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Bret, Heather

**Bret** 00:16

Hey folks, welcome back to the 62nd Dark Horse podcast live stream q&a A in the middle of whatever it is it's taking place.

**Heather** 00:26

That's right. Well we got cat madness

**Bret** 00:28

we do have cat madness. For those of you who watch the initial part of the broadcast let me just say, I have looked and that heartburns article that we were talking about does indeed look like it's from 2018 although in my defense the article itself does not have a date on it so the fact that the author tweeted it today led me to think this was current So anyway, I'm sure what he said is true nonetheless. Now a couple years back and

**Heather** 00:53

like I said, I'm familiar. You know, we are decades old. subscriber to Harper's and Walter Kirn has written many of those opening essays and it's really quite excellent. So I'm I did not know that he was no longer writing for Harper's, I had noticed. sort of been a lot going on. There has been a lot. Yeah. Even though it's two years ago, I guess two plus years ago at this point, but anyway, I recommend for people who aren't familiar with him, finding his writing. He's quite good, Walter Kirn. Alright, let us begin with a few questions from Episode 61. Question from the discord and then move into questions from last hour. HMOs are now woke? How can one get safe health care now? Do we let our diseases play out caveman style? Or are we not there yet? I'm in California, incidentally on HMO through Medicaid expansion with several conditions. So this, obviously, what is it how we're supposed to get health care? And it's not just the healthcare question, but the insurance questions sort of all tied up? This is many lifetimes question.

**Bret** 01:59

Yes.

**Heather** 02:00

You got to?

**Bret** 02:00

Well, what I would say I mean, I think you're you're headed in exactly the right direction, which is yes, this is very frightening when it comes to health care. It's also very frightening when it comes to everything else. And the very fact, you know, we have banking that is not immune to this, we have, you know, the ability to source basic human needs. And the problem, you know, as we were alluding to, in the in the initial part of the podcast, is that the dangerous ideology that appears to want to control access to well being and shunted this way and away from that way and is pursuing something it calls equity, and then all of that, that that ideology, is, unfortunately being emboldened by the conservative response that says private property rights are paramount. And private property rights are important. But to make them Paramount, and make everything else subservient to them, effectively means that Well, as I was talking to a good friend of ours yesterday, you may have the right to drive on the road because it's public. But that doesn't mean you have the right to tires, right? tires are not public. And so, in a world where Yeah, I mean, I think the point is reductio ad absurdum is really the thing that you need to avail yourself of, because we're headed in such an absurdum direction that you know, we're going to land in these, you know, that's not how that works, right? It is now Okay, you know, because the Romans is gonna stop you exactly, then pharmacists, I don't see that happening. So yeah.

**Heather** 03:49

I guess I had I had two comments about this question that are not exactly what you said. And I don't remember remember the first second one. The first one with regard to you know, do we let our diseases play out caveman style, or we're not there yet. I have said and you have as well, for for many, many years that Western medicine has, if you amazing successes, and with those few amazing successes, it has imagined that it actually knows more than it really does. And those amazing successes come in two broad categories. One is surgery knife work. And the other is the pretty narrow slice of pharmaceutical interventions that are antibiotics and vaccines. And you know, I I say that, you know, even you know, with our conversations about vaccines that we've been having, but like really antibiotics and vaccines and surgery, in combination and you know on things like a germ theory of disease and you know before before many of the things about what pharmaceutical food can do for us got over applied and rendered doctors sort of Script readers and script and script givers. Many, many more medical doctors, I think are great diagnosticians, which is what you know, we need, we need scientists doing medicine, as opposed to people who have memorized a book of symptoms that may or may not have been described through an actual scientific process. So if you have a condition that is actually going to benefit from an antibiotic, or a vaccine, or from surgery, you should absolutely find the best primary health care provider you can and and, you know, allow them to know you well enough such that they will be able to tell you when in fact, you have, for instance, a bacterial infection that warrants an antibiotic or you're going to a place that you need these vaccines, whatever it is, I have found and this again, is a you know, your books long careers long, certainly many more than a couple of sentences long conversation that is warranted, but in the wake of two major medical things that happened to me five years ago now when I ruptured my Achilles tendon playing Ultimate Frisbee. And then for Gosh, now four and a half years ago, almost dying in the Galapagos, like boat accident, which caused such you know, such all body destruction across almost every system except my head. I have found so many health care providers who don't come looking the way that we are told to health care providers, the most excellent health care providers are necessarily going to look and this ranges from an amazing do do being an alternative degree to MD, which has all the same privileges in terms even in terms of like, prescription granting, but just is coming from a tradition that is more that spends more time with patients and is more hands on, through all manner of you know, there, there are certainly lots of quacks out there in every in every realm, but an excellent physical therapist or chiropractor or even acupuncturist, start structural integration therapist, all of these things myofascial release, have the ability to actually understand the health of a system of a body more than a doctor with a prescription pad and 10 minutes to hear what your complaint is, and assess whether or not they have that in their you know, in their file. That said, most modern insurance won't pay for all of these alternative practices. And so we're really kind of screwed.

**Bret** 07:39

Alright, I want to say two things. Follow up to that one. Or maybe it's three things. One is I know you to be somebody who will try things that people find effective and reject them when they don't work.

**Heather** 07:52

So several things I've tried that to the extent that naming

**Bret** 07:55

you know, you were not kidding yourself, because I definitely know you to come back from such things and say no, I don't think that that that helped. Second thing is the comparison to so called caveman is an interesting one, it cuts both ways. Yeah. And the, you know, your caveman ancestors, your Pleistocene ancestors would have been thoroughly jeopardized by bacterial infections, right, a wound could be very serious because it can turn into gangrene, which can kill you very easily. The ability to treat such things with antibiotics is amazingly powerful, a huge gift. Yep. But this modern world that has given us antibiotics, has also given us things like air travel. So the extent to which we are far sicker, far more regularly, because we are in contact with all of these things that would be circulating in some little place, you'd never hear of them. But suddenly they're everywhere. The it has robbed us even in the modern world has robbed us even as it has given us new tools to fight disease, it has given us a great many more diseases that we have to worry about. So that's significant. I also want to say, you know, I, of course agree and have said that, that, you know, basically medicine has these great successes, vaccines, antibiotics, and surgery being the most major of them. But I want to point out that each of those is actually us utilizing a built in biological near miracle, right and wielding it well. The antibiotics are chemical warfare agents that are being made by bacteria and fungi to fight each other and we can use them to fight on our behalf. Surgery is basically entirely dependent on the magical process of wound healing in which we can actually cut into you remove a tumor, and then you will magically you know, reassemble yourself in a way That if you think about doing such a thing on a car or an airplane is, you'll realize just how amazing it is that your body has this, this capacity. So anyway, I guess the point is now in vaccines trade on the ability of the immune system to be alerted ahead of time to something that it would ordinarily just acquire information about, you're getting sick. So anyway, we do this, but we're using medicine at its best is basically surfing a beautiful biological substrate that evolved and is there for us to improve upon

**Heather** 10:34

concert with our bodies, as opposed to acting like an engineer and going like how can I How can I brute force this thing into submission? Right?

**Bret** 10:42

Yeah, the arrogance of thinking that what we're doing is taking a biological system that ain't so great, and intervening in a way that makes it better if this is a garbage nonsense notion, and we get over it? Well,

**Heather** 10:52

I mean, it comes from the same people who say things like we only use 10% of our brands, and the vast majority of people have a chemical imbalance in their brains that needs to be fixed with exogenous drugs, really, you must not have been around for very long or understand anything about science or evolution, if you believe either of those things.

