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**Bret** 00:16

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse podcast live stream number 52. q and a segment we are ready to go. We got some questions. We got some questions, find out if you got the answers. We got some cats, we got a dog. Yep, it's all happening.

**Heather** 00:33

Yep. It's all happening. All right, we will start with three questions from the last episode. Let's jump right in. In Turkey, Venezuela, North Korea, total submission to the boss is the common trait of all high level political cogs. A Beta trait makes them alpha males, and influences the gene pool as well. Is their long term significance.

**Bret** 00:55

Yeah, absolutely. Now, I don't want to claim that I necessarily know whether the basic assumption here is right. But I will say this is a mechanism that one sees in hierarchical authoritarian structures where effectively the top of the pyramid has an inner circle that he takes care of which is protected by a next layer. And so you have you know, this pyramid structure. And so anyway, I think what the questioner is pointing to, is the fact that submission is the key to dominance. If you submit the thing that's very powerful, then you end up very much more powerful than you would otherwise. Yeah. So that's an interesting, interesting point. And it's,

**Heather** 01:41

it's it's absolutely universal and strongly hierarchical structures. Right? And it's, it's true, it's true between it's more true between males in other species that are strongly polygynous as opposed to monogamous polygyny being the form of polygamy in which one male tends to monopolize the reproductive output of many females, as opposed to the inverse would be, which would be polyandry. And, you know, I think these again, like you, I can't speak to whether or not the, the basic assumption here is true, although it sounds right to me. This will be this is a decent analogy to a strongly polygynous structure, in which the alpha male is allowing some other males to hang around. But ultimately, he has the last say,

**Bret** 02:31

Well, he doesn't he doesn't. The reason that he grants any access to any anybody else is because he needs allies to keep him in power. And the point is, it's basically a, a concentration of power phenomenon that in which the wise move is for each tear to share as little as possible with the next year in order to retain its position.

**Heather** 02:54

Yeah. Next question, what else do you have in common? What else do you have in common with Digi tech DJ? Donald Trump, aside from Censored online, pro science, but skeptical of establishment scientists, pro lab leak hypothesis against racism, anti fog, CRT, new wars, the desk, etc.

**Bret** 03:17

There's no end to the number of things that we have in common with him from bipedal bipedal, we've got respiratory enzymes in common digestive enzymes, morphological structures at every possible scale. mesenteric mesenteric, to beat the band. Yep. So many things. I don't even know what this question means. I think the idea is that we are supposed to confess some deep alliance with this person that we are ignoring, which is

**Heather** 03:46

it's one it's one of two things, it's either, you know, confess your your cryptic, deep alliance that, you know, you have, but you won't admit or realize that you have this deep alliance that you haven't yet seen. And so, you know, we see both of these things coming at us. The first one is just not true. Right. You know, it's not it's not that we're obscuring some deep alliance that we're that we're obscuring. We've said, often a number of things that we think that he has done, he is doing that are are valid and valuable and have been, in some cases, you're much, much better than you're just like outside of the domain of anything we thought he might have done. And then some places where he exactly matched our expectations anyway, in terms of not doing a good job at all. And but you know, the second, the second thing, I think, is a more interesting potential critique or request for investigation, which is, if all of these things are true about him, and what about what he thinks about what you think and the fact that they're aligned. Why don't you see yourself either of us as more aligned than, than we say we are?

**Bret** 04:57

Well, again, I feel like this is there's just a trap here. Okay, sure. So there's some structure out there and it hates him. And it hates us and hates us for different reasons but love to portray us as the same. I do not. You know, there are times when the enemy of my enemy is my friend, but my sense is okay, you've got two different crime families that my aligned with one because I'm very skeptical of the other. Now the fact is, we need good governance, we need corruption to be reduced from the massive influence that it has over our system to a manageable level, you know, yes, it'd be better to get rid of it completely. But that's unlikely. But in any case, I don't know why him. I don't want any part of this, those those of you who have settled on him as the vehicle are placing us in the kind of danger to address a different kind of danger. And sorry, no, I'm interested in the long term well being of the Republic and the planet, and that's going to require us to put decent people in office they exist. So let's address the system that prevents them ever from getting there.

**Heather** 06:10

any evidence for something like autism occurring and other aprimo species? Do you think psychological adaptations like this could have emerged very early on in the evolution of consciousness?

**Bret** 06:23

This is a tough one, because you're gonna find analogues for a lot of things, how close the analogy is going to vary a lot. I think we've got a lot of novelty in our system that's causing this disability, which means there are a tiny number of species that are likely to have similar patterns, those species will tend to be ones that are domesticates, and therefore also experiencing a huge amount of novelty.

**Heather** 06:50

Or just affiliates. Now there's a I can't that's not quite the right word. There's a word and ecology, conservation biology for organisms that do well in our presence, even though we aren't domesticating them. Yes, things like pigeons, and crows and brats, I

**Bret** 07:06

don't think we will see it in those creatures, because those creatures are subjected the same Malthusian dynamics where there's a limit on resources. And so if you're in the CRO population, yes, your niche may be humans, but there's a limit to how much that niche can feed. And so it tends to favor those that are fully functional. And so in some sense, the fact of human civilization removing the limits on resources that people can feed themselves from out also our domesticated creatures, means that there is a kind of ecological tolerance that doesn't exist outside of that very small number of creatures. And I'm reminded, I used to teach about two headed snakes. I remember one from when I was a kid in the LA zoo, there's a two headed rattlesnake. And my point was that we are not responsible for explaining to headedness as an adaptive phenomenon, because we always see it as a one off instance. Yeah. But anyway, because I've been tracking to headedness. And the Internet has gotten so much larger. I now see a huge number of examples are two headed creatures. And the basic point is, yeah, this happens all the time, in captivity, and you never see it nature. Why? Because two headed creature lasts about six minutes, you know, and so. So anyway, the point is, it is arguably marvelous, that we have room for a lot more diversity with respect to things like these parameters. But it doesn't mean Oh, these things are in and of themselves great, relative to a dire ecological situation that most creatures find themselves in. And so I think, you know, it'd be interesting if we found these things in other populations, but I don't expect it

