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Bret, Heather

**Bret** 00:09

Hey folks, welcome back to the Dark Horse podcast live stream q&a catedrais edition

**Heather** 00:14

catedrais. Had a day. That's right. Our oldest darkest cat has taken the opportunity to go outside.

**Bret** 00:20

He's flown the coop he

**Heather** 00:21

is not drinking cream today with us

**Bret** 00:24

without his loss

**Heather** 00:25

it is. Although frankly, I'd rather be outside to Yeah, me too. Yeah. Let's do this outside. At the moment. There's other people out there being outside noisy.

**Bret** 00:34

Yes. There is that lawn care

**Heather** 00:39

sounds like it. flow or something. Yeah, exactly. Alright, we're going to start with three questions from Episode 72. If we're going to discard question and then launch into the questions from the last hour, could counter will culture borrow the tactics that atheism used to challenge established religion?

**Bret** 01:00

Well, I'm not a huge fan of this idea, because I'm not a huge fan of how the atheist played it. I think B atheists box the job by not acknowledging that religion was something other than a mental malfunction.

**Heather** 01:14

I guess I don't know what the tactics are either. So I think that they got they sort of, especially like, the new atheism movement sort of got it wrong, but I don't even know what what are the tactics are that have been used?

**Bret** 01:28

Yeah, that's a that's a decent question. I I yeah, I can't speak to it directly. I mean, they obviously tried some goofy stuff, like defining people who are post religion as brights that didn't exactly catch it on. I don't remember that. You don't remember that. So it's, it's still a point of mockery of the the new atheists, but yeah, I I don't know. I mean, I think I'm not even sure what it means. Because the right thing to do is to acknowledge what religion is clearly from an evolutionary perspective, and then extrapolate carefully to the idea that we are somewhere new, we are not in the habitat for which our religious traditions are evolved. And

**Heather** 02:13

so that I agree with all that I don't think it gets to the question, though. And I think the reason that the question is not quite tracking for both of us is that we understand religion to be an adaptive and evolved state. And we are not the first to argue and I think john McWhorter, his book must be coming out soon, in which he, I think, largely in this book is arguing that this this woke stuff is a kind of religion, it is religious thinking. So you know, that that would suggest that it to me is adaptive, you know, adaptive does not mean that it is that it is honorable or good. You I

**Bret** 02:51

disagree with that. Because the difference between a long standing religious tradition, which we can say is adaptive, and a novel one, which we have no basis to say. So in effect,

**Heather** 03:03

so you didn't I understand what you're where you're going, but you should finish the thought, well, the thought

**Bret** 03:07

is just what we have is a brand new religious belief set, but it's not a religious belief set in which we can say, all right, it's literally false, but it must be true because it's lasted. lasted all of seven minutes, right? Yeah. So anyway, yeah, I think, you know, if you want to know what happens if you apply postmodern thinking to things that matter, the Suez Canal is as good a guide at this moment as anything. Right? It's

**Heather** 03:36

I think that's a non sequitur.

**Bret** 03:38

No, the, the, to the extent I

**Heather** 03:41

mean, I just I don't think there's anything actually that went on the Suez Canal that has to do with postmark. I don't

**Bret** 03:45

think I don't think there is but I guess my point is, if we extrapolate from the claims about merit being a conspiracy against certain people, and logic being logic, math, a belief in two sexes, all of these things being part of these oppressive structures, and then you say, Okay, well what happens if we get rid of them? And the answer is sooner or later every canal gets plugged, every type of expertise you need gets lost, and that's where you end up okay.

**Heather** 04:15

The question though Yeah, which I think we're not going to end up answering is about whether or not the same tactics can be used given that the two things are both religions and so far You know, given that religion is religion, and also the woke the woke revolution is a kind of religion. And a critical distinction being that religions that are established are de facto established and so have have generations of experience of being themselves and being effective and that the newest thing has passed no such test of time. Yep. That said, I would be interested to see a list of what are imagined to be the tactics used and you know, to see okay, which These, if any of us, some of these may actually have seemed like a bad idea, you know, on the atheist part and would be a bad idea to apply here. Like, for instance, calling yourselves the chosen people effectively, right. And some of them may just not translate and some of them might. So I'd be interested in that list. But I we're not generating the list because I think we're not aware of exactly what the tactics are imagined to have been. Yep. Next question, when a person's development is deprived of certain elements in childhood, and the person manifests craving, like behaviors and adulthood towards the missing element, why aren't these behaviors self correcting or eliminating?

**Bret** 05:41

I'm not 100% clear what the question is getting at, I would say.

**Heather** 05:48

So you didn't get say you lived in a home where sugar was restricted, because your parents understood that sugar was not

**Bret** 05:55

during my literal craving? You know, I

**Heather** 05:58

read the question to you exactly as I got it,

**Bret** 06:00

right. But but by invoking something like sugar sounds like we're talking about,

**Heather** 06:04

I am interpreting the question in a way I know exactly what you know about what the question says, Okay. But um, so it could, it could be any number of things. I'm giving an example because you said that you weren't sure what the question meant. One, one way to interpret this question is craving like behaviors in adulthood towards the missing element? It could be parental love, it could be sugar. Okay. So, you know, either of those things would fit this question.

**Bret** 06:28

So and the question is, why does it not self correct? Why does the golfing result in overindulgence?

**Heather** 06:35

Yes, exactly. Which is why I included here. I think it's a I think it's a Yeah, interesting question. You know, why? Why don't? Why once uncalibrated? Is it difficult to get calibrated at some level?

**Bret** 06:48

I think the answer in a general sense is going to be that you have to development is a period in which calibrations happen. If you leave calibration open, so that it is relatively simple to calibrate everything as you think it should be calibrated much longer forever. Duration of lifespan, you have a complete mess, the recalibration problem ends up. You know, you reset this and you realize that 16 other things were downstream of it that are now on calibrated? And so the answer is you're more of a hazard to yourself, if you have that capacity than if it's taken offline. And that doesn't mean that there aren't lots of things that we could realize, you know, okay, I'm permanently living in an environment where there's more sugar than is good for me. And I would love to reduce my taste for it by 75%. Right, sure, that doesn't in and of itself have a negative consequence? Why can't I just find that thing? But the answer is, an infinitely calibrated machine is not likely to be viable.

**Heather** 07:51

Yeah, no. And I think actually, that it's like, it's a utopian vision. And it's a utopian vision exactly of the sort that many of the, again, the trans activists are engaging in, like, well, I'm just, I can just change whatever is real about me. And by by dint of saying, now I'm a thing now I'm a different thing, right? And actually, that level of calibration isn't, isn't what we do. It's not possible. Yeah, me, you know, in some in some organisms of some certain types, you know, maybe sometimes, but not, not us, not mammals. Yes. Yeah. Do you think next question from final question for Episode 72? Do you think there's utility in caring for houseplants? Why do we do this? Does keeping plants provide a meaningful connection to the natural world, or my many tropical specimens specimens, merely simulated nature?

**Bret** 08:43

I think there is lots of value in it. I suspect that it is one of a million different things that let's put it this way raising houseplants surprisingly hard, right? Actually, you have to be tuned into their needs in a way. You know, we have downstairs and African violet. My grandmother used to raise African Violets she did a good job of getting them flowering, very sensitive little creatures. And it's you can overwater them I learned from you that watering so that the water gets on the leaves has negative consequences which doesn't make any sense to me because I think they're South African but in any case, there will be rain where they come from so what is the natural Hell yeah, so what the hell but anyway, the point is the tuning into a creature that when you screw it up is not a tragedy, right and killing a houseplant is not it's not like you know, mistreating your animal, right? But getting accustomed to paying attention to those signs is one of many ways to tune into both a non forgiving physical system a system in which feedbacks are real, where there are conservation laws. And also to getting good at the kinds of skills that you do need for taking care of animals or children or other people.

**Heather** 10:07

Yeah, it gets it's it's practice of a sort. It brings some green inside. You know, we we don't have many we have we have so much nature around us that out every window is his plants. His is one of our non plant specimens digging at something at the moment.

**Bret** 10:29

For attention, yes.

**Heather** 10:31

Like all this talk about plants really as my miffed it's gonna step on my computer to show me just how he feels about this.