**Bret** 11:09

Well, I've come to a different conclusion about the claim that we use 10% of our brains. I think people who say that are when they say it using about 10% of their only

**Heather** 11:20

when they say, No, you're being generous, some of them say it a lot. So next question. Doesn't the politically driven narrative maintaining withholding of a known effective treatment prophylactic like ivermectin, arguably amounted to negligent manslaughter? How many would still be alive if given early treatment? So this again, is from last episode, when we spent some time talking about ivermectin last week? Yeah. Yeah,

**Bret** 11:46

I would say, potentially. So here's what I want everybody to get the nuance, the job of deciding what drugs might possibly be wielded, what evidence is sufficient in order to justify them being prescribed. This is not a job you want, right? Because you will kill people, no matter what you do, right. And there are lots of jobs that are true that for which this is true. But my point would be, this is a job that is impossible to do perfectly. And that means people will die as a result of whatever decisions you make. On the other hand, it doesn't mean that you can't make those decisions really, really badly, either as a result of ineptitude, or more likely, as a result of corruptions in the system that caused you to see things one way when you could see them another way. And so I don't know why, you know, hey, it's possible that the information we have on ivermectin is actually misleading in some way that we don't know what there's something we could see that would cause us to re evaluate what we think we know. On the other hand, if the evidence that we've seen is representative, then it does appear that at least we have gross negligence that is going to result in lots of loss, loss of health and loss of life. And so yes, potentially is the answer. Not necessarily.

**Heather** 13:15

What are the evolutionary reasons for comedy and laughter in general, and how did with time people come to appreciate dark humor? So again, I excuse me, every week, I pick some of the ones that we weren't able to get to the previous week. And because I'm going through the sometimes dozens of questions we weren't able to get to, these are often ones that we will should want to spend many hours on, but we only have a couple of minutes. So

**Bret** 13:40

So I, I can't remember exactly when it was but I advanced a hypothesis on the meaning of laughter and humor, at least a decade ago. And as I was describing it to somebody, they actually pointed to a quote that wasn't exactly identical to it, but certainly was in the same neighborhood and it was Tom Stoppard who said, laughter is the sound of comprehension. And

**Heather** 14:06

that's beautiful. I hope that's I hope that's true. Tom Stoppard is one of my favorites. Yeah,

**Bret** 14:12

yeah. And it's exactly a Tom Stoppard kind of insight So anyway, the hypothesis that I deployed was that effectively so a the thing to pay attention to is comedy timing, which I'm not going to claim to understand I don't think anybody understands it really. And there are some experts in wielding it but as to what exactly it's made of,

**Heather** 14:32

you can't do it explicitly, right? Like you're not if you if you go conscious on it, it's like catching a frisbee consciously,

**Bret** 14:37

yes, but I don't even think that an expert in it can describe what it is that makes for excellent timing. And what it is that makes for just slightly off timing that causes a joke to fall flat.

**Heather** 14:46

You know, when you see it, right and

**Bret** 14:49

so in any In any case, what I would say is that funny things are things at the fringe of consciousness that is to say there are things that we are conscious of to one degree Another but we are very often not conscious that others are conscious of it too. And so when somebody says something that is funny such that a room or a group erupts in laughter, what it effectively is, is a bunch of people signing on to the recognition that yes, they are aware of the same little oddity. And if one attempts to be part of the group by signing on to these things, by laughing when you don't really understand what it is that's being said, you will out yourself, right? Because you will laugh incorrectly. And the point is, there is something the way that a, you know, I was when I make a joke, and it's really good, right? I have the sense that it causes a kind of whiplash, the brain thinks it's going in this direction and suddenly changes direction, and it really Oh, that's not what it was. And that whiplash, you know, the sort of the snap of it is what makes the joke really funny. And so if you bungle the timing, it's, you know, sort of a, you know, moves around the curve.

**Heather** 16:04

But you're I mean, you're making a population level analysis. There's, there's two things here, right, there's, there's what, what it does to reveal an individual's comprehension per Stoppard's observation, but then it's about unifying and synchronizing a group such that not only are people who aren't in the same kind of know, reveal themselves as not being in the same kind of know. But you also become more synchronous going forward, and maybe better able to deal with an enemy Hunter, whatever it is come together and make an important political decision for the group, whatever it is, right?

**Bret** 16:39

Yes, well, it goes, it goes with the hypothesis, which we have outlined in various places. And as in our upcoming book about the nature of consciousness itself, that consciousness is most fundamentally collective, and that individual consciousness is secondary. And so yes, what is a group made of? It's a group of people who basically share conscious space? And how do you, you know, bump out the edge of some part of that consciousness will often we do it with humor, we dread around the edges of things that aren't quite understood or aren't quite comfortable to talk about? And somebody who does it? Well, you know, I mean, if you think about what the classic comedian does, right? They spend their life thinking about things that the rest of us find mundane. And noticing, you know, if you didn't find that mundane, and you thought carefully about it, you read, you'd realize how absurd you look doing that right? And so yep, so anyway, something like that. So what is the nature of, you know, dark humor, which is that this process knows no boundaries, right? It covers all of the topics that are most difficult to deal with all of the frightening stuff and all of the embarrassing stuff. And all of that doesn't, you know, in fact, you know, you can do comedy cheaply. In some sense, if you just go to one of these areas where people are, like, deliberately blinded to some set of truths and you, you know, you out them. Yep.

**Heather** 17:58

How do you think masks affect people? How do you think masks affect people, wolves, perceptions of us, with puppies born recently be affected with regard to the ability to read the behavior of strangers. So people, Wolf, is our term for our domestic dogs, including ours here lying on the floor that you guys can't see. So how do you think that masks affect people's perceptions of us?

**Bret** 18:23

It's a great question. I am not sure because I don't really know I mean, in some ways, we have argued that dogs are the most conscious non human animals debate domestic dogs are because they interface with us. And so in some sense, our collective consciousness extends to them in weird asymmetrical ways. And it is also I think, quite clear that the facial architecture of dogs has evolved in response to human sensitivity to facial expressions doesn't mean it goes the other way around. Right? You know, the

**Heather** 19:00

eternal sad eyes The Labrador gives us even when she's obviously happy results in her

**Bret** 19:08

getting a good many thing that's just so that we can stop feeling so damn guilty about how we mistreat the dog, which we don't but even she doesn't think we mistreat her but her eyes tell a different story guys tell a very different story. But you know, all the little gestures I mean, this dog has incredible eyebrows, right? ability to raise one eyebrow is on beyond any human I've ever known. But the point is, okay, we process their facial expressions, which has caused them to gain presumably is not a conscious control, but a subconscious control over the musculature in their face in a way that a wild animal wouldn't have. I don't know if they're processing our facial expressions. They process our voices,

**Heather** 19:49

they process our voices, and they probably process aspects of our endocrine illogical system that we aren't aware of. Oh yeah, given their much better sense of smell and the addition of that other chemical scent the vomeronasal organ, that, you know if we're agitated, even if we're not saying it, they may well be able to smell that agitation. Right? And do we?

**Bret** 20:12

Why do you smell frightened?

**Heather** 20:13

Yeah, like you, you could see agitation on my face, but she can maybe smell it on me.

**Bret** 20:18

Right, right, totally. I think that's likely now, even if they don't process our facial expressions. And you know, what this raises is a really good question. This raises all sorts of questions about, you know, what about those of us who, you know, are constantly joking around by saying preposterous things and, you know, trying to keep a straight face while we do it, you know, we're very misleading with our facial expressions, you know, that would tend to throw a dog if they were processing them?

**Heather** 20:46

Well, no, only if they were processing both the facial expressions in the language. And that's imagine that they have rather a lot more language on board than anyone Thanks.

**Bret** 20:54

Yeah, no, no, it doesn't really imagines that there is information in one misdemeanor, and that somebody who is abusing that channel in order to make jokes is basically noise with respect to a dog who doesn't care much for the jokes, you know, at least so far. And, you know, we can't therefore read actual information about your, your mental state. Yeah.

**Heather** 21:22

So I think I mean, frankly, the smells, the smells are less likely to lie, right? Like we're, we, as humans, as primates with less ability to sense smells are less likely to be able to lie with them to obscure our emotional state or hormonal state via smells. And so they're more likely to have an act of an active route into what we actually are feeling even if we are not aware of it.

**Bret** 21:47

Yes. So if they are processing our facial expressions that we are assuming or targeted another No, we're liars, right? They're probably walking around all the time thinking, Who does she think she's fooling?

