such a racist that he believed enough to say to his college professor, that he'd figured out what's wrong with white people and that the problem is that white people or aliens and is professor to his credit says, Hi, and he doesn't say that, but you know, what is wrong with you? And, and candy sort of resolves? Oh, yeah, I guess it doesn't make sense. I guess we can breed together like this is this is the rejoinder from the professor. You read

**Bret** 39:47

it to me. And if I misunderstood it, the professor tells him that can't be right, because white label can interbreed, right? I can take steps. So

**Heather** 39:58

that's what I meant to convey. Just now.

**Bret** 40:00

Well, what I take out of it is that Kenny didn't get there on his own.

**Heather** 40:04

No, he did not. How could you not? And not only did he not get there on his own, he's okay. 20 year old college student, but he wrote it into this book. And this wasn't his first book, right? This is his latest book. And he'd already had a best seller. I think so this is some, this is some crackpot racism that is proudly in this book and how to be an anti racist, but but because he's redefined racist and anti racist. It's not racist. To be racist.

**Bret** 40:30

Yeah, wow. Yeah, yep.

**Heather** 40:33

Yeah. Your point about Qd as being a book is interesting. But as soon as it becomes a screenplay, everyone involved becomes suspect. Yeah. Every 11 year old who audition now has an audition tape of performing those movements that will now last forever. Yeah, that's true. Yep. What I did wonder how old the actual actresses were. Not that it makes any of this better?

**Bret** 40:58

No, it would make it better if they, it doesn't make it a lot better. Right. But if they makes it a little bit better, right, but just the thing is they're they were so young, they couldn't possibly have been adults. Yeah. So it can't be fully better. Yeah.

**Heather** 41:16

No, no way. Does it get anywhere close to?

**Bret** 41:19

Yeah, not that it would be okay. From the audience perspective. And frankly, you know, as I've said before, I don't think it's even Okay, from the perspective of, you know, titillating a bunch of old people. But still, it might be okay, with respect to the fact that an adult is allowed to make a decision to be in a role like this. And then it becomes troubling from the point of view of the people selling this thing and the audience. But yeah, but it wasn't even there. Yeah.

**Heather** 41:49

Would you agree that early Homo sapiens, evolutionary is hard time speaking today? Would you agree that early Homo sapiens, evolutionary success was due in part to our skill in addressing immediate threats like wild animals, etc? How has that played out? And how does it affect our ability to address climate change?

**Bret** 42:09

Certainly, the ability to deal with immediate threats, like wild animals is a prerequisite to our success. But I think, to the extent that you mean, evolutionary success, what do you mean is our disproportionate evolutionary success? wild, wild animals are not a sufficient explanation, because a predatory ones are sufficiently rare that they, they just simply don't explain why, you know, humans got so much smarter and more capable than other creatures that also have to deal with predators.

**Heather** 42:50

Yeah, no, not the point. I mean, this is probably a level of sort of semantics that was not intended by the question. But if we're talking about early Homo sapiens, as opposed to early hominins, that have split from the chimp lineage, but aren't yet fully homosapiens, by the time we're homosapiens, we've already gone far down the road, we've already we've already mastered fire. We, you know, a million and a half years ago, ish and homosapiens are newer than that, I think almost sapiens sapiens is newer than that. And we're already in this Well, in this sort of, cycle that dick Alexander describes between ecological dominance which is a kind of addressing immediate threats like wild animals, and the intergroup competition, which which deck and you and I have argued is going to become more and more important as we become successful and dominating our ecology. So it's really you know, the thing that is more likely to have accompanied are, for instance, rapid brain growth, brain growth, the body size ratio, brain to body size, ratio, growth, and specifically growth the prefrontal cortex has to do with the with the social stuff.

**Bret** 44:06

It's well, I wouldn't say the social stuff, I would say it has to do with other humans as both opportunities and hazards

**Heather** 44:16

and, and, and being able to look at yourself on a timeline and think back and reflect back and learn from and project forward and imagine and build narrative about both past and future.

**Bret** 44:29

All of the tools that come along with predicting what other creatures whether human creatures are going to do for the purpose of either partnering with them or challenging them, all of

**Heather** 44:38

which seem to be kind of focused in again, prefrontal cortex, which again, is also not fully developed until seems to be current neurobiological models suggest until people are in their early 20s, which is yet another reason not to imagine that children are adults and have all the capacities of adults and should be allowed to make decisions like To become hyper sexualized, or take exogenous hormones to change their sex, etc. Joe Rogan, while speaking with Tim Kennedy yesterday, in different parts of the conversation endorsed both Tulsi Gabbert and Dan Crenshaw for President. What level of conversation Have you had with Rogan about unity 20.