**Heather** 10:40

And I will say, too, that you got the farther north or south you live away from the equator, the harder it's going to be to raise tropical plants indoors because of the Sun regime that they're just some months, the year where the plants are not going to be getting enough, although understory plants are accustomed to consistently low levels of light, but it's it's just a very, very different environment. And I, I've begun to wonder about some of the things that are particularly missing for houseplants like wind, like, you know, we know that being outdoors is healthy for us. And we don't know most of the reasons for that. What is he eating? At zip ties? Yes. So you're having having plants by a window that you open occasionally I think will render them healthier. But

**Bret** 11:40

I think we're in a predicament where the cat is in a position to potentially mess up the live stream. Eliminate that possibility? Okay, sorry. You were saying?

**Heather** 11:51

Yes. So he's he's off screen for all of you. You can see his ear, I guess. But he's sitting in front of a keyboard that controls a lot of things that Brett has just turned off. Yep.

**Bret** 11:59

So you were talking about the missing phenomena in a plant's existence? Like wind?

**Heather** 12:05

Like wind? Yeah. And I think we have a few of the mechanisms for humans about the value of being outside Yeah, like, like many pathogens will not transmit as easily because of boundary layers and, and wind and the fact of sunlight having many health benefits, some of which we know, but I suspect there are many more that simply being outside has benefits that that we have not begun to understand which are typically reductionist science. And certainly that will be true for plants as well. We imagine them as these much simpler creatures in some ways they are, but are sort of framing of their striving as tropisms right? Like they're, they're phototropic they strive towards lighter, they're gravit Trail, but they grow away from gravity is pretty simplistic. And while true while true so far as it goes, I suspect that it obscures a whole lot more complexity, that that gardeners really will understand pretty well and people who are keeping indoor house, houseplants alive will understand to some degree, but within these very interesting constraints that we've created for ourselves.

**Bret** 13:17

I agree. And I'm reminded of the late George Estabrook who was a mentor of ours botanist and he was an advocate for essentially having houseplants that you take outside and charge them up over the summer and then bring them inside and they yes there's an animal out there I want to know if it's an interesting animal I think it may be but in any case charging your it's behind the tree at the moment charging your plants up outside and then bringing them inside and enjoying them over the winter and basically you have to get good at sir you know they they don't you know if you're taking tropical plants which are many of the plants that we like to have you know they can tolerate outside conditions you have to be very careful to make sure that they are in the hospitable conditions and then you bring them in and yeah winter even indoors is not hospitable to them but if you can maintain an equilibrium

**Heather** 14:24

which it's not it's not a perfect analogy but it's good enough and he met he made it work in Michigan Yep, like he he brought he took tropical plants outside on his deck or whatever. Yeah to his garden. Yeah. And then would bring them in and Michigan Yes, I'm gonna continue apparently have like it's just so beautiful here today and winter is finally over and it's gonna get wet again tomorrow. So we're super distracted here.

**Bret** 14:47

No, I'm gonna be involved in this conversation. But there is a large there's an animal outside and they're terrestrial. Yeah, they're not very many things. It could be it could be our cat up though. It did. not appear to be in it's not somewhere he goes. So anyway I'm gonna keep watching.

**Heather** 15:05

Yeah my What am I well be him. We might, we might encourage one of the boys to send Maddie outside Maddie is our Coyote. Our Cody white, it's not that big. It's not gonna danger, okay. Okay so Maddie was going crazy yesterday thinking that there was something in the ravine but then she was barking up trees and I tried to explain to her in her best English that canids don't climb trees, but she was not buying it and he's I

**Bret** 15:29

hope I'm not making an error but my impression was this animal was much darker than a coyote and therefore can't be one and I really do want to see what it was. Okay, we have diverted are

**Heather** 15:39

going I'll read a question you can listen while you're looking out the window with Irshad Manji, you had mentioned that you expected at this this is from the discord server this week with Irshad Manji, you mentioned that you expect collapse to happen as a result of the corrupt forces in society. Can you talk about some specific possibilities for what that might look like? Do you foresee different collapses for different systems, educational system, energy grid, local governance online platforms? So I did tell the fine person who sends me these, this is a gigantic question.

**Bret** 16:10

Yeah, it is a huge question. No

**Heather** 16:12

doubt about it. No,

**Bret** 16:14

yeah, I would say we've got various different kinds of collapse in you know, you can have an economic collapse that in which your basic systems remain online, you can have collapse born of the stupid management of things like a power grid, which is much more fragile than it needs to be. You can have civilizational collapse as a result of positive feedbacks that result in something small cascading and having a bunch of different impacts. We are definitely to the extent that we implement the desires of the woke revolution, we are inviting a rather serious, relatively quick kind of collapse, because essentially demonizing competence is going to result in incompetence. And, at best, our enemies abroad, take advantage of our feebleness and order is maintained enough to keep food flowing to the grocery stores, or it results in something, you know, unthinkable, catastrophic collapse of the very systems that keep us afloat. So anyway, that's on the table. And it's part of why those of us who are focused on this issue, you know, we are sometimes accused of being overly focused on woke issues in the culture war, but what culture we're talking about whether or not we should be able to actually accomplish the things that are necessary in order for us to feed and how's our families, right. I mean, we're talking about the most basic functions of a society. And so you know, I don't see any culture where I see, we either will or will not be able to do these things. Yeah, I

**Heather** 18:00

mean, I think that's, again, I'm not sure it's addressing the question, but I do think that's at the core. It's a core disagreement between to the extent that there are two sides, the two sides the position that you have just taken that I also agree with that i imagine that most if not all of the people watching, you're watching this agree with, which is the framing this is a culture war is misunderstanding the scope of what is at stake. And the other side is saying, no, it's about priorities. And you've got and we insert and we insist on us, right? We, we insist on us. And I actually remember a discussion that was a disagreement that I had with a student of ours. years ago, obviously, a young black man who said, It's not time to talk about climate change, we cannot do that we must solve all of the racism first. Yeah. And I, you know, I pushed back as I did, when, and this this is a private conversation. This wasn't happening for the whole class, but it happened a few times. And you know, I just as we expected students to push back against us when we said things that didn't sound right to them, that we also made it clear that they should expect us to push back and I did and I never, I never could get past just that framing, right. That framing itself was like the core belief. Yeah. Which was simply racism exists. Therefore, it must be the only and not just the foremost really, but the only thing on on the docket until everything is resolved to you know, and this is the sticking point, of course, like due to someone who hasn't yet been named yet satisfaction, right? Right. Therefore, it will never be fixed, therefore

**Bret** 19:53

it will never be fixed. Yeah, I mean, I think it is clearly tactical. Yeah.

**Heather** 19:57

And it wasn't in this young man's case. Like he didn't what he was doing

**Bret** 20:00

was repeating something in all likelihood that he had heard that sounded muscular and clever, right. But the problem is, you know, yes, you can hold the ability to address, you know, climate issues hostage as a matter of gaining leverage, and the point is okay, but you're also then taking responsibility, or you should be and you don't sound like you are taking responsibility for all of the harm that will come from that thing that you're doing. And, you know, I hate to say it, but there are a lot of awful things that do not jeopardize humanity. And right, it seems reasonable and natural to say actually, all of our priorities ought to involve a recognition that there may be things that we find, you know, intolerable, but that those things that are literally intolerable by all of humanity, you have a higher priority by the very nature.

**Heather** 21:00

Yeah. You know, it's like, you know, ranked lists are is racism, right? Like, you know, it, not only Didn't you rank the things in order, I don't agree with but the fact that you have anything, but the one thing on the list is an indicator of white supremacy,

**Bret** 21:15

right. And in fact, we have heard the claims analogous to this, you know, the idea that, you know, nuance is itself, you know, white supremacist or something, like idea of anything but my priorities and you are the evil I am describing, right, like, Okay, I get that, but it's legitimate. Yeah. And not some clever at this point. Yeah. It's something you made up and you know, it. Yes, I'm the king of the world is a nifty trick, but it's, it's not acceptable. Yep. Yep. Yeah, we'll fly with the adults. Yep.