**Heather** 21:59

like all the other apes, right?

**Bret** 22:00

That's all right. But there is a question a dog, even if they don't process the facial expressions, they could process the fact of masks and the pattern of when we put them on, and when we take them off, and how we feel about them, you know, we all resent them and feel relief at taking them off. And then why are we putting them on? And why don't we were they've been in the house, and why do we wear them in the house when somebody comes in? Right? All those things? You know, that's those are questions a dog could potentially ponder. And, you know, the problem is the dogs are isolated from each other, so they can't discuss what the answers might be.

**Heather** 22:33

That's true. Yeah. I'm not gonna spend too much time worrying about that. I guess I won't do that. Okay, discord question for this week before launching into the questions from today. Why are beauty standards so diverse between cultures? Is it natural genetics or marketing? For example, thin European women versus larger, more curvy hips and behinds being the rage in America? Again, lots lots places to go here.

**Bret** 23:01

Yeah, there's there's a lot of everything in the answer to this question. A, there are certain things that are. I'm trying to come up with objective language. But there's certain things that are more beautiful than other things in Objective terms. There are other things which are arbitrary, and are hallmarks of, you know, membership, and, you know, lots of stuff that is processed. You know, you would expect men and women to process things that are proxies for stuff that matters, right. And so like

**Heather** 23:40

across cultures, particular waist to hip ratios and women, regardless of whether or not the preferences for a thinner person have thinner women or larger women, still, the hip to the waist to hip ratio, preferences are more or less stable, which is suggestive of an interest totally unconscious, presumably, in fertility,

**Bret** 24:02

right? breast to although I think there's a persistent paradox with this one, which is, to a point, larger breasts are something that you would expect men to be interested in, because they are a proxy for the amount of resource necessary to produce a baby, which is not a small amount of resource, which doesn't mean that the resources in the breast go into the baby, but it means that a woman whose breasts are large or larger than some threshold, has those resources on board.

**Heather** 24:34

But, but not I mean, that's, that's only true when you're actually actively breastfeeding.

**Bret** 24:40

Nope. I would say no, I would say I don't

**Heather** 24:43

there's no evidence that size of breasts outside of having a baby at the breast is predictive of how much milk you can produce.

**Bret** 24:52

I think there's no no it's not a question of how much milk you can produce. It was a question of how much excess resource so for those who are okay, so A human females are the only mammals in which breast tissue is enlarged when not lactating. So that's fascinating an important fact.

**Heather** 25:08

But anyway, therefore clearly sexually selected, right, therefore

**Bret** 25:12

clearly sexually selected, it is a an advertisement is an advertisement of the presence of resource, but I don't quite get and I don't get it either, as you know, a red blooded male, or as a scientist, is why, above some threshold, there seems to be this obsession with bigger is better, right? That doesn't add up right? To the extent that a woman has in some way physiologically demonstrated the resources to produce a baby. That would seem to be like a checkbox, rather than, you know, the bigger the better. So I don't understand why that seems to be a priority that many men seem to,

**Heather** 25:55

well in this this will end up being a cultural difference. And it is I mean, it is a bit peacocking that, you know, the big show we TNA versus a more slender aesthetic, in some cultures is is a cultural difference. Some of which is ascribable to differences in resources not so easily done in the modern era between Europe and North America, right. But in terms of cultures in which there are regular boom bust cycles of food availability, preferences for, you know, finding beauty and more heavyset on both women and men, would have been effectively a potential way to prevent famine, not personal famine, like starvation rather,

**Bret** 26:41

well, I sort of think it's a like a tinbergen phony egg phenomenon. So tinbergen, who was one of the early brilliant ecologists, I think he was actually Richard Dawkins advisor. He did an experiment in which there was a preference in goals, which was this study organism for larger eggs. And what he showed was that there was actually no upper limit right, the bigger the egg and making a difference absurd non egg like phony eggs were still preferred in some way,

**Heather** 27:13

even when anatomically impossible given the size of the bird, right? So I

**Bret** 27:17

guess what I'm, it's a little bit like people's affinity for sugar and things, it's like there was no reason to set a limit on how much sugar to you know, to, to avoid, because the presence of arbitrarily large amounts of sugar and the environment just isn't a thing until industrialization. So I think it might be something something like that, I have run into something recently, which we might want to track down. If you haven't, maybe, maybe you and I have talked about it. But there is this belief that beauty standards have changed radically in the West. And that is inferred from rubenesque. paintings in which women with a great deal of what might have been called poker tude, were painted. But the recent evidence suggests actually, that this may have to do with the models who were available to the painters, not the preferences. And so that, in fact, is may have been misinterpreted. So anyway, that's interesting. I haven't heard that for a topic for another time.

**Heather** 28:20

All right. Well, yeah, we could go, we could spend a lot more time on that. But we're gonna move ahead. To our first question from last hour. Is the world just a series of rigged games within rigged games, humans create and defend rigged games and competitors assert their own structures and games to be rigged for them instead? Can't blame everyone for trying?

**Bret** 28:42

Well, you know, yes. And no, I would say, you know, take romance for an example. Romance has a game theoretic structure to it, but played well and honorably, it's a collaborative game, right? There's also a way to play in an analogous space in a predatory way. And so I guess the point is, I don't think all games are alike. And the fact that everything is reducible to game like structures or economic structures or something like this is an observation that only takes you so far, because really, what we are detecting when we see rigged games is that the malignant versions of all of these things have taken over. And so we, you know, if romance has a game like nature in some way, it's playful, right? That's good. And the participants may not want to emphasize in anybody's mind that it's game like, right, it's much more delightful not to think of it that way. At the point that you realize somebody is playing you. It's hard not to recognize the pattern that says, oh, here's the game they're playing, and they're the winner at my expense.

**Heather** 29:59

So I thought We were playing not that you were playing at my expense, right?

**Bret** 30:02

And so I guess the point is what causes us to fall out of suspension of disbelief mode and into game analysis mode is the discovery that we are not collaborating in the way that we thought that we were. And so what that means is, even though the whole landscape is games, that it is the malignant versions that cause us to recognize it, and therefore we tend to see games as malignant, which is just a mistake, right?

**Heather** 30:26

Yeah, that's good. No, this person says Christmas is not over not here in Norway. We have to wait for newt for wiping the jewel out and he'll be here the 20th day of Christmas. Also known as the 13th of December, that must mean January, that must be the 13th of January because otherwise it would just on average has no idea on Christmas. What's going on, but okay, apparently in Norway, Christmas is not over. Which is good. I imagine it's still pretty freakin dark in Norway, and you need as much as much Christmas Yuletide spirit as you can get. Sure. All right, next question. What are your thoughts on commercial pet diets and vaccinations? Can you share the best diets out there? What are your pets eating? Thank you for spending your Saturdays Saturdays with us. It means a lot and it's greatly appreciated. Thank you. The pet industry is a giant clusterfuck Yeah, the pets themselves are not they're awesome. Everyone should have pets if they can. They are super wonderful and helpful in getting through all sorts of madness. But you have to Nigerians have become through no initial fault of their own. So so responsive to market forces unable to make a living except by charging for all sorts of things that animals don't need and and just basically being pill pushers, the way many MDS are now our animals are fully vaccinated. But I don't know I think I think they're asking for one of them to get a flu shot. Honestly,

**Bret** 32:08

Fairfax is actually anti Vax he just really doesn't like

**Heather** 32:14

yeah, I actually for the first time now I'm hearing about a flu shot for I don't even know which why it would be one and not all of them. Maybe it's just because it's the dog and not the cats but now they haven't had flu shots I don't think but they forgot all of their lifetime or you know, you need a tighter every two or three years shots. And they always will. Because they do spend some time outside pet diets. Man, you know, we don't to disaster. It's a disaster. And we you know, we don't spend the time to not give them commercial food because you got to have a life. Yeah. But it's a disaster. And it's all full of garbage. And it's terrible for them. But it's not even

**Bret** 32:50

like full of garbage. The way junk food is full of garbage. There's something physiologically dangerous in the pet food supply. And you can just see this in the number of pets who just mysteriously end up having some allergy to their food something is off.