**Heather** 09:05

Yeah, or there's a question about whether or not autism might not have you know, be a trade off relationship was something that actually rendered the, the many actually high functioning autistic people that we have interacted with and been friends with, have seemed to have some very special skills as well that come along with that, and you're not at the level of savant, you know, these these aren't people who were, you know, truly dysfunctional in other areas of their lives. And, you know, it often seems like the savant come with, you know, extreme extreme dysfunction elsewhere. Whereas, to headedness is just an error. Right? And I would say, you know, for me the right analogy for the two hiddenness discussion is more like intersects where, you know, it certainly happens in the wild, but it is an evolutionary dead end and pointing out You know, having all of the internet available so that you can point out all the many people who are intersex does not in and of itself, render that condition adaptation, or, you know, render sex non binary, for instance, whereas Autism is potentially something a little bit more interesting with with adaptive value

**Bret** 10:19

even Oh, um, that's exactly what I'm saying is it it does have adaptive value, but only in a context where it's not being forced up against the requirements of a normal ecological niche. So yes, there's no question. I mean, you know, but blindness also will reveal certain things, right? We have many extremely gifted blind musicians, presumably, there's some connection there. So anyway, yes,

**Heather** 10:46

extreme deficit can can force extreme talent,

**Bret** 10:50

right? Yeah. But it doesn't mean we should be looking for blind creatures out in the world. Because the fact is, it's a devastating loss when you've got predators and things. Yeah.

**Heather** 11:01

All right. Okay. Our question from the discord server this week, we always get one a week that comes off the discord server. For those of you who are on there. curious as to your thoughts on the stoned ape theory, the idea that psychedelics were a part of the development of human consciousness. Is there any weight to this hypothesis? Has there been any other analogous coevolution between an organism and a drug that proved beneficial in developing certain traits?

**Bret** 11:27

Yeah, let's put it this way. The stoned ape hypothesis is not as bad as the naked ape hypothesis. But I think it's

**Heather** 11:37

just negative the same as the swimming at the swimming. Yeah, they evolved in in shallows, right, yeah.

**Bret** 11:43

But what I would say is late, I would say there is a close relationship between humans and psychedelics, and it has a lot to do with consciousness, we see it in too many populations, various kinds of experimentation, and it's not always psychedelic. Sometimes it's things like sweat lodges, or starvation, or whatever else it is that causes those same phenomena to be unleashed.

**Heather** 12:07

And then low level psychedelics like marijuana,

**Bret** 12:09

right? But the idea that that's what triggered us to become special, rather than having become special, this thing, which to any other creature would be dangerous is useful to us as a hack is I think, flipping the causation on its head. The fact is very same thing that we were talking about in the last question, the fact that we are not constantly faced with predators and in need of spending every minute with reference to its ability to generate food, raise resources means that we can afford to disrupt cognition in ways that sometimes reveal things that our conscious mind wouldn't otherwise know about. I would say, in particular, psychedelics, take stuff that is all from your brain that is not available to your consciousness, and it moves that border so that you become conscious of those things. And, you know, increases plasticity and things like that. So anyway, your normal cognitive state is adaptive, and hacking, it is also adaptive. And that's what's going on here.

**Heather** 13:18

Absolutely. And to the final part of the question, I don't know, of any other coevolution between an organism and drug, a molecule or whole species that have that looks like the latter part of human evolution and psychedelics.

**Bret** 13:38

If the question is about cognition, I agree with you that disrupting cognition by introducing analogs of neurotransmitters. I don't know of another version of that, though, I won't be shocked if there are some. But the ones you know, there are lots of things like your poison frogs, for example, your poison frogs, both in the new world and the old role, two different groups of poison frogs, which lose their toxicity when they stop eating their normal diet, which strongly suggest that they are picking up something from that diet a precursor.

**Heather** 14:16

Yeah, apparently, it's a precursor molecule in the ants in the mites of their native diet that allows them to synthesize these, these neuroactive alkaloids that are deadly toxic to vertebrates, including us. Yeah,

**Bret** 14:33

so that's very different from the normal way that food and our own physiology interact, where you basically eat proteins, break them down to their constituent letters, effectively write new words out of them. In this case, these creatures are borrowing a peptide presumably and building on it. So it's not it's not what you're asking about, but it's an it's,

**Heather** 14:58

that's actually that's superficial. It's, it's a different level of breakdown and rebuilding and totally far afield and you have no reason to think that I actually spent any time thinking about this. But when I was writing, the science fiction that I was working on is evergreen was imploding. But before it went public, I was specifically thinking about how, how humans who had successfully gotten to another planet that did have organic life, but had obviously a totally different evolution of life would make would make food and whether or not you would have to have you know, the biologist on on staff break down into effectively elemental forms and then rebuild, or if there was a less fundamental level of breakdown, depending on exactly what the, the informational molecule on this different planet might have looked like. And I didn't, I wasn't thinking consciously about my frogs. But I think that story, of course, informs a lot of what both of us think about how nature some of the myriad ways that nature manages to make function out of the things that want to just Yep. Alright, first question from today. I live in Colorado, Noah writes, there is a Unity Party on the ballot here, obviously not unity 2020. Who are these people? Did you have any communication with them? Also, thank you both for sharing so much wisdom and spreading the tools you use to gain it? Who are these people? Brett?

**Bret** 16:25

I'm not sure. I've seen I've heard of them. I've seen unity in various places. I assume most of it is the fact that we've landed on a resonant idea because it is a resonant idea.

**Heather** 16:38

I mean, even Biden, Harris has to say, well, we're no,

**Bret** 16:41

here's the problem. You never know whether or not that was them discovering, Oh, goodness, there's something out there claiming that we're influenced peddlers and that it's unity. And the way to deal with that is just to steal the concept of unity and use it as our own and make it impossible to track or whether, you know, they hadn't noticed at that level. And the fact is, you know, I think we can see in things like the banning at Twitter, that as much as unity was a small movement, it was detected, the threat came not from the sides of the movement. It came from the resonance of the message and the fact that anything that was non ideological and was therefore empowered to call out both sides was recognized as a hazard that it would not surprise me if they saw unity on the horizon and decided to get in the road by claiming it for themselves, right?

**Heather** 17:40

Our global companies compliance manager made the following unsupported claim, racism exists in the workplace as microaggression. She then recommended finding allies by speaking to compliance teams, legal teams, or even calling the ethics hotline. I'm afraid to be accused of racism. If I question this topic, what questions Can I ask to be respectful of these very important issues in the workplace, but still determine whether we are headed towards a dark place of unintended outcomes?

**Bret** 18:06

Well, I think if it were me, I might actually track down that paper and we have put a link or we will put a link to the paper that we talked about in the first hour associated with this video. And I might actually deploy that. And I might say, here's the problem with your search for microaggressions. Is that it threatens to find them where they aren't.