**Heather** 21:50

Okay, let's move into the questions from this last hour. Could we make Darkhorse available on Patreon? UTR eo n, a platform that neither you nor I had heard of before? We can mirror automatically so won't burden Zack, we're a new video platform built to give youtube so much need competition. Love you guys. That's from Patreon. Yeah, Zack apparently looked into it just when he saw the question come in. Yeah,

**Bret** 22:15

I think we can't give you a definitive answer. We need to know more about it seems like it would be harmless to do so and probably wise to diversify in light of what the major platforms do. So anyway, it's it's an interesting idea. Be curious if others have experienced with the platform, and whether there's a downside to, you know, if there were a dozen such platforms, would it make sense to mirror everywhere? Or does that effectively create a problem?

**Heather** 22:44

And there are, I mean, excuse me, there are some other platforms and I just that that's that's the issue is how many of these are out there and which one which ones or one is actually best? So you know, if anyone does have experience with atrium, maybe apologies to our wonderful moderator, emailed Darkhorse, moderator@gmail.com. And then neutron itself can do so as well, if you've got something more than what you've just said here to say about your product. My son created a planet and said, there's only one type of camouflage things can only look like rocks. Could this sort of malaria and camouflage evolve? Perhaps because even if that rock totally moved, you still don't know what it is.

**Bret** 23:31

I see no reason to I mean, you know, just proof of concept. We could have a planet a rocky planet, in which only a tiny number of things are camouflaged, and they happen to look like rocks. I don't know how you would design a planet in which, I mean, I guess if everything looked like rocks, then what else is there to look like?

**Heather** 23:52

Right? But you know, there's only so I had to read it a couple times to and it's there's only one type of camouflage. It's not everything looks like rocks, like rocks and rocks and things that are camouflage look like rocks, but then there's other stuff.

**Bret** 24:03

Like trees, right? Okay. Yeah. Yeah, I don't see any obvious reason.

**Heather** 24:08

I mean, you know, you made it preclude it precludes camouflage ever being effective in any landscape that isn't Rocky. Right? Yep. So you would never have camouflage evolve in any landscape that was Sandy or wildly muddy and forested or something. So I think

**Bret** 24:22

the question is, obviously, there. I can't think of a world in which you would expect this, but could you construct a world in which this would be the natural consequence? You know, I sort of think you could get there but it would be a world of a small number of entities rather than a hugely diverse world.

**Heather** 24:44

I think that's right. I think it I couldn't imagine a world in which it could be the first type of camouflage, but other types of camouflage would would quickly evolve. I would. Yeah. I'm now hearing chemicals can be considered sis or trans. It seems the work have already taken over stem thoughts. So I don't actually know if this is a tongue in cheek question or if this is a this is a serious question.

**Bret** 25:10

So I have assumed and I have asserted, I've defended the term sis and trans, right? Because I believe they were borrowing from chemistry,

**Heather** 25:18

right? So this is about morality. This is about like handedness of molecules.

**Bret** 25:22

No, it's not a reality. It's about whether a particular if you have two hydrogens if

**Heather** 25:29

you're right, it's not karate. It's that's left, right. Yeah, yeah, you can have

**Bret** 25:32

them over here. Right? And you could have them over here. Yes, no, the atoms is the same, but the organization is different. So anyway, I think, you know, just and trans is fine. And I've been

**Heather** 25:45

attacked, wave aware in, in which context,

**Bret** 25:48

both as terminology, I think it's fine. You know, just as the Term Evolution is borrowed from chemistry for biology, I see no reason not to borrow Sis, and trans for sociality. But I have been taken to task multiple times by those who resent the idea that sis is anything that needs a label. And I think this is an error. I don't see any reason not to be generous about the terminology.

**Heather** 26:17

Oh, you and I disagree on this. I don't call myself a sis woman. I won't know I'm not interested in playing that game.

**Bret** 26:24

Well, I'm not just as I don't declare my pronouns, because they're obvious. I don't think it's necessary that I say I'm a sis male. In other words, if we're going to have a taxonomy, right, there's something Yeah. You know, just as you don't describe yourself in any regular sense as heterosexual. Right. The point is, there is a term for it when you need that descriptor. And so I see sis as viable in that regard.

**Heather** 26:48

So sis from the Latin meaning on this side, in reference to place or time as opposed to trans or ultra as the other. other alternative in this entomology online, originally only of place sometimes of time.

**Bret** 27:08

Yep. Interesting. Okay. Cool.

**Heather** 27:11

So on this on this side, so you know, it's not it's weird. It's not exactly, exactly right. for for for gender, on this side versus on, you know, opposed to?

**Bret** 27:22

Well, I think the idea is, I guess it's like, it's, you know, you are born with your sex and gender aligned. And in this taxonomy, you're one of them transitions, okay. To The other possibility. Yeah. Okay. The other binary possibility. I would point out, you would, Yes, I

**Heather** 27:42

would. Yes. I appreciate that you do? So wait, that's not what I'm looking for. There we go. Okay. Um, you both seem like you have really great memories. Any advice for those of us with poor recall and the retention of a steel sieve? Or is that just down to genetic lottery since we can't upgrade our Ram and hard drive space? So now you have something to say on this? I will

**Bret** 28:06

keep track of it. Yes.

**Heather** 28:10

Well, I will keep track of it for you, too. Because I already know, the kind of thing that you're going to say here. There's there's a lot to be said actually. And yeah, there's a there's a ton to be said here, I highly recommend for instance, the RA Louis bar has a short piece story exactly called fullness, the memorias which is a tale of the risks of having a prodigious memory. And it amounts to effectively, you can't see the forest for the trees that endure, he does so in a more mo more poetic way he arrives at that. But basically the idea is, you remember absolutely everything and there's no room, there's no gaps left for you to actually make meaning of the things that you've remembered. And so I used to, in my programs, and I think I think I was to actually dogmatic about this. Because I saw so much especially in science, so much emphasis placed on memory and litanies and lists and such, I specifically went the other way, and said, your memory is not going to matter here. I almost never give in class tests and comparative anatomy labs being distinct exception to that. But you know, I was very much more emphatic about the ability to generate ideas and to keep track of what the implications of those ideas were in a sort of have like a decision tree of like, Okay, if this than this than this, how far back do I have to go and the nodes to know you know, if I discover that something's wrong, like where do Where do I have to go from there. That said, you can fill out much more fleshed out trees, the more you can recall pretty quickly. And your recall might even just be like, oh, there's a whole class of things that I know where to look to find them. As opposed to I now have to know what all those things are. I just I need to know The place where I can go to look for the things. And you do need Memory Of course for what? To know how to assess what at first pass makes sense or not just like that ridiculous crocus site that I showed in the first hour here, the first hour and a half, that was just confused about the nature of sexual and asexual reproduction, exactly where it was trying to describe that fact. If I if I hadn't already known some things in that domain, I might have been, you know, certainly further confused, but also left to believe that they actually know what they're talking about which they didn't. So lots more.

**Bret** 30:34

Lots of magical thinking there. Somebody should have been called crocus pocus.

**Heather** 30:38

Totally Yeah, yeah.

**Bret** 30:40

Why not? Yeah. Yeah, I would say, Look, I don't think almost anything about this memory stuff is labeled to be genetic, in the sense that we tend to think of such terms. Yeah, I think this has a lot to do with reward structures and practice. And what I would say is, it is very easy to practice memory. And the question is, are you motivated to do it? The thing you need to know is that in order for a memory to stick to go from short term memory, what did I say 10 seconds ago, into long term memory, will I be able to understand or Remember what I said 10 seconds ago, tomorrow, there's some pattern of checking about whether or not there's been a reactivation of the memory. And so the reason that you can't necessarily remember what you had for breakfast yesterday, is that you don't tend to check in with what you had for breakfast after it's done ever. If you get sick. Exactly, you'll remember very clearly. But so you can use this to game the system. And you can basically take an idea that, you know, you won't be able to remember, and you can arrange to revisit it at some periodicity that you can remember to re trigger it, right. So if a memory is going to evaporate, and you say, actually, you know, I really need to remember, you know, the symbol for a particular element, right. And I always forget that one, right? Well, then you can just force yourself to check in with that chemical element and get yourself to recover it. And probably it's best a little bit like strength training is best. If you're just at the limit of what you can do rather than well within the range of what you can do, because you're sending a message about the significance. If you allow the memory to dissipate far enough that it is not easy enough, it is not easy for you to recover, when you actually practice the skill of finding your way back to it. And so you're really practicing all of the adjacent stuff, too. And the more you practice, the adjacent stuff, the farther you can get, where they're still something you can grab on to that helps you remember, you know where you're headed. So

**Heather** 32:40

yeah, so I mean, one thing and that is like, flashcards, therefore, which can be useful for for things, including the various video versions might be more useful with a longer periodicity between attempts. To follow on what you were just saying,

**Bret** 32:58

Yeah, more periodicity. Great if there's a sleep period in between Sure, different episodes,

**Heather** 33:04

part of why cramming doesn't work nearly as well. Yep. And so but I guess, I thought you were maybe going to talk about names and, and the classroom.