**Heather** 33:08

Oh, will you catch it developed a chicken allergy just developed a chicken allergy? What are you talking about? Yeah, cats been eating chicken for six years, let's just develop the chicken allergy

**Bret** 33:16

to chicken out which you know. So basically what this means is stuff that's in the gut is being exposed to the immune system, which is not supposed to happen. This I believe is analogous to what happened to me with wheat. Yeah, right. And so basically the question is, what is exposing stuff in the gut to the immune system? Right, that's the question and maybe it's the same thing for the pets that's happening to people that's causing so many of us to be allergic to things that we otherwise would normally eat. But that's the real question. And you know, you've got some kind of dysfunction and it's especially likely to show up in pet food because pet food is especially likely to be less well regulated than human

**Heather** 33:58

Yeah, and it's gonna have a lot of filler in it. And the fact is, especially for cats, but also for dogs, like you should expect I don't actually know if it's true, but the prediction is that you'll have less of a problem with the diets and the foods have animals that are omnivores in the wild like if you've got a rabbit or guinea pig or something then if you've got one of these car never ends and your pet food has any filler at all in it you know increasingly there's a lot of grain free pet food available and it costs a little bit more but that's almost certainly worth doing. But even the non grain free stuff has stuff in it that at least your cats wouldn't be eating in the wild you know cats don't eat sweet potatoes in the wild. Yeah, sorry. They don't. So it's you know, is it bad for them inherently not necessarily but is it the sweet potato then in one of one in 50 cats creates a leaky gut syndrome Yeah, maybe you know probably not for dogs. Dogs are more omnivorous and they do more sharing of, of food as well in their lives. Out state and so probably also have a more robust sort of, you know, gut biota also So, boy, it's a it's a disaster.

**Bret** 35:09

Yep. Could be could be the fillers could be the pesticides on the crops could be other stuff in our environment could be off gassing furniture that causes physiological reaction that, you know, inflammation that causes the immune system to see stuff if we you know, we'd be wise to figure out how to wield precaution more effectively because we are suffering from its failure. Yeah,

**Heather** 35:33

I mean, I guess one, one thing we do do is, when we cook, for instance, a whole bird, like a turkey or a chicken, we tend to not spend a ton of time getting absolutely all the meat off the bones, we will make the carcass into stock. And then we will take that carcass after we've pulled off all the rest of the resource for us to use for soup or for the base of whatever we're going to use, you know, freezing stock. And then we will take all the rest of the remaining meat and give it to the animals such that there's essentially no waste. And it's great for them. It's real food. It's honest, it's actual meat, and it doesn't have anything else in it. Yeah,

**Bret** 36:16

but don't give them the bones after you've cooked them. I don't know how good advice that is. We've certainly been given that advice, but I don't think it's safe. Yeah. I don't know how dangerous it is. But it's not the same as the raw bones. Yep.

**Heather** 36:31

All right. Hi, guys. There has been research showing that richer nations are more accepting of gay people than poor nations. Is there any idea why less wealthy nations and generally less accepting?

**Bret** 36:44

Yeah, again, this treads into territory that I hesitate to keep kicking the can down the road, but I just think there's no, there's no alternative. I think there is a good reason for the pattern, but it probably isn't the pattern that you think it is. In other words, there's a question of in what way gay people are accepted. And that's all I'm gonna say. And we will come back to it. When COVID allows. That's right.

**Heather** 37:08

Blink COVID.

**Bret** 37:09

Lame. COVID? Yes.

**Heather** 37:11

All right. Why not? It's not going to fight back. Wait,

**Bret** 37:13

no, it's Yeah. Okay.

**Heather** 37:16

Aside from the issue of censorship and suggestive algorithms, what risks Do you see for the common person that is people who are not in the public eye? who continue to use Instagram following the new terms and conditions announced in December? I'm not on Instagram. I don't know. I mean, I assume they're doing the same shit that everyone else is doing. But I don't know what specifically Instagram is doing.

**Bret** 37:36

I don't either, but Instagram is owned by Facebook. Oh, right. Right. Is WhatsApp.

**Heather** 37:42

Facebook is on by WhatsApp. Facebook owns WhatsApp.

**Bret** 37:47

Yep. Yes. So I don't know what these restrictions are in a very general sense across all platforms, there is less risk to you if you are not dependent on these platforms to reach your audience, or worse to earn your livelihood. But obviously, civilization depends on people who are reaching audiences and earning livelihoods. So in some

38:19

Instagrams, everything not about that it's more about having access to like your phone's data.

**Bret** 38:28

Yeah, so Zach is telling us something about Instagrams updated Terms of Service has something to do with access to your phone. I know that WhatsApp recently updated their terms of service in a similar way, allowing Facebook to access more data from you know, ostensibly what takes place on WhatsApp is encrypted, presumably it is. But that doesn't mean that the metadata isn't awfully valuable. So what I would say is, the smart kids are on signal, and I wouldn't use WhatsApp and I wouldn't depend on Instagram and we will talk more in future live streams and podcasts about what wise people can do to shore up their technical lives because we are behind the eight ball.

**Heather** 39:17

Why do you think rapid antigen stripe tests were not used by any government around the world to avoid having lockdowns if everyone would be able to test themselves every day? Wouldn't that lower dress with the number of infections? So rapid antigen stripe test? As a phrase here, it looks like it might be a term of art and I don't know it is a term of art. But I can imagine, you know what i what i think it means if it's not a specific reference, there was talk sort of early mid, I don't know May June, about these being available and deployed. And clearly, I mean, we were having conversations with people at that point like this is what we need. I don't know the state of whether or not they ever became like if they were ever the if the problem was one of development or deployment, and those two, which one of those it is makes for a very different answer to why not? Right? Like where they never developed? Maybe because it actually proved to be very difficult. I honestly don't know which of these is to or where they develop but not deployed, in which case that's going to be a political, you know, it's going to be we'll have the government issue.

**Bret** 40:28

Yeah, I don't know. I would say, I think there needs to be. It's not really a post mortem yet, but there needs to be a deep analysis of how we got COVID. So wrong. Yeah. And I would say one of the huge issues for me is the low quality of testing in general, right, the difficulty of accessing it the slow speed of results, the large numbers

**Heather** 40:55

of PCR tests,

**Bret** 40:57

false positives, false negatives, all of these things. And basically, the point is, look, you know, if your problem is that you're in danger of crashing because you're blindfolded. job number one is getting the frickin blindfold off. And the fact of not knowing who is sick when is making this all the harder to deal with it is fueling irresponsible conspiracy stuff, it raises the possibility of shenanigans being played politically. So

**Heather** 41:32

it makes everything more tribal, right now, wear your mask when you're in the park.

**Bret** 41:35

Right? Well, I mean, you know, to take one example, we have these new strains, at least one new strain that are showing up higher degree of transmissibility, I have not seen a good analysis on how that works. I know from studying trade offs, that it will have borrowed from somewhere, right, it will have borrowed from somewhere and that somewhere, could be a standard somewhere, or it could be a non standard somewhere, but it could for example, be that more transmissible than standard. SARS COVID. Two is a result of the fact that it's better able to transmit outdoors. In other words, if we are lulled into a false sense of security because the strain that we got used to has certain quirks that allow us to do certain things and some virus were to depart from that pattern. It would for a while be more transmissible doesn't mean that it's more capable, right just yet will you know maybe it's less transmissible indoors, more transmissible outdoors, and we are of a mindset where we think Outdoors is safe. So I'm not saying that's true, but just

**Heather** 42:43

asterisk I I'm not to say it's not possible, but I have an impossible time imagining how a virus that transmits. Basically, respiratory airborne particles could simultaneously become more transmissible outdoors and less indoors. Well, I don't I don't if it was optic, maybe some mechanism. Okay,

**Bret** 43:03

let's say that this was a gain of function escapee from the Wu Han lab. The experiment that generated it or the set of experiments were done indoors, so it would have been optimized inadvertently for an indoor environment. And then to the extent that there is some sort of slider right, in which a bias towards what you're optimized for moves towards a compromise. It's not that it would necessarily lose anything recognizable indoors, it would just be slightly less tuned to it, because it would effectively have borrowed from its outdoor transmissibility to get so optimized for indoor transmissibility, which is anomalously high.