**Bret** 45:21

I have to keep people's identities out of the discussion. I suppose I could change their names to protect the awesome. But the problem is, this is a very complex puzzle. And lots of in order to solve the overarching puzzle of how do we get from here to actual leadership in the White House, many people have to confront their own obstacles, their own social puzzles. And so anyway, it's, you know, is it a Mexican standoff? Is it the penguins waiting at the side of the, the ice flow in order to have something that gets eaten? I'll be the one. Exactly. I don't know what the right metaphor is. But the point is, actually, what we're looking for is the thing that catalyzes the change in which a bunch of other things can fall into place. And here's the thing, if you're rooting for unity, 2020, you don't want me to tell you, you want me to leave people as safe to contemplate things as possible, which leaves me being far more ambiguous than I would like?

**Heather** 46:41

How can we know whom to trust as a source for climate science? skeptical of everything? Help? love you both? Yeah, as you should be skeptical of everything? And how can we know whom to trust as a source for climate science? This is a tough question. And I don't know if you have any names, I don't actually have any names that I trust. I just know that. There are, there are honorable and dishonorable climate scientists out there as their honourable and dishonourable. Everything's out there. And because there is a conclusion that is now the thing that is accepted, it's harder to publish evidence that counter Valles, the conclusion that said, the conclusion has so much support the broad conclusion that anthropogenic climate change is happening from so many different kinds of evidence across so many different kinds of both empirical and modeling evidence that broadly speaking, my my doubt of that conclusion is near zero. But any individual result, I am highly skeptical, even more so than of any other scientific result, because it's become so politicized. And I'll just tell I'll tell an anecdote. Financial story here. Back when we were professors at evergreen, I was on a hiring committee to hire a climate scientist, and one of our finalists. So academic job hires you do you pull three people to the shortlist. And you do a couple day, interviews on campus with them. And because it was climate science, we dragged these people out into the woods and walked around the forest with them and talked with them. One on One, and I was asking one of their candidates, one on one, about a paper that he had published and asked him why in the methods he had talked about having used five models, and it was, you know, I got all these papers that had like 20 authors on it or something. Why there had been five models that were discussed in the methods but only one of them reported in the results. And he laughed as if I was joking, and I pursued it. And then he said why I don't I don't know. That's the that's not my that's that's not what I do. I thought okay, now your your names on this paper, you're trying to get a job doing exactly this work. And you have no idea what justification there is for having said that you had put your data through five models, but only report on one. That sounds like replication crisis waiting to happen and know the guy did not get the job. But I worry that that happens too much. With the giant caveat like I started with that. Throughout since before, this is politicized, and across all sorts of domains of types of data, including places where the scientists aren't calling themselves climate scientists. The the conclusions overwhelmingly lead to the data overwhelmingly suggest the conclusion that we are plummeting towards anthropogenic climate change that may at some point become irreversible.

**Bret** 49:55

I would say James Hansen, I find him trustworthy as a human being I would say I don't trust the models, it's too easy to lie with models. If you put enough factors in them, you can make them mirror any behavior without doing so because they actually match the the causal element.

**Heather** 50:16

However, it'd be a verification as models. Yeah, it is.

**Bret** 50:19

models can be used to predict things that you might go check empirically, but they can't be used as an empirical check. But what I would say is, the that which we know for sure, is already enough to worry, a great deal. co2 and methane trap heat from the sun. We've known this for more than 100 years, the fact that both of those molecules are rising in their density in the atmosphere, also known to be true, that that will have some effect is certain how much of the effect, we can disagree, because it's in a complex system. However, the important thing to track is that the the danger that one hits a threshold point at which, for example, the release of frozen methane clathrates from the Arctic, kicks us into a phase in which we no longer have any control over temperature, because you get a positive feedback where the temperature goes up that unfreezes, these frozen methane molecules, they are quickly released, that raises the temperature further, which unfreezes more and you get a positive feedback, that thing is not something you need to detect from here. In fact, you won't detect it until it's too late. Right? You can detect that there are these bursts of methane in the Arctic, which we've now seen, what we don't have is really good baseline data on whether that's happening all the time. But there is reason the yamo craters, which I pointed to in Siberia, tell us that there are new geological processes going on that appear to be the result of sudden releases of methane. So what we know is, there's a whole hell of a lot of methane up there that could come flooding out all of a sudden, and could take this question entirely out of human control, right? We don't know where that threshold is, it could could happen this evening.