**Bret** 33:13

So we had an hour just talking about this, I can't remember exactly why, although we'll we'll get back to it. But we were talking about the question. Oh, you're talking about the question of how easy it is and how different people have different facility with remembering names and I find I have gotten very very good at this but I was not very good at this. I was I would say average at the point that I started teaching at evergreen and because of the way evergreen was structured, where your students were your students full time for at least a quarter sometimes three quarters in a row. And that meant that the really cool rewarding part of the job involved knowing everybody individually it seemed to me absolutely essential that you know their names and be able to interact with them personally. And so I set about you know, my little task for myself was if I had if I was teaching alone, I therefore had 25 students and I would typically lead in a few off the waitlist so it might be 30 students could I have a discussion with them on the first day where by the end of the first day I could name them all and then I would joke with them that I wanted them all to continue to wear the same clothes for the rest of the quarter being in the same seats right yeah cuz you'll lose half of them yeah, before the next day but that's not bad to get half of That's amazing. One day

**Heather** 34:34

I my goal was always by the end of the first week, but first day is that's tough, it's tough. I spent 25 like if you're teaching with somebody got 50 robbery Person program 75 like but still ended the first week for me was always like, like that will happen. And I still cannot to this day believe that I actually had faculty at that school argued to me that it was ridiculous to try to learn students names at that school, where the the So much of the point was about relationship,

**Bret** 35:02

right? You would, you would expect everybody would be on board. And it's amazing how hard to sell it was. I also started, as you know, requiring students to learn each other's names because the community is much better. And this, of course, mortified a lot of students because they weren't good at learning names, because nobody had ever forced them to do it. So you know, give him a deadline by two weeks, and everybody should know everybody's name in the room. And,

**Heather** 35:25

you know, do some games, didn't you? Like thrown thrown names back and forth? like sitting in your circle? And Yep, like, I look at you and name you. And then you have to look at someone else's name them that sort of thing. Right? Yeah.

**Bret** 35:34

And, you know, typically on the first day, I would have some exercise in which we were talking about some part of the content that was going to get us into whatever we were studying that term, but I would, you know, have people contribute, I would pick up their names. And then at some point, I would say, all right, who can name everybody in the room. And the thing is, almost nobody was any good at it. But usually in a class of 25 or 30 people, there'd be one or two aces were really good at this, for whatever reason, I never knew why. But they were able to do you know, the same way right away. So anyway, there's variation. I think it's developmental,

**Heather** 36:11

I'd be super curious if those people were reliably aces and other types of things as well. You know, what, one thing that does right away is like those two people or whatever are now known. It's like, oh, they're like, I know, I can always ask them about what her name is, you know, and when it comes time to Oh, copper in a group with five other people, and I don't know two other names like Who does? Right? Yep, totally.

**Bret** 36:33

They did tend to be people with a diverse skill set. They were often they were often a students. And often, they may not even really realize that they had this special skill, but they did realize at the end of the first exercise, so they knew everybody's name. And yeah, interesting. Yeah, it was it was interesting.

**Heather** 36:55

So again, I'm not totally sure we any advice, you know, yeah. Okay. What's the advice? The advice was work on it?

**Bret** 37:04

Yeah, the advice is set yourself tasks. And, you know, the trick is, when you failed a task, don't dwell on it. That's not the point. The point is for you to set the task and to figure out how it is that you can actually get your brain to do this thing. And once you figure it out, figuring out how to get better is easy. Okay, so I would say, give yourself challenges and then try to meet them.

**Heather** 37:32

Next question, how do forensic analysts figure out that ancient life forms died from soft causes like disease or drowning if the murder weapon can disappear, as opposed to things like bite marks or bone damaged? Leave a hard trace behind?

**Bret** 37:47

They send this to the right podcast.

**Heather** 37:50

Yeah, I don't I know, I know a little bit about how some how some diseases actually leave traces in bone. That's not that's not super clear.

**Bret** 38:02

Talking. Can you tell from the question? fossil or subfossil? ancient ancient so

**Heather** 38:10

the distinction? Well, a murder weapon.

**Bret** 38:12

Murder is ancient. So there's definitely true. So the distinction is subfossil which is

**Heather** 38:20

so I guess I would say like does because disease will leave something systemic, like you know, something like bite mark or bone damage, you know, like, you got acute versus chronic sort of reveal in the skeleton. And although it's rare, sorry, I interrupted you, I know but like, it's rare to find a whole skeleton. But even if you have just like one long bone or even just a couple of pieces of bone, if you you know, if you find a mark, cool, you got a mark and and absent any other evidence, you might assume that that was the cause of death. But if you find like modeling, or porosity or something throughout, you've got something systemic that, you know, is probably attributable to like a class of diseases rather than a particular a particular disease.

**Bret** 38:59

Yep. I was just gonna say subfossil the bone is still present. And so there's a whole

**Heather** 39:05

host of the bone. Yeah, it's still present. Yeah, also in so the actual bone you're talking about, like the x actually

**Bret** 39:12

a true false Okay. Okay. The bone has been replaced by a mineral so it's actually stone, but you can see the shape of the bones. Yeah, that was present. In subfossil, the bone is still present. And so there's chemical analysis that can be done, and that's good. You could get in front of them that way. You know, obviously, the more recent the death, the more reliable that information is, but right.

**Heather** 39:36

Okay, we're gonna do a few more from last hour. What do we do with the hijacked term anti racist surrender to people like Kennedy putting snarky finger quotes and hope it takes on the same connotation as Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or fight to reclaim it? Yes, so far, I use snarky finger quotes, but I'm not pleased with that solution.

**Bret** 39:57

Right. I I think what we need to do is found the anti anti anti anti racism of my did I get the right number? I

**Heather** 40:08

don't know. Okay. Or we could start referring to the anti racist People's Republic of Korea.

**Bret** 40:15

Yeah, I don't know. I mean, you know, general answer is yes, we need to have a sense of humor about this stuff. And the fact that the movement is so damn humorless is it's an opportunity for us to tell more fun. Yes, it is a towel. Yeah, it does not suggest depth of thought. Sorry, because humor tends to go along with depth of thought. Yeah. But yeah, somewhere in there.

**Heather** 40:40

Okay. Here we have a devil's advocate position from last podcast. I can imagine Kennedy saying something like your comparison of humans dogs is clear evidence of your racism and reason enough not to waste my time we're debating an obvious bigot. How would you go about this?

**Bret** 40:55

Dr. Candy, it's not clear that I can reboot it. So I would like you to level that charge on the Dark Horse podcast so that we can talk about it like adults.

**Heather** 41:04

Good. Dating in college, it's been difficult for many young men of my generation. Most of the women at my university are anti racist, should to prospective partners ideology be a deal breaker if the goal is a long term relationship. I think if it can be described as an ideology, as opposed to a belief system that they are thinking about tinkering with, it's going to be harder to change. On the other hand, ideologies, you know, people, people do change their ideologies. Anyone who was proud to have an ideology is going to be resistant to change, because ideology is inherently resistant to change. It's not about questioning what is happening underneath, you know, behind the curtain.

**Bret** 41:49

Well, I don't pretend to know how this works on the ground for young people these days. But in some sense, if you can use the question of somebodies reaction to this as a litmus test without destroying your credibility, or your social, your ability to navigate socially, then they're in effect doing you a favor, right? Because anybody who runs screaming at the statement of obviously true things, my guess is not really long term partner material, right? Just really not. And I would say, long before woke was a force in this landscape. I used to advise students regularly. Don't ever sign up for a long term relationship with somebody who doesn't have a sense of humor about themself. So anyway, I guess my point would be, to the extent that somebody can't tolerate reason, I'm not saying they have to agree with you. But to the extent that your disagreement over obviously, your adoption of obviously, reasonable conclusions is a deal breaker for them. They're doing you a favor.