**Heather** 18:28

Yeah, no, that's that's that's really good. And then also the, the tools outlined in Helen and James's book pluck rose and Lindsay's book cynical, cynical theories against cynical theories. Yeah. That's a short answer. But I guess we spent a fair bit of time talking about this in the first hour. All right. Next question. Where are we? There we go. How can healthcare college etc be a right when no one has the right to use the gun of the state to force others to pay their bills, sounds a liberal, fire, police, etc. are local, not federal, and even rape and murder are handled at a state level.

**Bret** 19:11

Now, wait a minute, there's sleight of hand in that question.

**Heather** 19:14

There is sleight of hand in that question, but I can't quite put my finger on where it where it happens.

**Bret** 19:18

It is in the phrase, no one has the right to use the gun of the straight state to force others to pay their bills. This sounds true, but is false. And the indication of why it's false is found in fire, police, etc are local, not federal. So your point is these indicators that we all agree suggests a right of the state to collect taxes to do things that we think are important like putting out your house if it's on fire. It does not extend to the federal government, but that's a completely arbitrary division that you've drawn.

**Heather** 20:00

The fact that fire and police are local and rape and murder handed at the state level, that's still, that's still governmental regulation and control

**Bret** 20:08

and a demonstration that yes, we actually do have, you can't decide to opt out of fire suppression, you're going to pay for your share of fire suppression, and you will get it if your house catches fire. And you're right, you should be grateful because it's a bargain. But what I would say is, look, there is a whole set of false insight. In this case, it lives on the right, and the false insight has to do with well wait a second, I made that money, you're taking it in the form of taxes is theft, right? I mean, stuff, let's just call it what it is. It's nonsense. The fact is, that's not where the flaw is, we actually do have a right to figure out what is in our collective interest, we have to do it responsibly, it can't be done, you know, in a corrupt fashion, but there are certain things which are, you know, necessary. And the fact is, you're benefiting from them constantly, right? If you were really that rugged individual that that idea depends on you being you would be spending all your time trying to figure out how to get yourself through the winter, how to put away enough food so that you didn't starve

**Heather** 21:21

regrading your roads,

**Bret** 21:22

right, you would be generating power somehow, you fending off the, you know, the warlords who decided to charge you a tax that wasn't legitimate for your ability to go from A to B, all the things that you would be doing, if you didn't have the state doing them for you, or facilitating that they'd be done for you would be taxing you at a much higher level. So the question isn't, do we have a right to take resources from you to do things in our collective well being? The answer is, is it being done? Well, is it being done sparingly? Right, yeah. So well, I just the final thing I would say is, you are part of an implicit deal, and the deal has failed. But it didn't fail at the point that we collectively decided to take resources that you personally were largely responsible for generating for our collective well being where it failed is in exchange for taking those resources without asking you whether you want to provide them or not, you are do certain things from the entity that is our collective, our collective force, right? You are not in a position to be a hunter gatherer anymore, society decided you are required to be a civilized person, and to do civilized stuff, and to give up the rights of a hunter gatherer and that means that society owes you the other side, right? It owes you an obligation to do the job well, right? To do it carefully to make sure you're getting a good deal. And we're not doing that. So civilization is in breach of contract. But the breach of contract isn't in the idea of taxation, it's in the idea. It's in how well society is living up to the obligations that come as the other side of that equation.

**Heather** 23:13

So I agree with all that, I thought that was an excellent soliloquy. I do think there's something additional here though. You know, the idea of paying your bills, so I think the person writing the question has effectively, you know, they just list two things, healthcare and college. And I think the the insinuation there is that these things are choices that individuals make, and that other people can choose not to make. And therefore, because there's individual variation, and how much you might want health care, or how much you might want to go to college, or how much it might be necessary for you to function in society, it should not be something that is state funded. And you know, what things should and what things should not be considered universal rights is obviously a big part of the question that we need to be a big part of the conversation that we need to be having. And a big part of the sorts of things that right and left will tend to disagree on. Right, actually. And in fact, of the two examples that you provide a I think it's telling that school isn't on the list that we have so long since accepted public education at the K 12 level as something that the federal government is paying for. It doesn't even show up here anymore. And the fact that so much of K 12 schooling is terrible, should render it something that we should be considering, Okay, you know what, maybe we need to really, really improve these things, rather than continue to assume that because the government has paid for them for I don't know what it's been 100 years. They will continue paying for them and into perpetuity, but expand the idea of how much schooling should be should be paid for by the government into college at one end, or here in Portland actually on one of one of the local measures we voted on was universe. preschool. And it's easier to see that actually, maybe those aren't things that the government should be guaranteeing for people. And that that's certainly where I fall like I don't think that preschool and college are universal rights or should be paid for by the government. Compare that to healthcare, which there are good models in the rest of the world. And actually everyone does have a body and everyone does need to have a healthy body in order to live their best and and most productive life. That said, so much of healthcare is so broken, just as broken as education is for somewhat different reasons. But for some of the same reasons, because market forces and perverse incentives have rendered most of the practitioners in sway to the administrators, and in the case of medicine, the drug companies, such that it's like, I want universal health care for Americans. So we don't have to be paying through the nose on a monthly level for health care that I think is terrible. But it's harder to argue for that when I know that most of the health care that's out there that's at least sanctioned by the insurance companies is not very good.

**Bret** 26:08

Well, I would say that part of the flaw in that is the idea that rights is the correct mode to be thinking of these things. I don't think health care is a right. But I think that in a circumstance where you have a society that generates the kind of surplus that we do that it is in our collective interest to give health care. So to everyone now

**Heather** 26:34

you've answered the question that now so what the question actually asks is, how can it be a right and yours? And that's this is sort of why I just did what I did, because I think you were not answering the actual question, What you said was all correct in terms of what you believe, and what I believe as well, what many liberals believe. But the premise of the question is, how can it be a right? Well, as you just said, you actually don't think it isn't right.

**Bret** 26:55

Right. However, you will note that I do have a right that grants me the ability not to answer the question.

**Heather** 27:04

Yeah. And I'm the one who pays.

**Bret** 27:08

Indeed, yeah, so not there are rights, these things that are shoehorned into REITs are often not, but it doesn't mean that it's a bad idea. In fact, the real question is, are we better off creating a risk pool that includes all of us? Does that make healthcare cheaper, more available, and a society better when people have health care? guaranteed, then when we vary in our access to it? And the answer, I think is clearly Yes. Yep.

**Heather** 27:37

Next question. What would be an example of a failure of capitalism, that free and voluntary Association itself can't remedy? If monopolies are bad? Wouldn't monopoly on force as in the government be worse? If corporations care about profit, hidden where it hurts most their wallet?