**Heather** 52:19

Fires could be the thing that do it, right, the release of carbon from these fires are no idea

**Bret** 52:24

where we are relative to that threshold. And we know that it's out there. And you know, the day that it happens, it's not going to make the news, nobody's going to know that it happened. But there's a day at which this no longer is under human control. So the point is, given what we can say for sure, the rational course is to say we are playing with something very dangerous, the downstream consequences are potentially absolutely catastrophic for humanity, the solutions to these things are likely to be highly generative. And here's the hitch. If we were to solve these problems, it would threaten the business models of many established businesses. That's why we don't do it. It's not that it would make life horrible for us to solve these things. In fact,

**Heather** 53:04

a little bit more some of you hid, you buried a little bit, you said, you know, solving these problems could itself the solutions could be generative. Yeah, like the solutions could actually be good for individual humans and the economy. What it won't be good for is the established organizations that have already made a business in the old economy,

**Bret** 53:27

right. And in fact, you can see this by projecting backwards. We've been talking about, you know, carbon tax forever, right? A substantial carbon tax. Now, carbon tax has a cost and economic cost of substantial. But if 25 years ago, or 30 years ago, we had seen this coming. And we had instituted a moderate tax then which had driven the innovations in battery technology that we have seen, right? All sorts of things that we all regard as awesome about the modern world would have happened earlier, what hasn't regulation

**Heather** 53:59

is supposed to do, right? incentivize you to limit the next the negative externalities that you impose on the world

**Bret** 54:05

right now, the key thing would have been and frankly, we were the country that dragged our heels, but the key thing to do would have been to partner with other nations so that we would not have been at a disadvantage for instituting that carbon tax, we could have had that the cost distributed in a fair way. So the point is innovation of a kind. That's great, right? You don't want to breathe, exhaust, right. Frankly, I was using an electric chainsaw. Just earlier this week, electric chainsaw, it's pretty darn good, right? It's not loud. It doesn't put out exhaust or all sorts of advantages. And the point is, it hasn't been plausible until recently because the battery technology has been lagging. So if you can solve the economic competition problem, and you can get everybody to share their bit of the burden, and you are not constrained to protecting currently successful businesses, you can do great things and So where are we to address climate change? It's getting late. But where are we to address it? We would be living in a time when there was plenty to do for innovators, because we would have to figure out how to do lots of things that we already do in some new and better way. And so the point is, that's a lot of good jobs. Yeah. So anyway, that's the pitch.

**Heather** 55:20

Let's try to get through a few more of these before sweat switching, hypothetical for 1000. generations, a lineage of isolated humans were masks to hide from natural ills, we did not, we experienced all else the same, we meet them, their immune systems are stronger or weaker than ours.

**Bret** 55:39

Well, I hesitate with these stronger or weaker immune system things. But I think in some sense, we know the answer here, because the germs in guns, germs and steel are the result of the fact that Europeans who came to the new world or in some sense the beneficiaries of confrontations with germs that they had already had. And the reason that it was Europeans who had those confrontations with germs, was that the domestic couple animals were highly concentrated in Asia. And because Asia is it is longitudinally laid out, the migration of those animals into Europe, was unimpeded. And so the point was, it was the close contact with pigs and cattle and other large domestic little creatures that caused Europeans to have already had experience that made them durable with respect to many germs. So most germs and the most deadly ones impacted natives of the New World, rather than Conquistadores having brought back deadly diseases from the New World.

**Heather** 56:52

Yeah. So I mean, there's two, there's two questions in one question here. And you can't, you can't do both at once, because you have to control for one. And obviously, it's a hypothetical that can't be done. But so you know, Old World meets new world is, you know, a story of allopatric. How could we ask this question with sympatric, which is to say, two populations living side by side, one of whom is masked, one of whom is not, wherein they are being exposed to the same stuff, except the people with masks are presumably getting exposed less. What, what then, might be the distinction after 1000 generations, between simply being exposed to fewer airborne and aerosolized pathogens, versus more? I could I could see it going. Either way. Frankly, it depends on exactly what pathogens were were met, right? Like the the pathogen, the deadly pathogen that that you are saved from because you're wearing a mask that otherwise wipes you out, is obviously you're better off if you're masked, over 1000 generations, protecting yourself from every single thing that is that is out there might make you less resilient when something flips a vector model for instance, it moves into say, contact transmission rather than aerosol transmission.

**Bret** 58:28

I don't think so. And the reason I don't think so is because of carrying capacity. So if you've got these two populations, let's make them sympatric so they're living in the same place. But you expose one of them to more pathogens, and some of them die that selection for immunity and it will leave a population that has that immunity in its wake, whereas the unexposed or less exposed population will have undergone less selection so it's not just the immunity that comes from the individual having encountered the pathogen that informs their immune system it's this selection that favors immunity towards those pathogens so

**Heather** 59:07

by the same logic that if you don't finish your course of antibiotics the bacteria that you leave are stronger and more resistant to antibiotics in the future the population that was that was what not wearing the masks or wearing the mask Which way did your story go

**Bret** 59:23

the population that was not wearing the masks will be stronger at the end of that selective

**Heather** 59:28

Yeah, that's that image so that's consistent I think with what I was saying as well. So what that was you know the the obvious place to go then if if we were in conversation with with Jeffrey who who asked No, it's different with Michael who asked the question would be okay then that what timescale does mask wear and make sense like if if if 1000 generation timescale mask where I might make a population weaker? At what time scale doesn't make sense. And I think part of the answer is going to be that for individuals, no, no individual wants to die of this thing. So at the population level, you might end up with a stronger population. But individuals all want to survive,

**Bret** 1:00:13

right? And so really what you're comparing is for the individual, the cost of getting sick, and the risk of dying from being sick, versus the cost of being naive and naive to the pathogen, the pathogen. And the problem is that the benefit to being naive to the pet pathogen is effectively zero. Yeah, so the bed not sick is substantial.