**Heather** 43:11

Someone says we need more, much more of a gain of function possible leak. Thank you. So yep, we're keep beating that drum. I don't know this. This so I'll just read you what we got here. If I were ologists Stanley Perlman was quoted in a Bloomberg article, that serial passage would weaken a virus, if done in the absence of antibodies and T cells. And he has not seen virulence go up in a lab. What are your thoughts? With regard to gain of function? I'd like to see, I'd like to see the article.

**Bret** 43:51

Yeah, so for one thing, I can't quite even if this is even if this is accurate in a narrow sense. If you were to serially passage in humanized mice, or ferrets, which are both highly likely serial passage environments, then that doesn't apply because they both do have immune systems. So

**Heather** 44:13

I guess maybe that's it. It's like, it's, we're talking about in in vitro serial passaging. Somehow, if it's absent antibodies into some

**Bret** 44:23

tissues. Yeah. But it's not the

**Heather** 44:27

serial passaging that I am vaguely aware of is in vitro, in which case, of course, it has antibodies and T cells. So in vivo, you mean I mean, I mean, in vivo? Yes. So like, I just don't know what this? I don't I've never heard of him before. And I don't know what his lab situation is.

**Bret** 44:43

I mean, in a technical sense, there will be some truth to it. How significant is the truth, right? If you were to do this in vitro, then effectively whatever constraint is placed on the virus by the immune system is absent. However, it It's not clear to me that the implications of that are dire in the short term because we're really talking about a system

**Heather** 45:06

by dire you mean lowering a fairly I don't know what dire dire for

**Bret** 45:10

the virus, right? So his claim is that you would weaken the virus by eliminating selection for dodging the immune system, right, that the virus would then become very susceptible to the immune system. Yeah.

**Heather** 45:25

So I mean, that that claim, therefore, is that all serial passaging, without he has not specified in vitro? Well, he is not specified that we are we are taking what we're seeing in this question to be specifically about in vitro, serial passaging. But he's basically saying, Yeah, and it sounds a little bit like magic, arm waving stuff, that also real pathogen is going to produce a weakening of virus, a reduction in virulence, which I just don't know this to be true.

**Bret** 45:57

Well, no. And the point is, you've got different tensions. Yeah, to the extent that what he is saying is reasonable, there is one constraint that you are eliminating, which is then going to be reintroduced at the point that you have a virus in the wild. That's the immune system, it is not clear that the implication is substantial of that, right? I don't know, I would not predict it is substantial, because the nature of the immune system is a self non self recognition system. And so

**Heather** 46:24

right, but the I mean, I think if I'm trying to, like steal man, an argument that I'm not even sure I totally have all the details on and understand fully. I think the argument that I'm imagining he's making Perlman is that if you do in vitro, serial passaging, and there and without antibodies and T cells, and therefore you don't get an increase in virulence, by the time it does enter another, an actual host something with antibodies and T cells, the clock was basically stopped for all that time. So it's like it's re entered. It's like it's entered a host for the first time at the point that has indeed entered the host for the first time or gone in vivo serial passaging.

**Bret** 47:04

I didn't 100% follow that. I do. My phone is back there making noise? I do. I mean, I think we're I think we are saying the same thing. I'm not 100% sure we're saying the same thing. How much actual material implication is there for the absence of this constraint? Right. If it reverts a tiny fraction of its accumulated wisdom over 1000 years, there may be no detectable difference, and so unclear to me, just unclear to me whether this is a relevant critique or pure red herring. Yep.

**Heather** 47:41

Yep, I agree. Another another source question. If the source Coby to virus jumped to the minor of the SARS Coby to virus jumped to the minors, happened in 2012. And that is eight years ago, which seems like a long enough time for the virus to become efficient at human to human transmission. No,

**Bret** 48:00

totally. But there's no evidence that it was in the population.

**Heather** 48:03

Exactly. So it did go to the miners it killed three of three of six, right? And then what happened to the other three? they recovered, they recovered and there's no evidence they transmitted it to anyone else right?

**Bret** 48:14

There ever, ever they didn't transmitted to each other either. As far as we know,

**Heather** 48:18

they all got it from a bat or from the cave Yeah. Okay, one more question. And then we will go to the to this hours questions. The Swedish Swedish, I was just gonna say that I'm going to mispronounce the Swedish name, but instead I mispronounced Swedish. Yesterday, the Swedish leasable button with saffron is only available traditionally in November and December.

**Bret** 48:44

Really love this. Fantastic. Yeah. Imagine that. Imagine that. Very cool. November in December, when you might imagine that you wanted to interfere with the re uptake of serotonin. Yes. By virtue of the darkening of the days, yes. Okay, almost too good.

**Heather** 49:01

It's almost too good. First question in the next hour, if one by trans is sacred, is to buy trans sacred squared? D trans, yes. Why are single transition activists suppressing the multi transition of minorities and their minority? Yes, totally. Exactly. Right away. Yes.

**Bret** 49:24

So I actually, I think I ended up tweeting this was going to suggest that instead of calling it D transitioning, they call us plus retransmit, retransmission? All right, we're double transitioning, we would make an extra trans. Therefore, I don't know.

**Heather** 49:39

Or given the apparent Latin here, ultra trans.

**Bret** 49:44

Ultra trans. Totally.

**Heather** 49:48

I don't know what this means. evaluate our case selected means. Do you enjoy busking?

**Bret** 49:57

A lot. Seems like two different things.

**Heather** 50:00

Yeah, I can't make the connection. To enjoy busking Bret

**Bret** 50:05

actually tried it. Yeah, fun as you might imagine. No,

**Heather** 50:08

I have not either. Not you know, not being able to carry a piano around I guess was one of the things that got my way.

**Bret** 50:18

I buskin occasional move, but I just I don't know. Yeah, it's not that we have no subway

**Heather** 50:24

here. Oh, that's what's limiting. Well, I

**Bret** 50:26

don't know. That's limiting me and I was just

**Heather** 50:29

thinking like a subway. Yeah. Let's Philadelphia have a subway.

**Bret** 50:37

I should really no, Philadelphia has a subway.

**Heather** 50:39

I think it does have a subway and you lived in Philly for two years? Did there's

**Bret** 50:43

no The problem is that I was hanging out with a lot of New Yorkers and they definitely have a subway. So I was on a certain number of subways in that time.

**Heather** 50:50

Mary Bosque.

**Bret** 50:53

Well, that was then

**Heather** 50:59

the only place social credit wouldn't work is in the US. It might work swimmingly Well, with China, Russia and Iran have a monoculture. So is this cultural revolution specific to the west only?

**Bret** 51:09

Right? Could you go back to the beginning of that question? Yeah,

**Heather** 51:12

I think it's, I think we're talking about like, work social credit. Wait, no, I don't actually know. The only place social credit wouldn't work is in the US. It might work swimmingly Well, for China, Russia and Iran have a monoculture. So is this cultural revolution specific to the west only? I feel like the actual question doesn't totally proceed from the from the statement. Yeah,

**Bret** 51:37

I'm not sure what that what this person is getting at. I think the problem is social credit, could potentially work anywhere, but work to do what is. And so you know, a market is a de facto social credit mechanism, it does accomplish certain things, some of them horrifying, many of them awesome. And the real trick is, instead of doing some top down, authoritarian social credit system, to fix the market, so that what it accomplishes, is actually desirable. And I really think that that's the sum total, doesn't make it easy. I'm not arguing, we know what it is, that would make it awesome. But I am arguing that the most effective, least awful solution will be a market that is targeted at problems that markets are good at solving, and therefore results in the well being the increase in well being for those who create things that are good for us. Yep. Right. That's what we should want. And we should not piss and moan about the fact that some people will live better than others. Nobody should live terribly if they play by the rules. But to have people who bring something valuable to planet earth, that's good for us, we should get used to the idea that that should result in them being disproportionately rewarded. And therefore, equity is nonsense. Right? You don't want equal outcomes, right?

**Heather** 53:05

No, no, you don't, unless you know you will lose otherwise.