**Bret** 27:55

externalities? Okay, I'm

**Heather** 27:57

not sure I understand the question. But you go, what would

**Bret** 28:00

be an example of a failure of capitalism, capitalism that a free and voluntary Association itself can't remedy. So if I make goods, and I pollute the atmosphere, In so doing, and my product is therefore cheaper than another product of exactly the same quality, where the company was treating its waste responsibly, and the company that is treating its waste irresponsibly, will out compete the one all else being able to will out compete, the one that is behaving responsibly, and the consumer would be foolish not to buy the cheaper product because they don't actually clean anything up due to a tragedy of the commons. So, in effect, externalities require us to regulate in order that the costs of keeping the environment clean, for example, and there are dozens of non exactly environmental analogues to this. But in the environmental case, the cost of keeping the environmental, the environment clean, is born in the correct place rather than borne by those who are the most careful. So anyway, I would just say the more once you understand things like tragedy of the commons race to the bottom, prisoner's dilemma is the more you will see that many, many problems require a governmental solution. Now, I would argue to be as light handed as possible, but those light handed solutions are required otherwise, you get perverse incentives all the way across the system.

**Heather** 29:33

Do you have thoughts on Joe Rogan's podcast featuring Tristan Harris? I believe that particular podcast should be seen by as many people as possible. From a strategic standpoint. PewDiePie PewDiePie would be the ultimate signal booster. Love Your Work, be well. So you're going to be having Tristan on our course person. Yep. I at least have not seen Rogan's Tristan podcast. I did. Listen to Tristan Conversation with Sam Harris, which was excellent. I mean we so we interest on our friends and he's, he's terrific and he's really sounding the alarm on some very important things right now have you seen or watching

**Bret** 30:13

I saw clip I certainly didn't see the whole Rogan interview so I can't speak to it directly. But yeah, I would just say, I believe Tristan has understood some things very deeply and much earlier than most people and that he is sounding the right alarm. And anyway, I look forward to talking to him about where we are and what we do about it. Yep.

**Heather** 30:37

Do you still do you see a link between the political left and right and lumpers and splitters? For example, left advocates for equality and spectrums, the extreme being post modernism, if so, is the current madness, biological or psychological? Talk to Professor Frank Ferretti. So, I will let you take the first part of this I will just say that Frank Ferretti whose name I feel like I'm probably mispronouncing, we met him when I taught at Oxford two springs ago. He is terrific and definitely a a kindred spirit. Hungarian, I think now Emeritus, some University in Great Britain, doing really excellent work. Excellent sociological work, actually. But to the first question, do you see a link between political left and right and lumpers and splitters? We saw something that

**Bret** 31:30

well, lumpers and splitters is clearly a phylogenetic systemic list of some kind. Or a taxonomist? I mean, who knows, but I can't, I have a feeling you're pointing to something I don't spot right away what the analogy would be. It may dawn on us later. But I would say I tweeted something that resonated really well with people yesterday, I think. And it was effectively that if you, I said painting with a broad brush, because you have to, if you divide the world into political left and right, I am solidly on the left, but that is not my team. My team is composed of those on both sides, who understand the vital role being played by the other. And lots of people seem to think this was a sensible formulation. I'm certain that it is. But in any case, I mean, I think I think it's about as good of an answer to your question as you could get Nick down further.

**Heather** 32:41

You just been at it today. How about you?

**Bret** 32:44

Let's see. There it is. Yeah. Yeah.

**Heather** 32:47

So just like you said, divide the world, the political left and right. I'm solidly on the left, but this is not my team. My team is composed to people on each side who understand the vital role played by the other. Yeah.

**Bret** 32:59

Yeah. It's, it's interesting. It's amazing how this actually works is a very good, broad brush litmus test, that I hear a lot of people who are just pulling all out for red or for blue. Yeah. And there's almost no headway you can make with them. It's the people who realize that there's a dynamic tension here, who you always make headway with, right? It's like, you find the person downstream of that discovery, you find a reasonable person, right?

**Heather** 33:31

many cats, like most species of mammals become a lot. lactose intolerant, as they grow older. would you expect the lactose tolerant cats be more prevalent among those segments of human populations that also remained lactose tolerant? Love from Poland? Awesome.

**Bret** 33:48

Yeah, yeah. So just to flesh out the logic a little bit, that's good. I like this question. We have an enzyme that brick breaks down. lactose is the lactase enzyme, we all produce it because mother's milk has lactose in it. And so we need the enzyme to break it down. In cultures that don't have a dairy tradition, you don't produce this enzyme, beyond an age where you would be in contact with mother's milk. In populations that have developed a dairy culture, we create this enzyme throughout life. And it is often in fact, maybe always sensitive to the presence of milk in the diet. So that is to say, if you're eating milk, your body detects that you are and it produces this enzyme to break down the lactose in it. And in cultures where there is no dairy tradition, the ability to upregulate it in adulthood is either weak or non existent. And so but it

**Heather** 34:45

also seems that there's an ability to affect during development whether or not you've upregulated, the production of lactase. So just anecdotally, and I believe there's some research that backs us up, but anecdotally, we have had the experience of traveling For months at a time in places where we weren't really exposed to dairy, and upon returning home, finding ourselves less capable of digesting dairy

**Bret** 35:09

and I quickly returns, it returns, I discovers that you're, you're ingesting milk evertz product.

**Heather** 35:14

So if that's true, if there is in an individual that has had lactase upregulated, such as it continues to be produced in adulthood, which, you know, the one the one blackbox here is Has that happened in cats at all? But if that's true, we would expect Yes, that in, for instance, dairy in traditions, that, you know, cats that live near milkmaids are likely to retain the ability to digest lactose throughout adulthood, because if they do, they're going to be really much better fed.

**Bret** 35:44

Absolutely. And the other comparison is not just within domestic calves, but domestic cats and their close wild relatives, you would expect the close wild relatives to be like populations that don't have a dairy tradition, where it just simply gets turned off and doesn't get turned back on. And domestic cats would be variable. Yeah, very much. Yeah. In an analogous way as human populations just as you suggest, yeah.

**Heather** 36:08

Okay, next question. With another name that I will butcher the pronunciation of. Do you have thoughts about Yanis Varoufakis. His theory that uncontrolled capitalism erodes democracy, by incentivizing would be quality leaders away from politics. So I don't know this guide or this thinker. But if that description of the idea is accurate, if that thumbnail of the idea is accurate, it It sounds savvy.