**Heather** 43:42

Again, I don't like it's possible, there's some mechanism I haven't imagined but the the high indoor transmissibility seems to be about this, you know, this, this metaphor that you've used up the bucket felling, yet, it's about boundary layers and density of particles. And you know, you're indoor in a room without good airflow, and there's nothing the virus can do to change the fact that you're indoor in a room without good airflow. If someone else is breathing out viral particles, they are going to stay in that room and get more more dense over time as someone continues to breathe them out if there's not good airflow.

**Bret** 44:17

Okay, so here's what here's how you do it. This is this is not based on evidence, this is just proof of concept that something can X can fit the space. We know that outdoor transmissibility, has been very, very low. We also know that sensitivity to UV light is very high, but we know that those two things are not the same property. In other words, even at night, it appears not to transmit outdoors. So it's not just the UV sensitivity. Now suppose that what happened in these novel strains that are more transmissible is that some sort of pigment or other robust defying element was introduced that made the point Article a more durable in the presence of UV light but less transmissible because some percentage of the time whatever molecular coating it was heavy

**Heather** 45:08

on it drops faster. Exactly.

**Bret** 45:11

Yeah. So that means it's not like it's lost a skill that it had in years it just means that something is making it a little more of the stuff in the bucket is

**Heather** 45:19

on the floor, you're not going to run into it, right?

**Bret** 45:21

I mean, it's exactly like, you know, you you take your umbrella into the world carrying an umbrella makes you slightly less fast if you have to run and it makes you substantially more capable of staying dry. If it starts to rain and sand. We

**Heather** 45:37

all know it makes it less likely that it will rain. This is established. Right?

**Bret** 45:42

I quibble with the we all know part of but I agree that there is rain that it exists. It happens and sometimes

**Heather** 45:48

concession I heard a concession in that yes.

**Bret** 45:50

Yeah.

**Heather** 45:55

I'm not sure I think I'm not sure exactly what this question means. I'll show it to you as well as I read it. Hi, Breton. Heather, I'm white pilled. On the Capitol, it's weeds out the authoritarians within our government and political parties. What do you think? So I think there's just there's a typo, we're missing word or something in there. And I'm also not sure what white pilled is referring to, I know red pilled and blue pilled. We In fact, recently re watched the matrix for the first time in a long time when they're boys.

**Bret** 46:22

red, white and blue pill. I also have not heard white pilled

**Heather** 46:27

Yeah, so I don't know what white pill means. I'm not sure what the what the rest of this means. But they but this person asked it twice. So So I put it in here.

**Bret** 46:38

Yeah, I really wish I understood that. I'm especially confused by the idea of it. I think it's supposed to read it weeds out the authoritarian point weeds out the authoritarians. Yeah, yeah. Definitely.

**Heather** 46:56

You can, but I think the rest of the phrasing and the question is obscure enough that it's not necessarily gonna make out white pilled the moment or series of events by which a person abandons despair and surrenders to the inevitability of hope, not out of sheer optimism, but from facing difficulty and nihilism head on through the use of reason inquiry, is the final destination of those who are red pilled and black pilled. And tends to happen when a person becomes cynical of cynicism and skeptical of skepticism. It is named after the white hot fire of hope in a pill form and it's medicine for the soul. So

**Bret** 47:27

is it not? CS Lewis? Is it not in some way related to Oh, one pill makes you larger and one pill makes you smaller? No, not least Carol CS Lewis CS Lewis, right. So it's some people laughed in the back of the wardrobe.

**Heather** 47:45

I think it was partly as religious and philosophical writing rather than wardrobe. But if

**Bret** 47:51

it is not close kin to the first against the wall club, first against the wall club is the embrace of the idea that you can't really protect yourself from the Yeah, authoritarianism that's coming. And so you might as well lean into it, although I gotta say,

**Heather** 48:04

you know, there's a there's a line in there. And that urban dictionary definition that Zack pulled up that I was just reading from abandoned was something about cynicism, and then something about skepticism. And, you know, you in your teaching used to explicitly one of the earliest assignments that you would give to students in many classes was ask them to write about define and explain

**Bret** 48:29

the relationship between cynicism skepticism and faith. Yeah, yeah, that was a that was one that turned to people's thinking on its head and

**Heather** 48:39

it's it's brilliant and you know, to to simply object anything that comes your way is to have a cynical perspective and to simply accept anything that comes your way is to have a faithful perspective on you know, in within some context and to be skeptical is this middle ground which which says, maybe, maybe not. Let me see what other evidence there is. And so the idea of abandoning skepticism seems like a very dire choice no matter what the conditions but certainly certainly right now, right you do not abandon your skepticism.

**Bret** 49:10

Now some people will disagree resulting in a skeptic schism. Yes. All right. That's not worth anything. But I was known to say nothing. I didn't even know if I was going to be able to say and I thought,

**Heather** 49:21

yeah, skepticism, Celtic schism. skepticism. Yeah, I couldn't say it.

**Bret** 49:25

Yeah. difficult.

**Heather** 49:27

Are there are there any missing links, outliers or any other deviations in species that have made you question the core of evolutionary theory itself and consider alternative explanations? parentheses? I'm not a creationist.

**Bret** 49:43

Yeah, I would say no,

**Heather** 49:46

there are certainly California Yeah, no, no,

**Bret** 49:49

there's there's certainly some impressive gaps right. Now let's just take the gaps amongst the living text the gaps. Don't

**Heather** 49:59

Don't render important.

**Bret** 50:04

Imagine you have a tree, a phylogenetic tree, and it has lots of tax on it, right. And then a lot of time passes. And one of the processes is an extinction process that leaves some tax on isolated, the other creatures existed, but they've gone and in fact, this is something we should expect. Because the process of adaptive radiation, the thing that causes an ancestor to produce a whole bunch of species, right, that's a species increase process. And then time create, so you basically get exploration of design space, and then you get the elimination of some of these things, which were good enough to work for a while, but not durable to last for the long term. And so you know, you can get a very big exploration with lots of taxa. And then you can get a lot of loss. And then if you have a process that lasts long enough, you get things like, you know, the order to Billy dentata the aardvark, right, which is totally alone. No. Well, I mean, yes, it is so long. I mean, there are other aardvarks so it's not that lonely, but But in any case, so the point would be

**Heather** 51:17

surprised I guess, if we had uniformity of organisms across across time, you know, sort of demarcating every 100,000 years or something, what it looked like at that point like that's, you know, that's not how geology works. That's how weathering works that's not how you know therefore the fossil record works and it's also not how the evolutionary process in the first place worked. So you know, where are we defined consistent evidence with no gaps in any way? That actually would seem to be the kind of evidence for a creator but at is often trotted out as like that's what you need in order to prove that evolution is true. Like no that would that would be bizarre that would be statistically so unlikely.

**Bret** 51:58

Impossible. Yeah, all but impossible. So you know, there are things we mentioned on our last podcast, I think the clade that includes hyraxes, which is something that looks like a rodent. It's not, but hyraxes, elephants and sirenians

**Heather** 52:16

do, the higher X's have nice nice teeth.