**Bret** 53:11

Well, that's that in some sense, this is the question is given that we shouldn't want equal outcomes, because they're inherently unjust. Will you always have that fraction, which happens to be losing from a system of rewards rebelling against the system of rewards in favor of an equal outcome system? Yep. And then I should just say that none of that is to say that our system rewards people correctly, right, which I don't think it does. Right? But that doesn't mean you don't want a system that rewards people. Yes.

**Heather** 53:47

What is your take on Colloidal Silver, used for antimicrobial treatment for intestinal sanitation? What about its different uses inhaled or implied on skin gargled, adjusted What about using it for children? Thanks and be well, I have no idea I've never looked into it. It's you know, it looks some some combination of woowoo and crackpot but it might it might not be I

**Bret** 54:14

mean, I think the problem is it has no historical analogue that I'm aware of and therefore you're signing up for unknown consequences so I guess my instinct is it's it is dangerous in the same sense that a vaccine about what you know nothing of its long term consequences is dangerous, which doesn't mean it's harmful. Yeah, may or may not be but it's risky.

**Heather** 54:37

Yep. Hi. Someone wants to go outside. We'll see you then get deep platformed for COVID disinformation that way all the little people talking about lab leak did in the past. Gee, I wonder. Good point. Yeah. variation of the Fermi paradox. If complex life was abundant in the Kama Cosmos Shouldn't we expect to see macro organisms that eventually evolved for life in space seems like one hell of an Yeah, I think I mean, I think that is the Fermi paradox. Oh evolved for life and space. Yeah,

**Bret** 55:06

life in space is. I mean, there's photons if you're close enough to a star but what do you do with them? I mean, yeah, are these is this is the question really about living in space?

**Heather** 55:20

Yeah, no I it just about living in space then you know once you once organisms that evolve on planets get to space and they can evolve to be better adapted to space but like life evolved evolved for life in space. There's nothing you already have to have this technology in order to nothing there there's no there may

**Bret** 55:41

be the question is about would you find species adapting to interstellar travel?

**Heather** 55:46

Yeah, which is what that was my first that was the first interpretation. Yeah, okay. Yeah, absolutely what

**Bret** 55:51

you would as long as there was reproduction post travel, right. If you had a planet colonizing species, right, then all of the downstream planets would be increasingly well adapted to the transition that gets you between planets. Right?

**Heather** 56:07

Exactly. Have you heard about Abigail shires book irreversible? I think it's not irreversible change. I think it's reversible damage. To transgender crazies. Yeah, this this title here is wrong. I believe it is irreversible damage the transgender craze reducing our daughters. She went on Jordans pod Jordan Peterson's podcast. Yeah, I actually I talked to her when she was writing the book. Actually, I think she quotes me in it. It's terrific. And it's much shorter than she wanted it to be. And it's still extraordinary. And she's very important. In fact, we mentioned her in the last hour.

**Heather** 56:45

Yep. I'm not sure what this person is responding to. I'm hesitant to take it if this stuff is so great. Why isn't the parent the parent company's transparent with their science? The small pattern of doesn't seem like a good question. Yeah, the small box. The smallpox vaccine was question mark. Yes, I mean, we definitely want transparency. And there's you know, there's a tension between intellectual property and not having information stolen by your competitors and having information available to the people who would be your customers but but that slider is way over towards protecting company's intellectual property at the moment. In a discussion with a Silicon Valley executive, he insists that the COVID Lab leak hypothesis is impossible and a conspiracy How does one even discuss it? I do think I come up with the right name ultimately that it was the Nicholson Baker article in the like the New York Post Intelligencer maybe in December of 2020 I should I should I can pull it up but I do think that article maybe more than anything else like you know we've certainly had conversations but in terms of just being like not forcing for many people being told to watch a video is a barrier and for some people it's the opposite it's you know being told to read a thing is a barrier but my guess is if it's a Silicon Valley exact just being like this was published like that that has struck man and there's also plenty of actual scientific literature Yeah, but that's that's a harder in as well so I'm just gonna look this up. Well, yeah,

**Bret** 58:21

I would also I have not I have skimmed it I have not thoroughly read it yet. But I would also point to Rosanna segreto, and Yuri Dagon and they have a third co author who I'm forgetting at the moment but they have just published a paper looking at the evidence it's basically a review article that looks at the evidence on these things and it is excellent for understanding you know in sober scientific language what is being discussed and why and you know, yeah, anybody thinks that this is a simple matter of a quote unquote conspiracy theory is either lying or has looked into it not at all because obviously it's a viable hypothesis.

**Heather** 59:08

So I don't I would love to be able to show that right but I don't have that paper. Is it this one? It's not this one is it? Hold on? Is it bioessays Yeah, this is the one okay pretty sure Oh, but this is just two this is just two authored

**Bret** 59:22

Well, here you keep going okay,

**Heather** 59:24

so Zack if you can you can show my screen for a minute. Just an answer to this question answer to people. You know what, what you might show so there's this is an academic This is a scientific article and bioessays published. Actually, it looks like late 2020. Many authors the genetic structure of SARS COBie two does not rule out a laboratory Oregon origin This is by the two authors that Brett already mentioned resilience regret though and Yuri Dagon, thank you dig in. I never get the pronunciation right. And then for a non hizack Can you show my screen please? Thank you. For a non scientific article, this piece long Nicholson Baker, more narrative and style published Oh, actually, it looks like the very beginning of January of this year on the lab like hypothesis, and very compelling it got it got the IRR of a lot of the right people.

**Bret** 1:00:21

Yeah, that's a it's a quite a good article. Yeah. So anyway, I have this article here, which we can't show. I think it's the one that you found, but it's many authored notes segreto at all, it's quite

**Heather** 1:00:36

a different article, actually. So I can try to find that you're not showing it in a way that anyone on screen can see that? Yeah, well, I don't know how useful that's gonna be. You're just telling me the title.

**Bret** 1:00:50

It is should we discount the laboratory origin of COVID-19? And it is environmental chemistry letters?

**Heather** 1:00:59

I don't see it yet. Okay. Oh, you should move on. Yep. And that just came out, just came out quite so great. I was the first author. Yeah, and a bunch of other authors. Alright. So Matt is desperate to go outside. So I, there are a lot of things to be done about discussing it, actually. But I think sharing some resources is is a good first approach. Yep. 73. I've watched them all and had a blast. My question is simple. Do you get enough income from the Dark Horse podcast and extras to be financially secure? If so great. If not, what should we do?

**Bret** 1:01:39

Yeah, I got this one. It's

**Heather** 1:01:40

a nice question.

**Bret** 1:01:41

We're doing fine. What we don't have is security. And this is the thing that's very troubling about our situation as having been forced out of jobs that we thought were quite secure, we now are making a living where our living is dependent on, let's say, YouTube continuing to allow us to do the Dark Horse podcast. I, at some point, want to talk about the evidence that YouTube is not being even handed about this. And that, in fact, there is a thumb on the scale that is causing the Dark Horse podcast not to reach many people who would like it. But let's just say it is insecure to live in an environment where everything we do depends on corporations that can be pressured publishers, video platforms, Twitter. And so anyway, yeah, security is not something we have figured out. Nor does it appear that there's any obvious way to to get there from where we are, what can you do? I would say, in addition to supporting us, if you can, the number one thing that I think people could do is circulate material from Dark Horse so that it reaches more people, because what I feel the thumb on the scale has to do with the popularity of the podcast growing, but its exposure not growing, right? We can see this in the numbers, right? So you would imagine if the, if the podcast was less appealing to people over time, you might see the numbers slow. But we see the opposite. We see a lot of enthusiasm. And what we don't see is the numbers growing in fact, they slowed to a trickle at like almost a point. And so that feels like an algorithmic distortion. And the way to overcome it is to use whatever influence you have to point people to things you think that they might be interested in seeing. Yeah,

**Heather** 1:03:40

sure. Sure it yep. And and that's part of why we have the clips channel because our derivate clips guy really does clip out pieces. By and large, we actually don't make the decisions, he clips what he thinks is right. And if people think that there's something that's specific, that should be clipped, they should email our Darkhorse that moderate@gmail.com and they will pass it on to the clips guy. But those clips are often a way for people to get in to start seeing new conversations across a wide variety of topics that are unified by you know, respect for you know, people and ideas and not being denigrating just because you disagree with someone. I will say you know, we are we don't particularly you know, we're not interested in the commerce aspect of this but we have merchandise now. And we're, you know, we're pleased with the merchandise we have, like all of these things are attempts to diversify so that if something does fail, we have other we have other routes. Yep. Right.