**Bret** 36:35

Yes. And that's one of the problems. So again, if that sentence is an accurate representation, then it's certainly likely to be right. But it is not an unsolvable problem. In other words, if you recognize that this was causing a corrosive effect, you could correct for it. And this is it's one of the puzzles in how you would build a more functional, stable 2.0 version of our system is how you would incentivize the the presence of the highest quality people in the mechanisms where their insight would be most useful. Yep.

**Heather** 37:16

Why does the news not tell us the truth? Do you think the West is dying a slow death?

**Bret** 37:23

Why does the news not tell us the truth because it is an irresistible prize to those who have the need for it to propagandize us. And so the problem is, it's kind of a, it's an arms race, where it would always be a great idea to have news. But the value of having there be nothing that functions like news is so high to so many that we can't find. And anyway, yeah, that's another puzzle that has to be solved, because we're going crazy. You're 40.

**Heather** 38:04

Okay. Sorry, where are we humans are very bad at analyzing risk. But frequently think in terms of luck. What's the deal, faulty heuristic, or useful think fiction.

**Bret** 38:20

I don't know that humans are bad at assessing risk. It may be that they are bad at consciously understanding risk. And it may be that they are getting worse in novel modern circumstances

**Heather** 38:34

where they're not exposed to sufficient risk at young ages, where the risk can be mitigated,

**Bret** 38:41

right. But I also think that we misunderstand the problem because we over understand individuals as somehow important. And the thing that has made populations important has been the fact that the individuals in them were disposable. So you know, you need somebody to cross the horizon on a ship in order to discover that landmass, which means you need somebody to badly estimate the risk of doing so in order that they're full enough to try it. So in essence, I would argue, we are built to lie to ourselves about risk because of a deeper calculation about the necessity that we confront risks that are very frightening.

**Heather** 39:25

Like that. Yeah. There was a biological analogy to the manuscript that you referenced receptor upregulation, ie when the ligand is in low concentration cell increases sensitivity to the ligand by increasing receptors. Oh, that's good. Yeah, that's true.

**Bret** 39:41

Yeah, that's absolutely right. Yeah.

**Heather** 39:45

critics claim that we overreacted to COVID-19. Given the viruses 98% survival rate, aren't overreactions? meant to be successful? vehicle operation as a higher rate, should we rollback safety standards?

**Bret** 39:57

Yeah, we almost certainly under-reacting Even if elements of what we did were positively incoherent and are still positively incoherent, right? This obsession with signaling to each other via masks when we're Outdoors is nonsense, and our inability to behave ourselves enough to drive the virus to really low levels, or to up regulate testing, you know, to generate high enough quality tests and get them widely enough distributed, that we could actually effectively see where we were and behave in a rational way. It was all very incoherent. But we could have done a lot more for a lot shorter period of time and gotten a lot better result. Instead, what we kind of did was split the difference between two warring political factions versions of things, which, in essence, was pretty close to the worst of both worlds. Yep.

**Heather** 40:53

They created a tremendous incoherence, as you say, yeah, yeah. Are you supporters of regenerative agriculture and permaculture? Have you gone into it from an evolutionary standpoint? Guest suggestion. Joel Salatin, and I may be mispronouncing his name, but this question from Crystal, I love this. So Joel Salatin was profiled in the Omnivore's Dilemma by Michael Pollan, which is one of one of my favorite books. And he I believe, ran the farm, Southeast seaboard, Virginia, someplace like that, where he had pigs and chickens and he's growing vedge in a I hadn't remembered that it was being called regenerative agriculture, regenerative permaculture, but there's there's a lot here that is that is valuable. It's not clear how well it scales is the one big issue, you know, how many people can you feed with this kind of model. On the other hand, the number of people that you can feed with a spray it all and monocrop everything model has so many externalities built in, and the regenerative agriculture permaculture model doesn't. So we know this is another conversation that we need to be having. If we could be if we could not be talking about how everyone is racist when we're not. And, and get back to some of the important questions. How it is that we move forward with good health care, good agriculture, good education are some of the top issues I would say. Good. Heather and Brett, please come to live in Miami. A truly diverse city with great weather and law and order.

**Bret** 42:39

All right, recommendation. You want to replace law and order which is now a very divisive,

**Heather** 42:46

did it's the it's capitalized. It's the show.

**Bret** 42:51

I think no, you don't think No. Okay, law and order. Okay. President has been invoking all over the place. Okay. We all hear that gavel thing.

**Heather** 42:59

I thought he was talking, I assume I don't know. I was talking about the show, which I assume is still on because it's been on forever.

**Bret** 43:05

Well, it will be on forever, even after we're gone. And by we I mean humans. The thing that I would say is lawn order is now one of these partisan dog whistle things. And that's bad. Yeah, right. rule of law. That's the way to do it in the patriotic unifying American forum.

**Heather** 43:26

So yeah, we haven't spent I had a 14 hour layover in Miami a few years ago on my way to lead a study abroad trip, actually my first one of Ecuador before we went down together. And I kind of say, it was a very weird experience. You know, I stashed my bags, and I went and I thought I'm just I did try to seek out the weirdest part. So I went to, I took the Jitney or whatever it was to Miami Beach. And I got there. I was there like seven in the morning, and it was already just weird. There was a bike topless female volleyball tournament going on. And they were cruise ships going past and lots of people sipping in probably architected cocktails at seven, eight in the morning. And I think I actually I took a picture I took a couple of pictures, but one of the pictures that I took was from the bathroom in the place where I got breakfast, which had on the inside of the door, the women's bathroom, a picture of a topless man with a dog on him. And it wasn't sexual, except it was clearly like hey women this is this is what you want. This is what Miami offers you. And the whole thing seemed very very weird to me. So I gotta say that's my sense of Miami is very very weird.

**Bret** 44:39

Alright, I have the sense that it is a very normal wonderful place. Please just continue to follow us Heather and I will hash this out. And eventually we will find out the truth of Miami even if at a distance.

**Heather** 44:58

Yeah, no in terms I actually we Head, we're trying to make plans to get to the keys. And then COVID happened. So I'd be interested to explore Miami, which is, I guess the jumping off point for the keys at least. Why would you not recognize the positives of last four years? No new wars, no terrorist attacks peace agreements in the Middle East? Oh, absolutely.