**Heather** 1:00:43

So and that fits with this, of filling the bucket model of exposure, right? You don't, you're not actually looking for zero exposure at all. Yep, you're looking for a little bit of exposure, occasionally, over time, such that your immune system can can maybe, you know, taste it and get a sense of what it is.

**Bret** 1:01:06

Well, you know, I see a lot of people playing with this idea that low exposure to COVID, for example, might produce some sort of immunity. It's very hard to demonstrate that this is true, of course. But it's it's plausible.

**Heather** 1:01:19

And it's consistent with the idea that apparently I don't I don't have it pulled up. So I can't show you guys. But there's some recent work suggesting that mask wears mask wears compared to non mass squares and otherwise identical situations have lower, less severe symptoms when they contract COVID. And so that, again, is suggestive of the sort of density dependent model of virulence disease. Okay, critical race theory is spreading rapidly through public school systems, corporations and even military schools. What does the United States look like if these advocates get what they want? It kind of looks like the streets of Portland. Well, it

**Bret** 1:02:05

looks like have failed state because we know that this is not a proper recipe for being able to compete with others. And therefore anything that succumbs to this will be vulnerable in competition to anything that resists it. And that goes for nations. any nation that doesn't do this will be at advantage over nations that do this, any school of engineering that doesn't do it will produce, you know, higher quality graduates etc. So seems pretty straightforward.

**Heather** 1:02:36

All right. Um, several more before we switch because many of these are comments. Love you both will be awesome to see Brett and Eric host a roundtable with pro Trump libertarians such as Candace Owens and Stefan Molyneux to build steel around the cases for and against as well as sow seeds to hashtag heal the divide. Don't just let you let you grimace at the screen and go on to the next. Well,

**Bret** 1:03:00

I get into trouble when I talk about Canvas. I don't trust canvas. I don't I don't think Let Me Be careful about this. Many of the things Canvas says are right. The question is why does Canvas save them? And I would love to believe that Canvas is growing up and becoming more nuanced, but I don't really see that.

**Heather** 1:03:27

I think the best model to describe left versus right is as explored versus unexplored territory. Conservatives. So but except that's reversed, I think so I'm gonna read it the way I think this person means that I think the best model to describe left versus right is as unexplored versus explored territory. Conservatives seek to preserve what's established, but can sometimes stagnate. Whereas liberals push new bounds but sometimes go too far. And that's, that's quite right. It's quite good. A comment, please talk with David Friedman, law professor, economist, theoretical physicist, oddly shunned by their libertarians because he's such a principal scientific thinker. That's a claim, maybe that's why he shunned could be tragically underappreciated genius needs to be part of the conversation. I don't know the name, do you know, have no last question here? And then we'll skip to the ones from this hour? Do western states need to radically change their forestry management to combat the symptom of climate change? Or will that just make it worse? Are we missing pragmatic leadership versus just blame games? Yeah,

**Bret** 1:04:32

there's a lot of room for clever improvements on what we've got. And unfortunately, we have a dearth of leadership and possibly a dearth of insight where it needs to be but yes, we could be doing a whole heck of a lot better.

**Heather** 1:04:46

Yeah. So Zack, I don't see a line here, but I think I'm at 30 set, right? Oh, I forgot. No, I think I think I got it. Yeah, so the militant moderate is sort of filling in for us here on when Joe Rogan in Episode 1535 says that he likes Tulsi feels like she was cancelled by the DNC and then says later, I love Dan Crenshaw, that's another guy who should run for president.

**Bret** 1:05:18

Yeah, Tulsi and Dan, that's a cool idea. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:05:21

Never heard that before. With new waves of immigrants. With new with new waves of immigrants, the first mixed a couple of seem to be newcomers men and women who've been on the territory longer a generation later couples of newcomers are couples or newcomers women and established men? Is that a pattern? And if so, how would you explain it? So coming to this, this is unintentionally sort of telegraphic, Li written or telepathically written? Because of the limits on characters? what the question is arguing, I believe, is the observation is that new in new waves of immigrants, when you have couples, between the newcomers and the established people, I don't know if this means establish people from the immigrant country or from the new country. Early on the mix couples seem to be that men are the newcomers and women who've been on the territory longer. And then later on a few generations later, when it's mixed couples, it's women who are new, and men who have been on the territory for longer. And

**Bret** 1:06:37

I'm confused by what you said. And I don't quite get it. When you have a an immigrant population, the initial couples tend to be mixed couples, right? those couples tend to be resident men and newcomer women.