**Bret** 1:04:47

Thanks for asking the question, though.

**Heather** 1:04:51

I feel uneasy about taking these vaccines, but some of my friends have got it already. They're very pro vaccine and are starting to ask why I haven't taken it yet. How would you navigate that? Presumably you are eligible eligible at this point? Student be asking.

**Bret** 1:05:08

Yeah, I mean, I think it's it's tough because this has become a moral issue. And the moral issue obscures the analytical issue. Right. And, you know, in the best possible circumstances, there would be a moral if you don't want people. If the vaccines were truly as safe as could be arranged, right, if we had high levels of certainty about their consequences, then everybody should take their fair share of the risk. But the problem is, we are not getting a straight story, we're effectively being told that they are safe when nobody could possibly know that, which means that we are all left to our own devices to figure out how much danger there might be. And the nobody can force you or maybe they will ultimately force us. But morally speaking, they shouldn't be able to force you to take a vaccine if they're not being honest with you about the safety profile. So anyway, I've sort of lost my train of thought and the dog leaving, but Okay, there's no good, there's no good way to deal with it. Because there is this implication that those who opt out or are not sure are not shouldering their part of the burden, when in fact, we have not been told the proper story, which is that we are taking unknown risks and that we ought to look at them very differently based on how old we are, whether or not we've already had COVID, all sorts of things. And these, the discussion is just not mature enough that we can get to the question of Alright, what share of the risk really belongs to you? Yeah,

**Heather** 1:06:48

that's right. Just a note of appreciation, Breton, how their pod cats and dogs for your great energy and conversations much love from Scotland, Johnny, thank you. Thanks, Johnny. is fragile memory in the sense that it can be tampered with advertently or inadvertently adaptive.

**Bret** 1:07:07

I'm not sure what fragile memory refers to

**Heather** 1:07:09

Yeah, I don't I don't know if that's a term of a technical term. I've never heard it before, if it is, but certainly the ability to deceive yourself to be deceived, such that your actual motives are obscure even to yourself, can be adaptive. There's an exploration and exploration of that by our first mentor, Bob triggers the adaptive value of deceit and self deception. But beyond that, I'm not sure

**Bret** 1:07:35

well, I would say there's reason different people could have different roles in society that would have them be more or less plastic in this regard. And, you know, forgetting is an adaptive phenomenon. And it could be the certain things that you would want to do would cause you to forget at a higher rate, and to do so productively. My guess is we're botching the job, and we just have random developmental phenomenon that causes an arbitrary distribution of our capacity to remember things. But yes, you could certainly imagine a situation in which different people had different capacities in this regard, and that it was valuable that it be that way.

**Heather** 1:08:18

I agree. Good. And I'm not sure what that means. Are we experiencing a war on America, be it cultural, international, etc, or on the open Internet that allows thought to work outside of popular institutional influence, like the media or university?

**Bret** 1:08:50

Again, that sort of seems like two separate ideas? Are we experiencing a war? Is somebody inflicting something on us? I skipped one. Yep. And then there is something about thought existing outside of the mainstream that clearly thought is flourishing outside of the mainstream. I think Eric makes the point frequently about the dysfunction being about institutions. Yep. I think he's right about this. And that there's lots of non dysfunctional stuff happening, but it's all extra institutional. Yeah. And then that's a separate question from whether or not the somebody is seeding the psychosis that is causing us to tear ourselves apart. And it's, I don't know of any evidence of that, but I certainly wouldn't rule it out. Yep.

**Heather** 1:09:37

I agree. So for something the Super Chat is doing something weird here the the spreadsheet into which has been dumped. So I missed at least one question here, which I will go back to the one that I see. As we are not sure of the long term effects of the mRNA technology. Do you think it's wise, even being less effective to opt for j&j, which would you see that they've rebranded they're actually now call themselves j&j. Not really Johnson anymore.

**Bret** 1:10:02

Oh, man, they're having their KFC moment.

**Heather** 1:10:05

Anyway, opinions of the long term safety of mRNA technology. So we've done I think it was, I think it was Episode 58, where we spent just a ton of time on vaccines and, you know, basically, yes, in

**Bret** 1:10:18

Well, we should be careful knowing nothing about the long term, which would you guess is more exactly dangerous? That's a relatively easy question, I think doesn't mean that you won't find that the j&j DNA vaccine is more harmful. But the question is, which runs a greater risk of being harmful? So those are two very different things. And the last thing we want is responsibility for whichever one turns out to be more dangerous, long term, or more harmful. You said it was gonna be the other therefore your models no good. It's a question of ex ante versus ex post good decision making. And this is a tough call because, yes, there are extra there's extra novelty in the RNA vaccines, that extra novelty runs extra risk, which doesn't mean that the harm will end up being there. But if I had to bet that's how I bet

**Heather** 1:11:13

Yep. And the j&j vaccine also has novelty. And you know, I'd rather than any of those traditional vaccine, yep. See where we're we, my mother was diagnosed with COVID. Last week, we asked to have the blood test to confirm but the doctor refused several times, stating the only order that of the quick test came back negative. Also, I asked what we could take if we started symptoms, over the counter meds, etc. Any thoughts? So I don't know why they wouldn't do the blood test. That seems that seems like a mistake. That seems like an obvious mistake. But then in terms of symptoms. Vitamin D,

**Bret** 1:12:00

vitamin D ivermectin seems well, vitamin D. carries very little risk and potentially very big upside ivermectin using it off label. I would say the evidence is pretty strong, but the evidence is not conclusive. And so you're taking a risk by taking a drug that hasn't been prescribed and isn't being prescribed. For for this condition? Probably where you are?

**Heather** 1:12:30

Yeah, there are there are places I can't remember now. But we have been sent links to various protocols and various hospitals where ivermectin is very much part of the reitman protocol. But it's not universal.

**Bret** 1:12:42

It's not universal. And what I you know, do your own research. I do have a couple of papers, I will see if I can dig them up. Maybe we can put them in the notes, but you want to get the dosage right. I've never met an ivermectin and you know, you want to be careful about things like side effects but it does seem to be a good and effective drug in this case. And yeah, let's put it this way. We can't really advise you to take it because you're you and we're not doctors

**Heather** 1:13:14

or any doctor anyone's doctor anyone's doctor Yeah.

**Bret** 1:13:17

However, if I was in the situation of having come down with COVID I would take it yep.

**Heather** 1:13:25

And you know vitamin D is just to supplement by and frankly if you're sick but not too sick to go to bed and it's warm enough be outside and you know I don't know I haven't seen nothing about that actually helping in the case of being sick with COVID but there's some remarkable evidence Akash I think we may have talked about this in the very first live stream actually a year ago that tuberculosis wards the outcomes are better if you open windows such that you get across breeds and that patients do better yet if you take them outside and if you just let them get better outside and you know what, what all is it again? Is it just the sun is it also the wind is it the about the boundary layers and them not being so densely afflicted with the pathogen? some combination of that plus other things we haven't named yet probably

**Bret** 1:14:17

could also be that a tuberculosis Ward is effectively a serial passage experiment and that we don't realize it because you've got a bunch of people were afflicted with nominally the same condition but there will be you know, mutations and things and so imagine

**Heather** 1:14:35

you don't just have TB, like you've actually had TB four times and four different strands. You've got

**Bret** 1:14:41

every strain on this row. Yeah, you know.

**Heather** 1:14:45

Amazing. Yeah. On the anniversary here is money for the mods annual box of romantic chocolates. Also, Brett get a bolo tie for fuck sake.

**Bret** 1:14:58

Hell yeah. You're like Getting up. Why am I getting Ebola?

**Heather** 1:15:01

I don't know. Okay.

**Bret** 1:15:02

He wants you to I will look into it.