**Bret** 45:20

We do recognize them. The problem is you're well, I don't want to say you, but the implication of the question has to do with the individual driving this and, you know, look, I would say, if I was talking to Chomsky, I would say, how can you make this point, in light of the fact that you've made this point in prior years about these adventure? adventurism abroad and the wars that we've started needlessly? And so yes, Trump is a mixed bag. But the problem, the problem is the man's temperament, the driving force, the obligation to politicize everything is lethal. And what I would say, I hope you can hear this, what I would say is, those of you who see the positives on that side, and are tempted to look past the negatives, because there are positives, and want everybody else to do the same thing, have to understand that you are in fact, inviting in a person, that is a package and the package is very dangerous, very political, very temperamental, and that that is not an acceptable solution. So am I telling you don't vote for him? No, I'm telling you, you don't have a good option on your ballot period that I can be certain of. So is it wrong to vote for him? Absolutely. It is, as would be everything else you might do. But why you expect everyone who can see some of the positives that have occurred in the last four years to embrace the whole thing? I don't quite see it. And you know, I have no patience for what the other side is doing either. And, you know, I, I take no position on which one is more lethal. I can say in Portland, there's reason to fear. The

**Heather** 47:20

in Portland the lesser of two evils argument is clear, actually,

**Bret** 47:24

well, the lesser of two evils argument on our local bout.

**Heather** 47:28

That's why I said in Portland. Well, but

**Bret** 47:30

in Portland, we're still voting on the president, which is the subject of this question at

**Heather** 47:34

the national level, it is not clear, which is the lesser of two evils. In Portland for Mayor lesser two evils argument is clear.

**Bret** 47:42

Well, even when the lesser of two evils is clear, in a federal election, it's a very different puzzle.

**Heather** 47:50

That's That's true. That's aside from what I said, I actually think and I think, you know, many people who are watching Don't inherently know that this is actually unreal, maybe it's not what you believe. But I actually and you know, I have heard this from a number of friends this time around. It's really not clear to me, which, you know, I put aside that we live in Portland for the moment because that does skew things somewhat. If you live in a place that doesn't look like it might head off into complete anarchie. After the election, given some results, it is not clear to me which of these two clowns is going to be worse for the country? At the federal level? Right? It's just not clear to me. So the lesser of two evils arguments doesn't make sense for a wait a minute, why are you contributing to play with the duopoly reason but it also just doesn't apply here? Because I actually just, it's not clear to me which one is lesser? And no, that doesn't mean that I'm cryptically for Trump, or that I actually have trumped arrangement syndrome and can't see anything positive. He says neither of those things are true. Yep. I agree. Two quick, two more quick things here. And then we'll go to the next set. What episode Do you consider your best that showed the most for knowledge of events and turned out to be true? But I have no idea actually on that one is no idea. 600,000 So this I just I'm reading because I don't know what it means. Except I have some sense of I'm going to mind read a little bit 600,000 cancer deaths protected by the CDC this year, just because it's Halloween doesn't mean you look intelligent with a mask on. So this strikes me as someone one of these people who thinks that masks don't protect against COVID. And also that COVID isn't a real threat and therefore, why would you protect yourself against it even if it was useful in this 600,000 cancer as predicted by the CDC this year. And like a that's actually lower than I would have thought given that over 200,000 have died from COVID. That's actually that actually makes me think COVID is even more deadly than I thought. And cancer isn't go and COVID isn't cancer and it already exists, and it will always exist. So I don't even see what the relevance here. Except that this is someone who imagines that they have the right answer. And the rest of us who think there's a virus out there that's doing harm or buffoons have some sort of

**Bret** 50:10

two things. One, the cancer thing cuts the other way. Because in some sense, this is something that emerged from my work on senescence in cancer years ago. in some senses, you cure various causes of death, whatever causes you haven't yet cured take up the residual. So the fact that cancer rates are going up can mean something bad. It can mean you've got toxins in your environment, or it can mean something good, which is I think, going up, though, I don't know that they're going up. I'm not saying that point is a high number for the number of cancer deaths is in part because we have dealt with other causes of death. In this case, COVID is now a new cause of death, it's going to cause the cancer rates to fall because people are going to die of something that isn't cancer. That's not good. So yeah, what I'm saying is you have to be cautious in figuring out what these numbers imply.

**Heather** 51:07

And oh, yeah, that's important. That's really good.

**Bret** 51:10

What I think people need to understand is that people like us, who full well understand that this is not nearly as deadly, the case fatality rate is lower than we feared, right? That's good. The immunity that is apparently generated by having been sick with COVID is less than we would hope, especially the antibody based immunity, that's very worrisome, that means people are getting COVID, twice, right? So

**Heather** 51:36

And third, the long term effects of it are worse than anyone was talking about are imagining in the early days. Absolutely.

**Bret** 51:42

And they affect tissues that you really should be very reluctant to surrender longevity, you know, if it's your liver, if it ages, your liver by 10 years, probably it doesn't cut any thing off most people's longevity, your brain. Well, that's very different. Yeah. And it does appear that people who have had this sickness, even mild cases of it have cognitive damage or brain damage that is detectable. So in any case, all of those of you who think you know how to evaluate what the cost is of things like lockdown and masks and can evaluate it relative to the cost of economic, recession, etc. There is not enough information available, nobody can evaluate these things properly. And so that means that you have to take seriously people who are informed and get the argument but disagree. So anyway, keep tracking it.

**Heather** 52:44

Okay, first question from the current hours super chats as a disagreeable person, I am mostly drawn to disagreeable people. And most of my long term relationships are with disagreeable people. Is it a pattern? How much of disagree ability is genetic versus cultural? Thanks, love you.

**Bret** 53:00

Yeah, this is a great question. I do think this is a it's a it's a great test case, because you would tend to when you hear the word disagreeable, you tend to think oh, well, I would like to not have disagreeable people in my life. On the other hand, disagreeable people are exactly the kinds of folks who will tell you what you need to know who will stand up when it's not simple, safe or convenient to do so. And so there's something to be said for Do you have enough disagreeable people in your life? How disagreeable should they be? Obviously, people who are disagreeable for no purpose other than being disagreeable are a problem. But you know, there's a question about what you're trying to maximize and

**Heather** 53:42

genetic versus cultural?

**Bret** 53:45

Yeah, I mean, I would say it's gonna be almost all cultural. Yeah. Or at least all accumulated. Post birth, right? Didn't come to you and your genome, which you know, doesn't necessarily mean cultural, it can mean that you you know, you can learn it from being in the wilderness and realizing how things work and then it can manifest in a social context. But

**Heather** 54:07

yeah. So hope you like my article rights. I'll fight you naked. I did I read it. I did enjoy it. Thank you. Given the tribal nature of humans, are we biologically capable of world peace? If not what form of global cohabitation should we be striving for?