**Heather** 1:06:58

Yeah, but I think actually, it means from the old country, but they've just been there longer. So not resident of, you know, if we were talking about, for instance, Jamaican immigrants to the US, right? We're the claim isn't American women and Jamaican men, it's the other way around. It's no, it's Jamaican women from three generations ago who've been here for longer and the newcomer Jamaican men, so it's not about you know, European descended Americans. It's about, it's about the immigrant population in all cases, but how long you've been in country? So

**Bret** 1:07:38

I don't think I get it.

**Heather** 1:07:40

I understand the question, but I don't. And I've seen that I did see this question once before on our private q&a, and I didn't, I didn't go to it, because I don't recognize it as a pattern. So I would want to I would want to see some evidence of it actually being a pattern before I tried to do some sort of like an adaptive arm waving explanation for why it might be true, because it's never occurred to me that it was true. And I'm not saying it's not, I just have never seen it. And I've never, I've never thought to look for it. And I've seen it before,

**Bret** 1:08:09

I think your interpretation is wrong. I think what it means is, when you have an immigrant population, to an existing population, that the first couplings into racial couplings will tend to be those men who are from the home population, and women who are from the immigrant population.

**Heather** 1:08:35

You disagree that that's the I think you got it backwards.

**Bret** 1:08:38

So I think that's the I think that's the way it is. And I think that no, I think

**Heather** 1:08:41

so. So there's two different possible interpretations. I don't so you are, I just don't think we should spend more time here. But I think you've got it backwards from what she has said here. And then there's an interpretation that you and I have different that's it's about immigrant men versus native women versus immigrant men versus longer ago immigrant women. So the that's the point of disagreement between you and me, but then I think you just sort of reversed the the hypothesis here in addition, so that we need more clarification and even just evidence, because the idea of trying to come up with why a pattern that may or may not exist, does exist, is not maybe dangerous, but kind of fruitless and not that useful. An exercise, I would say. Supporting the duopoly creates a dystopian future where evil robots rule the land. They can't master time travel, but they can make technology glitch. Get a flux capacitor and your problem will be solved. You're welcome. Or

**Bret** 1:09:41

a p 30. A month later unit. What we could get one to blow up the earth.

**Heather** 1:09:46

I was that is that from Bugs Bunny,

**Bret** 1:09:48

Mars. Marvin the Martian? Yeah. Right. Yeah. Or Flux Capacitor would

**Heather** 1:09:54

be all right. Yeah, it seems like that's probably more likely to be available.

**Bret** 1:09:57

Yes, nearby. While we're on the glitch question several People suggested that we get a Why am I forgetting the term for a yes spectrum analyzer but what what are the details of the object that we need to buy? If you know yeah please put it in the chat

**Heather** 1:10:13

you can just put it in chat because I think is looking at the chat at the moment. Yeah. Given escalating strife Is it possible for the United States to consciously uncouple and form separate entities and countries a lot of the USSR love you guys okay, you made me laugh by using consciously uncouple here can the US consciously uncouple I don't think so.

**Bret** 1:10:39

No, that's that's the biggest problem here is that there's just no geographical resolution to be had which doesn't mean that it won't come apart into

**Heather** 1:10:47

I mean, there have I mean, there's there's always talk about California sedang or the West Coast us eating or Texas seceding.

**Bret** 1:10:53

The cities can secede from the States, right

**Heather** 1:10:57

like except what is the West Coast is even going to look like because actually other than a 50 mile strip along the coasts, the politics of inland West are very different from coastal West

**Bret** 1:11:09

restaurants and urban and rural so I think the point is sorry that that dog ain't gonna hot so we need to figure well It ain't enough Yeah, so I do think we simply need to figure out how not to go down that road because anybody who's imagining that we're going to get some kind of workable divorce out of this is missing the geographical point.

**Heather** 1:11:42

Have you heard the song The greatest show on earth by nightwish? It is about evolution of features Dawkins? I have not have you Nope. Okay. Master's in physics student here Brett Is there any way to nudge your brother into publishing for rigorous scrutiny is geometric unity love from Texas?