**Bret** 52:19

They do have very pointy teeth and what they don't have is rodent like t so the diagnostic characteristic of rodents is these evergrowing incisors, which the hierarchies don't have But anyway,

**Heather** 52:30

and they like canines, rodents, written select canines diagnostically and hyraxes don't

**Bret** 52:35

true. Now, the point is elephants, manatees and hyraxes that's a pretty widely separated group of taxa. They don't have similar niches anywhere. They're

**Heather** 52:51

each other's closest living relatives, but that doesn't mean that they, you know,

**Bret** 52:55

they can interbreed, right? Oh, yeah. Not remotely close enough for that. So anyway, those sorts of gaps are natural, and we have them. But the other thing that you and I have, we are old enough as biologists to have seen gaps that seemed impossibly large get closed by fossil discoveries. And in fact, we were lucky enough to be at the University of Michigan, when Phil gingrich came back with his initial fossil finds that showed exactly what creationists used to mock evolutionists, about which was the claim that whales were ungulates or, and so

**Heather** 53:35

the whales had returned to the sale as a secondary return to the sea from an angle that ancestor

**Bret** 53:41

right and so there used to be creationist literature mocking evolutionists in which you know, a whale on legs wandering in the sea, which is of course nonsense, but what Phil gingrich found were fossils in which you had whales that had legs that were in the process of being reduced over time and there are now quite a number of these fossils. I would

**Heather** 54:01

point this does you have tiny little femurs in very basil extent snakes early in development like bones but Woods have tiny tiny little femur bones early in development because

**Bret** 54:10

they are lizards that lost their legs they're not the only tax on what the most speciose tax on that did so anyway, this is so we were we were there Phil gingrich was at the University of Michigan Phil gingrich found the fossils newt gingrich has never found a significant fossil in his entire career. Yeah, and

**Heather** 54:28

and guess what? You're gonna love this. Those two gingrich's spelled differently? I know. Oh, man.

**Bret** 54:34

All right.

**Heather** 54:35

I need like that one. Okay. Trump's ban will directly hurt free speech and authoritarian regimes like Russia, they'll justify harsher censorship and restrictions by pointing to the US. I Incidentally, writing this in from Russia. I love you both. Thank you. Yeah, it's a Yeah, that's right. This

**Bret** 54:55

is a huge setback. For all of us,

**Heather** 55:01

yeah, man, there's so yeah. Okay, so we had a ton of questions this last hour. And we're not going to get to a majority of them, including many, many good ones. I'll read one more here and then we'll move into the questions from the next hour. To what extent do you think that overfitting the algorithm leads to capitol storming and BLM riots

**Bret** 55:21

overfeeding? That's what that that's what it really means overfitting. I think there is a kind of, so I'm just guessing what this question means. Okay. I think the question means to what extent does verification ism result in things like storming of the Capitol? And what else?

**Heather** 55:44

and black lives matter? Right? Yeah, this the extremists on both sides.

**Bret** 55:49

I think it accounts for a huge amount of it. And that basically, the point is, you've got a chaotic, noisy environment in which that which is captured on film, and that which isn't, is arbitrarily distributed. And if your mindset is looking for evidence of, let's say, rampant white supremacy, you'll find that if you do a scientific analysis that says, Is there rappin white supremacy, you won't and so we are all born verification assists, that's the natural thing to be you have to learn the sophistication of being a falsifications, which greatly upgrades your ability to sort pattern from noise. And people who are not aware of that. And just simply are looking around trying to make sense of the world naturally default into verification ism, which makes them easy prey for those who are selling overly neat stories. Yep. And so yes, I think it plays a huge role.

**Heather** 56:43

That's right. Okay, Zach, did you put a line in here for me, or should I figure out? I don't? I'm not seeing it. Oh, wow. Yeah, we've a lot of questions. Okay, first question from the next hour after a no question contribution of any amount of $42. Thank you. So we already got our answer. isn't the only Stuart what isn't the only story here? Why the Capitol wasn't defended by more than a few mall cops. And the question why was that allowed to happen?

**Bret** 57:18

It is certainly a question. And it's one I have asked and wondered about. There, of course, nefarious possible answers. And I, I don't think mall cops is the Yeah, that's, that's not a fair description. Yeah. You had the Capitol Police, who were overwhelmed. You have the question of why there was not. And then you had, I think Virginia State Police who were brought in, in large numbers. And there's a question about why the National Guard was not present early on. And I don't think we know the answers to this. I am not convinced that it in an environment in which this event is, you know, the lightning rod in a polarizing debate over, you know, how authoritarian to be and who is allowed to speak? I'm not convinced we're going to get a fair analysis of what took place. Yeah. You know, it's hard enough for something like COVID, which ought to be completely nonpartisan.

**Heather** 58:22

And it's slow. Like that's, that's a slow moving nightmare. Yeah. As opposed to, you know, some hours of chaos. And I mean, I think so it sounds like the conversation that you had this, the second conversation that you have posted, the Dark Horse podcast that you have with Jeremy Quinn, yesterday, is now is now is now live on YouTube. And he, he is someone who is on the ground, if you haven't listened to conversation yet, but does he speak to what he saw as the police presence there?

**Bret** 58:53

Yes. And he says, you know, he says a number of things about being surprised, as he so apparently there was no ability to communicate. Cell phones were not functioning at the time, because there were so many people present. So the cell architecture was overwhelmed. But he was very shocked to discover how the event had been cast in racial terms when he got back to the internet. And he was shocked at the portrayal about the police, effectively having let the whole thing happen, and it's nonsense as a portrayal that he saw push back and you know, he saw a lot of variation. And that basically, that's a cherry picked analysis, which doesn't explain why there wasn't sufficient police presence to prevent it. But he the idea that police just let this happen, he says it's nonsense.

**Heather** 59:52

Does birth order rather than mom's age influence the occurrence of gestational diabetes? Is it a heritage of interaction Female and previous embryos. What else can be influenced by previous embryos? homosexuality? Super This is from eco super interesting question. I do not know the answer specifically with regard to gestational diabetes. It is known that embryos leave markers in mom. And I believe boy to this off the top of my head, I think the evidence for that is that women who carry male fetuses end up having some some Y chromosome produced stuff circulating in them even after they've given birth, or that shows up again, at the point that they become pregnant again, I don't remember exactly what it is. So I don't the idea that homosexuality is about something happening in the womb seems unlikely to me, we don't we don't need it. We you just don't need to go there to explain sort of birth order effects and whether it is a birth order effect. But to explain birth artifacts. You don't need to go to gestational stuff. Yeah. Right. With regard to homosexuality? Well, I'm

**Bret** 1:01:13

not I guess, I'm not sure. I don't know that we need a physiological explanation. But it is certainly very interesting. The older brother right hand rule, which has been demonstrated multiple times, says, the more older brothers you have, the more likely you are to be gay, if you're male, so long as your right hand is a fascinating pattern. That does not imply that it is a physiological distortion of the birth environment or something like that. And in fact, I think it's probably a an adaptive pattern in which you know, something.

**Heather** 1:01:48

Right. Yeah. I mean, the prediction, the prediction of what, what I was alluding to, and what you're now stating explicitly, that there's no reason to think is gestational. The prediction would be that a later born right handed son who was adopted out at birth would not be would not have an enhanced likelihood of B being homosexual.

**Bret** 1:02:08

Well, but I leave open the pot. I mean, it's possible. This is known, and I just haven't looked into it recently enough to know the answer, but it could well be gestational, but it doesn't have to be a distortion of the environment. Now there, there is a set of processes that will distort the environment, which has to do with the work of David Haig, primarily about the conflict of interest between mothers and fetuses over resources. And I would point out, most of you are probably not going to know what the hell I'm talking about here. But I would point out that the conflict of interest exists, it is inherent to the fact that the mother and the offspring are not 100% related to each other. But the degree of that conflict is very different. In the case of a monogamous bond, in which all siblings are full siblings, rather than a polygynous, polygamous or promiscuous system in which siblings are presumed to be half

**Heather** 1:03:11

siblings. So let me just provide an actual example from I think Hague's probably that first 1993 paper, although he's done a tremendous amount of work as of others since then, which found that so it's about genes being imprinted. The idea is that genes actually retain and I'm going to speak as if they're conscious, and of course, they're not retain a marker of which parent they came from. And so you could have a maternal imprinted gene that is identical in terms of its spelling to a paternally imprinted gene, except that one of them came from mom, and one of them came from dad, and that the these different alleles, maternally. imprinted versus paternally. imprinted will code for different kinds of, for instance, rates of development in the developing fetus, were in a mother with a fetus inside of her wants very much for that child to thrive and survive, but is also interested in her own health long term and her ability to continue to produce more children down the road. Less so that analysis changes the closer to the end of her reproductive life she is and the father of that fetus, if they are in if he is in a pair bonded relationship with a mother has a very coincident interest as as the mother does. But if this was a this is a one off thing, and the baby is never going to meet its dad. The paternally imprinted genes in that baby have an interest in that kid laying on as much as fat as possible and getting as big ahead as possible before it's born, which renders it more likely to be more successful after birth, but also renders it less likely to provide its mother with an easy birth and more likely to actually harm its mother on birth. And so you get maternally imprinted genes, pulling resources slightly away from the kid, so that mom is more likely to survive birth intact and be able to produce more kids later. And maternally imprinted genes, especially in polygynous, societies, pulling towards putting more and more developmental speed on the kids when they're still in utero, such that the maternal health is downgraded relative to fetal health.