**Bret** 54:27

Yeah, we're capable of world peace. The question is how you stabilize it. And we humans are clever. That's kind of the point of us. And what that means is what would you have to know what lessons would you have to reinforce that people understood that what they were inviting by engaging in a behavior, like violence was going to make them worse off rather than better off and how would you disincentivize those who sought to profit by engaging in islands it, I would say it's a design problem. And it's one that we know is solvable because you could make this argument at every scale that we've already solved it on. Right? In other words, we have a very peaceful society, which Yes, we are threatening to take apart for no reason whatsoever. But nonetheless, it has been, you know, the sort of pinker level point about how safe it is to walk down the street amongst people who have no genetic investment, and you're continuing to breathe, right? That fact means, oh, well, we used to be more violent, and now we're less violent, and it works. And you don't question it, because it just, you know, it's the water you swim in. The question is, can we make it the water we all swim in? Well, unfortunately, we've got to deal with some folks who don't agree. That's the problem. But yeah, we can overcome the folks who don't agree that it would be great to be peaceful, then

**Heather** 55:50

we have to remind the people who say they agree what they're agreeing with, and especially if they're in power, and they have the ability to cause the folks who don't agree to sit down and shut up,

**Bret** 56:00

we have to force them to agree with violence if necessary.

**Heather** 56:05

The the leaders.

**Bret** 56:09

I was being ironic, but I mean, it's at some level, this is the problem. It's not that there's anybody we have to be violent against. But to the extent that there are those people and populations that don't subscribe to the idea that the objective is for us to be able to live together harmoniously and minimize violence. We have to be prepared to use violence to protect that principle.

**Heather** 56:31

Yes. Ghost Stories, what do they do for us how to explain sightings? When different people have the same experiences independently without other without prior knowledge of other stories? Are there any ghost stories that you would like to share? Yeah, it is Halloween, we failed to mention that. It is. Did you not know that?

**Bret** 56:53

Let's put it this way. Last night when I took the dog outside, so that she might relieve herself. She

**Heather** 57:00

told you that tomorrow was hollow in the full moon reminded you that it was Halloween.

**Bret** 57:06

I reminded myself because I'm just that with it. So it did occur to me last night, that it would be Halloween, and it just didn't manage to occur to me today that we had actually gotten there. But look, it is undoubtedly the scariest Halloween ever. Am I right about that?

**Heather** 57:23

I think so. Ghost Stories,

**Bret** 57:26

ghost stories? Yeah.

**Heather** 57:27

What do they do for us? Well, first

**Bret** 57:29

of all, there's the whole idea of ghosts, right? Ghost Stories are one thing once you've got the idea of ghosts, then you can borrow it for, you know, spoofing your date, or whatever it is. But why do people go to horror movies?

**Heather** 57:45

The bond I think of God ghost stories, like sitting around campfires telling ghosts I

**Bret** 57:48

do too. But my point is, it's close kin whatever, you know, going someplace to be scared. Right? Like a movie isn't that far off from Tell me a story that's going to spook me while we're sitting around the campfire. It's all closely related stuff. Yeah. So I would just say a the idea of a spirit world is pretty clearly I would say a literally false metaphorically, true phenomenon in which there is a cohesiveness that derives from the continuity the ephemeral pneus of people is not all that healthy, right? That the fact that somebody exists, and then suddenly they don't exist, means that we are constantly in an upheaval of what the dynamics are. And, you know, the red thermal ceremony that you've talked about, in Madagascar, where the, the dead are brought

**Heather** 58:49

back disinterred

**Bret** 58:51

in physical form, as bones to hear, a recounting of the recent history of their group tends to create I mean, the thing about it this way, if your aunt is the reason your art on your hand, your art is the reason that you retain the civil relations with your cousins. Because you're fond of your, your aunt and your aunt. You're not wanting to disappoint her as a motivation and then she's suddenly gone up suddenly, your reason to be good to your cousins is lower, unless you're going to have to explain to your aunt why your aunt, why her absence is has caused this change in your behavior. So the point is, you are actually

**Heather** 59:46

it's a way of keeping the ancestors alive. Well, but it but you know what it also is, is it may actually relate again to that paper that you showed in the first hour with regard to seeing something with more frequency as it decreases frequencies. So with regard to sightings, I mean, I know, I know, after my father died, I occasionally saw him in a crowd and he wasn't there yet. Obviously, he wasn't there, he was dead. But I had, you know, because my, because my parents would love to be close to us, I had been in this lucky position of seeing both of my parents, you know, multiple times a week at that point for years, and suddenly no more. I began to see him places where he was not an I didn't call it a ghost. But I but you know, I was I was, I was doing the pattern recognition thing I was looking for the the man that I loved, who had been very present and was suddenly completely absent. So you know, some of it is also going to be that

**Bret** 1:00:42

Yeah, I agree. That's a very good point. And I think that may well have something to do with it. And I've had that experience to it. You know, even with your grandfather, probably. Yeah, my grandfather, and you know, I remember it with some pets. Oh, yeah. In some ways, just a really good test of this, you know, going around a corner, right and going around a corner and you know, you know what happened? It's like an optical illusion where you're like hypersensitive for you know, to see that creature and it's not there and you imagine it.

**Heather** 1:01:10

Oh, I remember this. Yeah. Yep. How much time are we outside? our environment? Okay, let's do let's do three more. How about that? Good.

**Heather** 1:01:22

Okay, that's 600,000 cancer desk, guys back here. But we already addressed that. So like, we don't have to go back there. Can you explain all the election worries to a non American? Why does someone have to concede? Don't you just count the ballots and run the college? Run the college uses scare quotes?

**Bret** 1:01:43

Well, first of all, the concession thing is a what would you call it? It's a courtesy. Yeah, maybe that's the wrong term. But it's somewhere in that neighborhood. What is a concession? Yeah. Okay. Considering the election when enough ballots have been counted that, you know, you're going to lose his gracious, yet.

**Heather** 1:02:08

It bookends the arduous nature of a presidential election. Yeah,

**Bret** 1:02:13

it reduces the hazard of your followers not accepting this. And so, you know, and you know, we've seen recent examples where it didn't happen, you know. So, anyway, you know, you do just count it, and it is the electoral college. And that's the way it actually works. But a system in which we all understand that the civility of the citizenry is desirable, and that we should recognize that our political differences do not contradict all that unites us. That is essential, and we are losing that that's part of why this election is so damn scary. Yeah, is that we are frequently now looking into the eyes of people who under other circumstances would be comprehensible to us, and we are unable to fathom them, because they're saying things that make no sense, you know, Noam Chomsky, saying Trump is the greatest criminal in human history, Bernie Sanders suggesting that we vote for a support everyday anti fascist, yeah, and everyday anti fascist to when she is anything but lightly invoke Stalin, right? These things are unimaginable. And yet here we are.