**Bret** 1:12:02

There are those who could but they are not of this earth. Now, but the dude wants to publish he does he's busy and there are hazards in the way but to the extent that there is hunger for this thing I think it would nothing would please Eric more than than to publish this stuff and so I do I I expect to see it soon because I think the the world is becoming more hospitable to the possibility of such a thing emerging from the quadrant that is Eric

**Heather** 1:12:41

the whole families on the podcast someone there we got got a substantial representation here we got half of the of the organisms who have names who live in our house. Yeah, on on air ish, the dogs below our feet here. And Fairfax is in my lap. Perhaps I get that, right. Yes, half. There are eight of us who live here for non human animals and for humans. Thoughts on Disney thinking government agencies responsible for propaganda hiding. Remind me how to process or gear. This word? Oh, we spelled Right, right. We are camps in there. I don't even know how to pronounce this Disney film Milan, Milan, Milan. We lived in Michigan for a while and they pronounced Milan, Milan. So now whenever I see this word, I have no idea. And I don't think that's how the Disney film either announced,

**Bret** 1:13:36

say line saline

**Heather** 1:13:40

or something like that. Yeah, I think it's Milan, actually, which is not what this word says. Okay, so I don't know how to pronounce these words anyway, but I'm a speller. And so once I don't know how to pronounce them, and they're not spelled the right, which is like all bets are off. That's my excuse. The question is basically, do you have thoughts on Disney thanking government agencies? Who are responsible for propaganda, hiding these camps in credits of some film? Also, are there any meaningful differences between the Chinese Communist Party and Nazi Germany at this point, they both seem to have ethnic concentration camps, centralized autocracies, and are expanding along questionable claims of historical ethnic ties. Example includes Examples include Mongolia and Indian border currently. So I don't I don't really know anything about the Disney story. I have sort of memories of it, but I just can't speak to that. What about CCP and and Nazi Germany?

**Bret** 1:14:33

Yeah, I don't think we want to leap to the Nazi comparison too early. The fact is, we do not, as far as I know have evidence of the systematic extermination of the weaker. We have evidence of concentration camps, we have evidence of organ harvesting, for sterilization. So these things are really really terrible without rising quite the law. of all of the Nazi a systematic extermination of Jews, homosexuals. Jehovah's Witnesses, gypsies. Right? So it's not I mean, look, this shows the signs of a situation that does head that direction. But lets you know, if we leap to that conclusion too early, then we lose the ability to level that charge when it is apt. So there's plenty of room for evil below that threshold. Yep.

**Heather** 1:15:37

So I can't tell if this is our screen or something. Doctor, can you figure out what that says? Doctor dot h. or lowercase? p? Yeah. So I don't know if that's supposed to be an S might be an S. So in which case would be Dr. Sue? Doctor Who with a maybe that's supposed to be a diacritical? Mark? And of course, you you do want allow that doctor, someone who Sue set on Jerry, equality does not mean symmetry. That is absolutely true. That has me rethinking my views on feminism. According to you, what is the equality that you should aim for? Could people then argue women don't deserve certain rights because you don't, because you don't have certain capacities as men. So I think, equality under the law, and equality in terms of outcome and ability are different. And we are a liberal worldview, a democratic worldview suggests that equality under the law is something that we should all have, and that we must strive for 100% that is a place where equality of outcome is absolutely desirable, and should be what we are striving for. That does not presume, though, and it should not presume that it means that we are actually the same. And so there's a lot more to say here. But I don't know if we're gonna get in the weeds here a little bit.

**Bret** 1:17:10

I am not sure that I agree that equality under the law is equality of outcome. I think it's actually a cryptic form of opportunity. The laws protecting the opportunity is the is the balance of the law, the blind justice that distributes the good comes from the legal protection. Okay. Yeah. So I would say, you know, it's easy to deal with equality of opportunity as a cliche. But I think I think the point is, that is, in some sense, the opportunity, we are talking about being equalized, but there are two components, right? It is important that no group have an advantage at the level of opportunity. And there are many groups that do have advantages at the level of opportunity, though, how that advantage is passed on. And all of these things are murky, but it is also important, that opportunity itself be substantial, rather than trivial. Right? So there's question of how much opportunity and then there's a question of where it is. And we want to increase the amount of opportunity and decrease the level of its concentration. And I think, you know, whether it's exactly equal, it's never going to be but how the unfairness is distributed is should be a focus, it should be distributed as evenly as possible. And the opportunities should be as broadly distributed as possible. I

**Heather** 1:18:44

can't even get to my trackpad now. What is the relationship between evolutionary biology and morality, what universal moral taboos or ethical truths are rooted deeper than culture?

**Bret** 1:18:56

I would say, rooted deeper than culture is not what you're looking for. Culture is just as biological, as genes is a separate mode of transmission. And morality is effectively it is a product of evolution, we know that it's a product of evolution, because behaving morally is costly, an obvious way is relative to the evolutionary goal of increasing fitness. And so it must be paying its way somehow That is to say, fitness may not be defined exactly as we expect it to be. and morality can increase overall fitness. You know, you could increase your long term fitness by foregoing short term fitness enhancing opportunities, for example. But basically, the answer is going to be rooted in trade offs. I wrote a paper about this many years ago. I won't drag you through the logic of it, but but for a lineage moral precepts that result in long term enhancement of fitness, meaning persistence will be favored and therefore will be inscribed in culture that's that's basically the model your our minutes