**Bret** 1:05:23

So, in effect, what you have is an arms race between fetus and mother. And this results in fetus, which has access to the mother's bloodstream, using chemical signals to try to increase the liberation of resources, and the mother turning down her sensitivity to those messages so that she doesn't over hear you. Right? Yeah, the point is, you get these two systems, you know, you get something broadcasting too loud, and something not listening at all. And the point is, this is at least one of the root causes of the illnesses that go along with gestation. I would also point out, though, this is such a deep rabbit hole,

**Heather** 1:06:04

that we're not really getting at the question, but hopefully it will be satisfied. But

**Bret** 1:06:07

in effect, you have what we have described as the two reproductive modes of males, one of them is collaborative, and the other is predatory. And the point is the predatory one results in things including gestational disease. Because the male who has a one off sexual encounter with a female does not have an interest in her future offspring doing well, in fact, they're competitors with the offspring he's producing. So it is inherently of a very different type, which goes back to our discussion earlier of different kinds of games, collaborative and competitive games. And, you know, unfortunately, we're stuck with a situation in which love and romance are being pushed in the direction of this predatory game, which is part of the reason the landscape is so dysfunctional.

**Heather** 1:07:01

Yeah, let's play games. But let's make it collaborative. Yeah. All right, Brett,

**Bret** 1:07:09

that's all beginning to hear voices.

**Heather** 1:07:16

Brett, have you considered of capitalism is one of those things, which helps us when we're young and kills us when we're old? Why are we allowed to cherry pick the Bible, and vice versa for marks? I think the vice versa for marks means helps us when we're young. No, hurts us when we're young and helps us when we're old?

**Bret** 1:07:40

No.

**Heather** 1:07:42

So there's three things here, I'm not sure what the vice versa for Marx is referring to the Bible or to capitalism. In this case,

**Bret** 1:07:48

well, he also did not allow we are allowed to cherry pick in the Bible. In fact, you have to do to get a coherent story because it's self inconsistent. But with Marx, you're not allowed to take the good and dispense with the bad, which I agree with that. There's, there's some valuable stuff in the Marxist analysis. Well,

**Heather** 1:08:05

and we talk about prescription Yeah, needing some systems that are socialized without, in any way arguing for a, an entirely socialized society. Yeah.

**Bret** 1:08:15

So my quibble here is going to be that the, and I think I just went through this on the trigonometry podcast. I hesitate anytime anybody wants to attribute anything to capitalism, because I don't know what they mean. Right? And I think the thing is, if you're if capitalism is as broad as markets, then you can't dispense with it. And so, you know, markets are a gift, they need to be well enough regulated that they don't produce massive amounts of harm, which was happened, which is what happens when you don't regulate them. But in any case, yes, the process you're alluding to were processes involved in our markets. And I would say the interaction between our markets and our political system, cause this senescence like process where things that are profitable early and have massive late arms tend to be unstoppable, right. That's the process we've described. Now, earlier this week, I had another thought which I need to flesh out a little bit about the other side of this process, which I didn't realize, which is that there's a tension in, in bodies, which mirrors a tension in governance, that is the driving force that causes this, this senescence process. So it has to do with continuity of governance in the civilization case being analogous to things like tumor surveillance in, in bodies, but anyway,

**Heather** 1:09:50

you just read that later. You just said that the deep state is to tumor surveillance, as governments are the bodies.

**Bret** 1:09:58

No, let's put it this way. tumors are bad. The things that correct for tumors cause us to grow age to grow feeble with age and fall apart. And that all of this, that the whole thing has an analogy to the civilization context. And I believe all you would need to do is get it and then spend enough time to realize that it's true to recognize where we have to go that this process, the games, we are playing in political space cannot possibly address this problem. And the end is coming if we don't escape the story.

**Heather** 1:10:35

Well, that sounds like that should move to the top of your to do list. Yeah, so pressing? Yeah. Okay. Because I don't, to me, I have not yet that doesn't yet sound operational.

**Bret** 1:10:45

But, well, we've talked about the solution, the solution involves the recognition that the values of our system need to be rescued from the vessel, which is out of date. And so you know, instead of the Constitution sucks, or the Constitution is sacred, the values,

**Heather** 1:11:03

okay, but rescued from the vessel, which is out of date is not operational, in terms of what new vessel shall be created, and how

**Bret** 1:11:11

the equivalent of a child we need to have the new system born from the old system before the old system dies. Anyway, it's for a frontier stuff.

**Heather** 1:11:24

Yeah, it's just it's, I think you and I may disagree about what operational means?

**Bret** 1:11:29

Well, let's put it this way. I, you certainly wouldn't want it. I think the recognition of the process and the broad brush that suggests what we have to do, you know, revolutionary change without revolution. That that's about as operational as you need to get because until we're all on board with that idea. You don't need the operational it's, you know, it's like, spending a lot of time. Terraforming Mars before you have a rocket that can get you there.

**Heather** 1:12:02

I'm not sure I agree with the analogy, but maybe. Alright. Do you think the UK is appointed for life House of Lords gives us some protection against rent seeking and combative politics that your senate does not?

**Bret** 1:12:20

Yes, yeah. Well, it will, it will have both to have benefits of this type, which is, of course, why our supreme court is appointed for life, and it will have costs right. And, you know, none of these structures is perfect. And it's it's all trade offs. Yep.

**Heather** 1:12:37

phylo mimetic analyses, have been seen for legislation originated from originating from Alec Capps who can provide such analyses for the Patriot Act, and the upcoming response to January 6.

**Bret** 1:12:53

What was the Alec connection?

**Heather** 1:12:54

I gotta remember what Alec Alec

**Bret** 1:12:56

was a corporate legislation writing process, I think,

**Heather** 1:13:02

Yeah, I will. I'll look it up. But a phylo mimetic, it's not a word have ever heard before. phylo mimetic analyses have been seen for legislation originating from Alec, who can provide such analyses for the Patriot Act, and the upcoming response to

**Bret** 1:13:16

it. So what they're saying is that one can deduce the source of legislation by looking at elements of the way it's phrased, basically, that you can deduce heritage. What are they? What does Alec stand for?

**Heather** 1:13:34

American Legislative Exchange Council, and right at the top of their page, they have the Alex statement on the events of January 6 2021.

**Bret** 1:13:43

So the question is a good one, which is when you have these diabolical pieces of legislation, how much can you figure out about where they actually came from, and therefore, whose interests are being represented? So yes, I think it's a great idea. And I don't know who can produce it, but it should be. It should be somebody focus. Somebody good.

**Heather** 1:14:05

Yeah. Heather nailed it with the word futility. Do you have any recommendation for how to help volunteering or is there a pill I can take so I can learn to Stop Worrying and Love the New World Order. We're all Huey Lewis now. Yeah. Yeah, new drug. We do.

**Bret** 1:14:23

And it just never shows up. Yeah, look, yes. The, the remedy. To the extent there is one is just the recognition that we're all in it together. Right. That's kind of that's where the comfort comes from. And the horror of it is, you know, there's nothing to be done about it, other than to confront it. So I think this goes back to what you read. of tech, not Han and the question earlier. About white pills and the even earlier illusion to the first against the wall club, but the point is okay, let's stop avoiding the obvious authoritarians are on the march. They're jeopardizing everything on which we depend. And we don't have any choice but to prevent them from trying to bring about their utopia, which will of course be dystopian in a novel and yet, highly familiar way.