**Heather** 1:03:32

Yeah. So that's an incomplete answer, but hope it gets you somewhere. What are your thoughts on the ethics of veganism?

**Bret** 1:03:43

the ethics of, well, I can say that, almost as a rule, vegans are among the least moral people I've ever been No. Can I say what the ethics of veganism let's put it this way, we have a sustainability problem. If your veganism is motivated by a desire to live more lightly on the earth, I think you're making a mistake about how we get there. But I understand the impulse and I regard it as you know, it's it's a mitzvah as we would say, in Jewish culture. So anyway, it's positive but it's symbolic as far as I'm concerned for reasons of game theory, you know, which I described in the personal personal responsibility vortex that your personal behavior is not the place to solve these problems. They have to be addressed systemically or you will actually paradox, paradoxically make the problem you're trying to solve worse. at a personal level. I would say that unfortunately, the problem is, the more extreme you are in trying to solve these problems through your personal behavior, the more difficult needs to be properly nourished, right. So vegetarianism creates a problem for vegetarians veganism all the more so because it eliminates a bunch of the things that you would use to substitute for the meat. So probably from the point of view of doing the most you can for a sustainable world, while not compromising your health, a small amount of consumption of meat and animal products is the way to go. Oh, there's one other thing here that I should say there is one way in which I regard vegetarians and vegans as way ahead, morally speaking. And that has to do with the ethics of the way animals are raised. Right, I find as many people who've thought about it, do the, the conditions in which factory farmed animals are raised, just impossible to accept. This is not our right to do this to animals. And the fact that we do this, basically out of everybody's view, so they don't think about it too much, makes it worse, not better.

**Heather** 1:06:05

And we are lucky enough to be in a position where the meat that we buy and bring into our home to cook for ourselves and the animal products are not raised in those conditions. But that requires a certain income level. And I know of almost no restaurants, where you can reliably expect that that is true. So if you ever eat out, you aren't, you are not being wholly consistent in in what might be your efforts to be thinking about the conditions in which animals are raised for our consumption. And

**Bret** 1:06:35

even if you manage to source all your own meat humanely. Still a lot of animal suffering in appalling conditions. And so at some level, it's our obligation to collectively address that. But the hard point for people to swallow is ethically raised animals, that is to say, animals that are raised in a way that they are healthy, and not existing in a way that they are not tortured by life. You're not living in a feedlot or a cage or something like this. animals that are raised in such a way, it is not immoral, in my opinion, to raise them and consume them, if they are humanely raised, and they are humanely slaughtered, and they are kept healthy, that can be done in a way that doesn't involve a moral compromise. And that is in fact what we should be heading for. But that meat will be inherently more expensive. And we have to accept that we would be eating a lot less. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:07:39

Assume Trump wins and we make it through. What realistically could we be facing in 2024? If Biden wins, what are the chances that Trump would try again in 2024? We need unity.

**Bret** 1:07:51

Yeah, there was some some frightening prospects. I yeah, I don't know. I

**Heather** 1:07:58

mean, we really we we very much hope that end 2024 is a is an active force, long before the election of 2024. Starts wrapping up.

**Bret** 1:08:09

Yep. And we are, we are accumulating the puzzle pieces to make it a more effective movement going forward. So yeah, we do need unity. And we need unity, whether we have unity, the organization, the movement, the entity, we need the concept to change our behavior towards each other, and for it to carry the day because, frankly, we got a lot of bombs to throw out a government without a lot of people who've been betraying us through their corruption.

**Heather** 1:08:39

Yeah. So I actually want to drop to the bottom two, because one of them is just apropos what we already talked about, and one of them is particularly timely, and we'll come back to a few others that we missed next time. Please help my brother and his wife tested positive for covid 19. They have two young children under 10. who tested negative, what should they do?

**Bret** 1:09:00

Well, it depends on what your options are. Yeah, it

**Heather** 1:09:02

depends on what your options are. If, if, if they live in a town with close family whom they know are being careful, and there's any possibility of basically having someone else do the childcare until they test negative that would seem to be the right move. But that is almost certainly not possible. Yep. Most people do not live in a situation where that's going to be possible. I

**Bret** 1:09:27

agree. It's very unlikely that they would have those options

**Heather** 1:09:31

to children under 10 they're not old enough, almost certainly to be doing all of their own food prep themselves.

**Bret** 1:09:37

Yep. And so there's a question about whether they test negative family member can take over their care without getting themselves sick. It's a really serious situation.

**Heather** 1:09:49

Now, so yeah, you know, quarantine as much as possible to keep the kids from getting sick and you know, the the the virus deniers well say well but kids when they get sick, they don't get that sick. They then spread it to other people who get sick and we don't know the long term effects of that is that is the truth at the base of of all of these things. One more it's just a comment with regard in response to the question about or the suggestion that we consider Miami you seem like St. Petersburg Florida people Heather the Dali museum just reopened and Brett plenty rule of law los esperamos hashtag keep the Republic.

**Bret** 1:10:31

All right. Well, cool looking. I don't think I've been to

**Heather** 1:10:35

Petersburg St. Pete? No, I don't think I have either.

**Bret** 1:10:39

Anyway, sounds warm.

**Heather** 1:10:41

It's it's Gulf Coast, I think. And it's it's panhandle Gulf Coast. If memory serves, I don't know, my, my my Florida. Geography that well. Cool.

**Bret** 1:10:49

Well, if travel ever comes back, maybe we'll visit Florida. Oh, boy.

**Heather** 1:10:53

I'd go just about anywhere. About anywhere. Yeah. So we I think we'll be back on Wednesday for our next episode. Probably because we may know more things about the future at that point. We may not.

**Bret** 1:11:09

Yeah, I mean, we will definitely know some more things about just by virtue of being buried at

**Heather** 1:11:15

that point. Ah, we may know, we may not know any more things about that, that moments future,

**Bret** 1:11:20

right, are almost certain to be in the dark about what's going to happen. But we can at least check in and talk about what we discovered. So all right,

**Heather** 1:11:33

so forward to that. Yeah. In the meantime, consider joining us at one or both of our Patreon ads. Darkhorse membership at mine Brett's ongoing conversations at his the first of this month being tomorrow morning. 10 to noon, Pacific time, and get outside.

**Bret** 1:11:53

Yeah, be safe. We'll see you Wednesday.