**Heather** 1:20:19

Okay, let's let's do a couple more okay part one okay so we got a two part question here. Jordan Peterson said men use the same circuit to hunt when looking for mates dogs like toys that squeak when they bite it makes them think they made a kill. In one uncomfortable context it seems women instinctively trigger the circuit in a similar way by spontaneously emitting dying prey animal noises that sounds pretty ridiculous to me. I have great respect for Jordan Peterson and his thinking and I don't think he has been I think the woke left has tried to drag him to the mud and woke left is merely ended up looking quite muddy and ridiculous as a result but I and I'd like to see what he has to say here but if he really says this I just think he's wrong. Well I will say the same circuit right now hunting for mates hunting for prey. Now,

**Bret** 1:21:10

I will say one thing one sees young women do is squeal to attract attention. So I don't know that that has anything to do with hunting. But it does have to do with hitting some frequency that causes attention to be drawn to them at some moment when they are engaged.

**Heather** 1:21:30

In fact, this happens in cuties right one point at which like, I think both of us god they're doing that thing, right?

**Bret** 1:21:36

Exactly. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:21:39

Okay. We had a follow up on the black intellectuals episode you did please make it happen. Make it like a monthly or bimonthly thing. Thanks for the pod. That's from move for me. I'll move for you.

**Bret** 1:21:50

That's a strange name. Yeah. Yes, there is something in the works. So sit tight, I don't think you'll be disappointed.

**Heather** 1:21:57

Okay. Wake up, hit the like button. There are 2000 people watching. Let's go people. Thanks. Thank you. I didn't just make that up. Hello. Yeah. And thanks for having the cats and dog on the podcast. You are welcome. Okay, one, two more questions. Now three, we'll end up with this one. Okay. Why did Heather immediately move to cover the cat's butthole? What evolved imperative was behind that gesture? I just didn't think you needed to see it. Yeah, he keeps himself clean because he's a cat. But I just don't think what I don't

**Bret** 1:22:27

understand what person wouldn't pull the cat's tail down and point their butt away from the camera. I'd seems to me like the right thing to do. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:22:38

Yeah. Okay, this one finished here. Pearl Harbor was a mostly peaceful Japanese flyover. It's a great meme on Twitter right now complete with CNN, Caron. Caron. Sorry, I had to split my question. Okay. Good. That sounds that sounds appropriate. Final question. Can you speak to the issue of COVID denial and delusion amongst family members and friends? That is somehow if you are failing or a friend, you are not, you are not an asymptomatic and will not wear masks in each other's presence. Hopefully that didn't get cut off. There's the rest of a question that I don't see anywhere here. So how do you like how do you talk to people who imagine? I don't even know what the narrative sounds like in your head. But I know.

**Bret** 1:23:31

I'm seeing a very dumb breakdown and conversation. Yeah. Which is the I think it's the right has a point, which is that how we respond to this pandemic, should be sensitive to all of the costs, including deaths that will arise because of lockdown, for example. And that we are not doing a holistic analysis, we're missing? How many deaths will be caused by economic failure, blah, blah, blah, all those things, right? This then results in a rejection of the idea that we should be doing drastic things because the death rate isn't what we feared it might be. Right. I don't think the death rate is where it's at at all. Right? So you know, I saw somebody we respect on Twitter the other day, say, you know, the rate of death for kids under 16 is below some very low number. Tell me again, why schools are still happening remotely? And the answer is, well, you know, if kids can get it, and they can, and they're going to bring it home, and they will, and somebody else is going to catch it and they will and it's going to damage their heart or their brain. Then what is the cost of that interaction,

**Heather** 1:24:48

at least though, is really complex, right? So the costs of schools being virtual to both the kids and their social development and the parents and their inability to have their lives is Huge. And the fact that kids themselves don't appear to be getting sick is true even though all of these other things are true. I, I'm not sure where I fall out on what I think should be happening and vary, and I think it's different in different parts of the country, different different parts of the world. But I can tell you for sure that virtual schooling is a farce. Oh, it's a farce, right? And so what what are we doing? This question, though, is both difficult, but I think easier, which is? It's not necessarily easier in the moment. But how do you talk to people you know, people in your circle, when like, Oh, I finally get to see you. But actually, given that we don't live together and aren't breathing the same air all the time, we either have to stay power part or mask and be careful because why is it that you imagine that you're like, why have you decided that you're inherently safe for me? That's not your decision to make. Right?