**Heather** 1:15:31

All right, a lot. Where did you say we're at? sack?

1:15:35

You're an hour.

**Heather** 1:15:37

Okay. Let's do these next three. Two of them are really just comments, and then we'll close up for the week. Wouldn't the capital attack be terrorism given Oxford's definition, quote, The unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians in the pursuit of political aims? The mob did want to intimidate the politicians, so they not? Well, you were saying that basically, there's a legal standard for which which terrorism has a legal definition. And the fact that the OED may say as soon as the odious definition may say something that does not fit that legal standard doesn't mean that the legal standard doesn't exist,

**Bret** 1:16:17

it's not even a legal definition, I would say what it is, is a trigger of a an other world in which all protections are suspended, because it is the most frightening thing in the universe. And I guess my point would be, we have protections for a reason, the idea that anything should cause us to suspend all of them, that thing ought to be something on which a huge number of eyes who are beyond reproach are, you know, if the aliens are pointing a weapon at the earth, right? Do we want people you know, do we want constitutional protections to prevent us from doing what we need to do in order to fend off the aliens? No, but the point is the chances of a circumstance in which you're actually better off suspending your constitutional protections because of this better, the other are pretty low. Yeah. Now in the case of, you know, COVID, do we need to prioritize some things over certain civil liberties for a short period of time? Yeah, we probably did. And we blew it. But the point is, you can't have a term that everybody thinks they know what it means. And everybody is using it to describe anything that they think is really bad, right. And then it triggers the legal suspension of all sorts of stuff. And most diabolical of all, when you start delving into what the trigger causes to move into motion, the Pfizer courts and warrants. You know, basically, you've got this, these powers housed in the executive, which are absolutely dictatorial. And so anyway, I don't think it's a definitional issue. I think it's a, you've got an emergency escape hatch from the most essential stuff that makes our civilization really awesome. And the protections that go with it ought to be, you know, absolutely top notch and have nothing to do with whether we intuitively feel that something is terrorism, because, you know, we're those people trying to intimidate legislature legislators, I can make that argument. But, you know, if I was trying to intimidate legislators, would I put on a fanciful Viking hat? Like, you know, I just

**Heather** 1:18:36

started to get into the brain of that guy.

**Bret** 1:18:38

I don't know what it is, but, but I mean, actually, you know, he had a YouTube channel, which is now suspended. But that's a shock. But my point is, could in a world where nothing special happened when you triggered the word terrorism? Could a reasonable person reached the conclusion that these people were engaged in that? Yes, reasonable people could disagree? In a world where that is the magic word that causes legal protections to evaporate? Is it so clearly terrorism that that thing ought to be triggered? No frickin way. So anyway, like that.

**Heather** 1:19:18

Okay, two last questions, comments. I can't wait for the work to force trumpers to wear orange armbands emblazoned with a big golden letter T. Are you both excited for reeducation? Always. That's from our old friend. I'll fight you naked.

**Bret** 1:19:36

Yes, not excited for reeducation. Now, it doesn't suit either of us very well. The people who are hell bent on re education don't seem to know very much about the actual world and they seem to have a chip on their shoulder. So yeah, I'm not looking forward to.

**Heather** 1:19:51

And finally no questions. This is this is a great full circle from the beginning of the first hour here today. No questions just an acknowledgement of heartfelt gratitude for this conversation. Your words provide us with the courage to carry on. Thank you and your sons and for people. Thank you for thank people yes for people, some of which the firm has been hailed

**Bret** 1:20:13

a bit more for than optimal. Exactly.

**Heather** 1:20:17

Thank you. We, I think reminding ourselves of what we have to be grateful for. And being explicit about our gratitude is very important right now, always, but especially right now.

**Bret** 1:20:30

Yeah, gratitude, cattitude and attitude, I would say.

**Heather** 1:20:36

I reminded of pasta rasa disaster, which was the trilogy in the Caribbean landscape where I did a season of fieldwork. And so you said, gratitude attitude? cattitude.

**Bret** 1:20:53

I believe cattitude was second. I'm not ready to go down with the ship over that one. But yeah, you know,

**Heather** 1:21:00

I think admit, it's possible but it may be kind of niche the way Rasta pasta disaster

**Bret** 1:21:05

after disaster. Yeah, I remember that place. So question before we sign off here? Yeah, very often we figure out what the titles of these episodes should be after we reflect on what we've said you want to do that live? Well, there's a good question. There's something that didn't get said in the first hour. But that might have and I'm wondering if it would be a suitable title. and if we talk about it here, then to the extent that it leaves people scratching their heads, there will be an answer that they can readily available themselves

**Heather** 1:21:32

of, perhaps perhaps, is it tyranny comes

**Bret** 1:21:35

at you fast? What do you think?

**Heather** 1:21:40

It does? Yes, it does.

**Bret** 1:21:42

All right. Well, we will talk about whether or not that might be a title. You're puzzling over such things. All right. announcements. A, we did not intend to release the Jeremy Lee Quinn firsthand report from the assault on the Capitol in the middle of our livestream here, but the report is so timely that we felt it was necessary to get it to you as quickly as possible. So if you would spread the word about the 62nd live stream, check out the Jeremy Lee win podcast which is only part three of my conversation with him. Part Two will be emerging next week.

**Heather** 1:22:24

We may be numerically challenged here at darcars podcast

**Bret** 1:22:28

we are historically challenged in the sense that tyranny comes at you so fast that you sometimes have to report on things as they happen and then go back to editing Zachary, the tyranny

**Heather** 1:22:40

is not a word about integers. It does not it

**Bret** 1:22:43

does it get tyranny gives the halfwit

**Heather** 1:22:47

it provides many,

**Bret** 1:22:48

many halfwits there, you can harden

**Heather** 1:22:51

ours to halfway, yep, yeah. All right. So yeah, join us at our Patreon. Please consider doing so we do a private q&a once a month, the last Sunday of the month, at at mine, where we can actually engage with people on chat. And then we leave that up for anyone to look at is who's on the Patreon at any time in the future. Brett has monthly conversations on his that are quite wonderful. You've been doing those since you started your Patreon back in the summer of 2017.

**Bret** 1:23:23

Absolutely. I met some great people. Yeah, really amazing people.

**Heather** 1:23:29

You can you should consider being a member of the first against the wall club, for which you do not need to have any evidence but there is stuff that you could get that has that image on it at the store at store that dark horse podcast.org. Yep.

**Bret** 1:23:48

Holly pointed out on Twitter that it was a good match for the events of the of this past week our friend Yes. Okay, cool. But again, you can draw up your own emblem for the first against the wall club.

**Heather** 1:24:02

That's right. And we have we got a great guy making clips for from these episodes. And I'm sure he will be creating some interesting ones from this week. So check out the Dark Horse podcast clips channel as well. And we will see you next

**Bret** 1:24:18

week. Yeah, one more thing. I would say one thing that we should be doing there are many things we should be doing. We will revisit the question, but what is it going outside? Oh yeah, go outside. Definitely do that. But what I was going to suggest is one hedge against this rapidly marching, authoritarian, tyrannical impulse is for us to start making sure that we follow people if you follow me follow Heather vice versa. So that to the extent that somebody gets shut out of an environment, there's some other places through which they can get messages into the world. So

**Heather** 1:24:53

yeah, so also Darkhorse moderator@gmail.com. is a is a portal into You know, ask logistical questions really, but we probably should be re upping are looking into alternative platforms just in case just in case the purge continues. I mean, maybe it'll stop. Maybe it's

**Bret** 1:25:16

I just can't see that happening. But hopefully, hopefully these crazed maniacs will come to their senses and stop the purge and realize what values it is that actually keep the West together.

**Heather** 1:25:29

All right. Let's keep talking even when we disagree, and get outside.

**Bret** 1:25:34

Okay, well, everyone, see you next time.