**Bret** 1:25:59

Right. So I have been having these conversations and typically I will take somebody outdoors to have a conversation

**Heather** 1:26:05

and also not to beat them up behind the woodshed. Those are different people. We don't have a woodshed that's part of the pro

**Bret** 1:26:11

right but I will take people outside and I'll say hey, let's have this conversation outside where COVID does not apparently transmit yet at least. The other thing that I will say when people are like you know, isn't this mass business silly I'll say you know, I think people have it wrong, you should see the A you should go to the subreddit of people who have tested COVID positive and look at the people who have long term symptoms that don't seem to go away You should also look at the data on heart damage and long term brain damage and you should realize that we don't even know whether you get long term immunity after you've had this whether the thing might reside in neurons blah blah blah blah blah. And so the point is you say all your all of these unknowns now the question is what do we do? It's not clear to anybody because until those unknowns are answered we don't know what the costs are but you know, it may be that everybody you know you make let's say that half the people who got COVID are going to lose a decade or more of their life

**Heather** 1:27:14

that's probably extreme but yeah, but

**Bret** 1:27:17

we don't know one way or the other. It could be a larger number and a smaller number of years yeah right seems more likely but but the point is and we you know, if you're going to get it every five years because it's going to circulate and your immunity doesn't last What does that say to us you know, so there are all of these things and from my perspective, I don't know how we get to the conversation which is let's talk about what we should have done right we should have really locked down for a much shorter period of time right we should not be dealing with schools coming back in virtual form we should have taken six weeks and we should have done this properly and we should have put everything necessary to get highly reliable testing so the the combination of a very intense brief lockdown followed by very accessible high quality testing would have been enough and the point is somehow we're

**Heather** 1:28:12

or this or even absent super high quality testing pool to testing that allows you then you know at the at the end of it like okay, what does I think University of Arizona maybe is is is testing their student population this way and actually keeping numbers low compared to like every other college campus that actually is

**Bret** 1:28:30

cool definitely when you pull a bunch of people together and if anybody tests positive then you do the fine so it's

**Heather** 1:28:34

like read like everyone being regularly tested a lot you know, frequently but you know, every test is like 100 inputs from 100 people. Yeah, and you have to have very very low false false positives for this to work yes, but the false negatives don't matter as much because they don't matter as much. So yeah, any any positive you get from that then you've you know, break it into groups of 10 whatever. I don't know exactly what the protocols are but yeah, you actually can just like really quickly get through a whole bunch of tests this way and and rule out okay, all you guys are safe, and you can like still be careful, but you can go about your business, right? Yeah,

**Bret** 1:29:12

but what what I'm trying to get past is the sense that what has unfolded is a vindication for the side that wasn't all that worried about this in the first place. I am, you know, if anything more worried than I was because of all the things we don't know. And the fact that we what we've learned is pretty frightening, even if it doesn't amount to sudden death for people. So the point is, look, I don't really want responsibility for what to do now I want to say what should we have done then? And who was saying that? Why didn't we listen to those voices and what are they saying now? Right that that I think is what we should be doing? And it doesn't amount to Let's end this lockdown already. This was this was a false alarm, because that's not that's not what happened.

**Heather** 1:29:54

Yeah. Okay, we're done except there's one more comment that I think we need to end on. Which is quote, I saw a moose in the desert, unquote, bartender, I'll have what he's having.

**Bret** 1:30:06

It's called a moose on the desert.

**Heather** 1:30:09

That was basically my reaction when you came home with the boys from that field trip that you drove with one of your classes. Like we saw a moose at sunlights. I'm sure you did. But I think that was the reaction of the Ranger too, right? You told the Ranger

**Bret** 1:30:22

well, but but I still struggle with the Rangers reaction because I saw most in the desert. I was with a great number of people who also saw it. So I knew it wasn't a hallucination. Y'all weren't tripping. We weren't tripping. We were field trip. And but we weren't tripping, tripping. And anyway, so saw the thing. I'm Amala just I know a damn loose when I see one. So anyway, I said to the Ranger, I didn't know if this was the first time this had ever happened. And I said to the Ranger, I believe I saw a moose out at deep lake. And he says, I don't think so. And, you know, I said, I feel pretty certain that was there. He said, No. And I said, has there ever been one here before? He said, it happens every now and again. And it was like, Well, if I just told you I saw moves, and it happens every now and again. Doesn't it stand to reason that that was the moose in question. That's that is a very surprising conversation. It was a very surprising conversation. I sometimes I'm somewhat traumatized by the logic, like eight years later, so yeah, well, every so often, it gives me a nightmare. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:31:29

Well, all right. I think we've come to the end of another live stream, we will try to be back Tuesday, I'm not sure. But if so we will be later because Zachary is now back in full time virtual school full time as our producer cannot be producing until something like 330 pacific time in the afternoon if we do come back on Tuesday. In the meantime, continue, consider joining the discord server at either Patreon, or getting access to the previous private q&a is on my Patreon and joining us for the next one.

**Bret** 1:32:07

Yes. Again, if you know what it is that we need to use in order to sort out our interference problem. I think everybody will be happier if we can get to the bottom of this. So tell us what device that might be and how much we need to spend to get it. Please like, subscribe, comment. Spread the word. Check out the clips channel pass along little bits that you think might be worth other people seeing

**Heather** 1:32:34

clear wishes for.

**Bret** 1:32:37

Yes, hope for the best with respect to fire and smoke and stay safe. We'll see you next time.