**Heather** 1:15:04

I doubt I didn't. I didn't say he's not getting one because I'm saying he can't, but I just know you well enough that I really don't think you're gonna end the

**Bret** 1:15:12

electronic one. And Ebola. Oh, it's getting late. It is

**Heather** 1:15:21

it is okay. What time? Are you back? Zack? Okay. Okay, let's do like three or four more here, the rapport between you two as endearing. Would that we all could be so lucky. I think I actually get better at having contentious conversations without creating interpersonal issues just watching. Hell yeah, that's awesome. That that is a large part of the point. That's great, thank you. Why do children seem to be less susceptible to COVID? My kids get colds and other viruses all the time. So why not? COVID? Do you need to have a more evolved immune system or half past adolescence? You know, would be useful to begin to answer this question is if we had a real firm foundation of like, what the origins were of this virus, because that would help us understand a lot more about what the evolutionary pressures had been on it before it became a pandemic worldwide. But apparently, we're not allowed to ask questions like that, aren't we?

**Bret** 1:16:16

Yeah, well, the I wonder, actually, and this goes very much to your point. The rubric we discussed last time, in light of the argument against using this type of vaccine mid pandemic was the model there was effectively that COVID is fended off by the nonspecific immunity, right and the specific immunity separately and that basically, as you grow older, your nonspecific immunity fails as a result of senescence. It grows weaker, and your specific immunity grows stronger by virtue of the fact that it is informed of things in your environment. And so

**Heather** 1:17:01

So just to be clear about names nonspecific and specific immunity also goes by innate and adaptive immunity. Yeah, that's the same

**Bret** 1:17:08

innate innate immunity, you're born with an adaptive immunity you acquire and vaccines acquired in cases where you have an encounter the thing, but in any case, if you imagine that the innate immunity, when it is strong, is very effective, but as it grows weaker, you grow vulnerable. And then the question is, so as you age, you get more vulnerable to COVID, both at the level of did it infect you, and having infected you did to jump to a lot of tissues and make you very sick, then that would explain that would explain the distinction. And so it is at least consistent with

**Heather** 1:17:47

that. Yep, exactly. Exactly. Right. Is it possible these live streams are in fact intellectual and moral busking?

**Bret** 1:18:03

Yes. They're not as musical as they might be. But they are their moral and intellectual mean more often than not.

**Heather** 1:18:15

Okay, we just got four more and then we're then we then we cleared this one out here. All right. 100 barges and four tower cranes unload the boat are done. I don't know if that's right. But that doesn't sound as complicated as it might have been. We're talking about the Suez Canal for you. Oh, I know what we're talking about. 100 barges and four tower cranes unload the boat and we're done.

**Bret** 1:18:36

One so by the way, I'm I'm unable to talk on this topic because I did have so much inadvertent exposure to the Panama Canal. Yeah, and so I'm thinking of there was Yeah, there were the two cranes that lived in the Panama Canal Goliath and I don't know what the name of the other one was.

**Heather** 1:18:53

They literally named the cranes Goliath.

**Bret** 1:18:55

Yeah, and I deserve the title to it was a gigantic Bard with

**Heather** 1:18:58

a he so it was by the locks or it was

**Bret** 1:19:01

like a gamble. And most the time it moved around, though. And in fact, as a great story. I don't can't remember I think it was, might be 2020, the news program, did an expose, say, on the disappearance of the Goliath crane as if it was some scandal, and in fact, it had not disappeared or something. But we're off topic. That is my recollection of the story from when I was there. But in any case, the thing is, these containers are huge. These containers are you know, we see them on the highway. Yeah, my truck trailers. And moving. I'm just imagining I look, I do think it's probably the right thing to do. I'm questioning how much it would take. And those numbers sound low to me, but maybe this person is proceeding from information that they actually have. Right. So I don't know. I don't know. Yeah, I mean, Started unloading it cuz, you know, sooner the better Really? Yeah. Yeah.

**Heather** 1:20:10

Speaking of algorithm, I can't speak either. Speaking of algorithmic distortion How would you explain the like dislike ratios of just about all Biden era White House videos? I don't have any idea what the like dislike ratios are. Yeah, so I wouldn't explain them because I don't know what they are. Yeah, I

**Bret** 1:20:26

don't know what they are either. Yeah,

**Heather** 1:20:27

I guess yeah, I'm gonna guess out loud because we

**Bret** 1:20:30

are gonna go back to the barge question, okay. It's the wrong way.

**Heather** 1:20:35

Why would you need more cranes and fewer barges? No, no, no. No. So it's the right you don't unload the boat. What do you do? You do unload the sink the boat. That's where you're gonna argue. Good. Great, Brad.

**Bret** 1:20:47

No, you're okay. Chinook helicopters.

**Heather** 1:20:54

It's more powerful than Chinook salmon.

**Bret** 1:20:57

Yes, absolutely. Chinook helicopters. You unload the boat to the shore.

**Heather** 1:21:05

So you don't Chinook can lift a loaded thing. So that's the trailer

**Bret** 1:21:12

container. That's the purpose of that thing. The Chinook? Well, not that particular thing. But the purpose of it of what the purpose of the the double rotor helicopter is heavy lifting.

**Heather** 1:21:23

Okay, I didn't know that.

**Bret** 1:21:25

So and it's not the only one. There are others now. But anyway, aren't their helicopters large enough to lift these containers? I believe there are. If there are then we need to get several of them. And they needed to offload the containers to a adjacent location at which point they can be moved at will once you've

**Heather** 1:21:47

emptied the show once the cabbage has gone through,

**Bret** 1:21:51

once the cabbage dislodged the drug. Right?

**Heather** 1:21:58

Oh dear. Could you theoretically engineer a virus that can reproduce in human hosts be transmissible, but not do any harm? Zero harm to human?

**Bret** 1:22:11

Um, no. Actually, it's funny, I was having a thought very much like this. Here's the reason I say no. You can do it so that they have negligible harm. But the very nature of a virus is that it is going to invade cells. And if it is going to invade cells and take over it is by definition taking those cells off of their regularly established job. Yep. And very likely, resulting in their destruction. Because once those cells start showing for an antigen, they will be killed by natural killer cells, and then cytotoxic T cells, I believe. So the point is loss of tissue is not good, right? Also tissue is bad. If a virus infecting a cell as part of what it does is going to trigger that then you're losing a little bit of your capacity. But it could be so little, that it's unmeasurable. And in fact, this is at least part of what a more traditional vaccine does, right? So by giving you a neutralized virus, you can trigger immunity, and that virus infects cells. So there are vaccines that involve viruses that infect cells and do a small enough amount of damage to be worthwhile, but it's not zero.

**Heather** 1:23:35

Yeah, it's not zero and i think i think the question was asked specifically like zero harm so good, right?

**Bret** 1:23:40

As long as the question is really about zero The answer is no. If no question is negligible arm then yes, almost certainly. But it would

**Heather** 1:23:48

Well yes, yes, such a virus could exist. But then there's a second layer of the question, which is could you theoretically engineer such a virus? Do we have that capacity?

**Bret** 1:23:56

Depends what you mean by engineer from scratch? Definitely not right? Could you modify a virus? Yes, we do something like that. When we create viruses out of live vaccine, I mean, vaccines that have live viruses that are not transmissible, though, right, right. Right. So that's the that's the key novel thing here. And, you know, were you able to do that you could in fact, undoubtedly, this is what the person who asked the question is thinking you could create a transmissible vaccine. Yep. Yeah, yep.

**Heather** 1:24:24

So the last question is a comet. And I think I know what the word means but I don't know how to pronounce it. Here's to Virtus, which actually means greenness lushness, very the top we're gonna toss so it's not about veracity, which is a different route. Via Reddit. As for Reddit us verda.

**Bret** 1:24:45

Tough but this is not a game where you throw green things

**Heather** 1:24:49

relate to us?

**Bret** 1:24:50

I think it is. Yeah, yeah, it is. Alright.

**Heather** 1:24:55

I think we've come to

**Bret** 1:24:57

come to a fizzling end on Dark Horse podcast live stream.

**Heather** 1:25:03

What a weird a weird day.

**Bret** 1:25:06

It's been weird and you know that animal that went behind that tree has not emerged. I can't believe it, it was a large critter. I am going to have to go look behind that tree so that I can just assure myself that it escaped while I wasn't paying attention. Yes, it's there.

**Heather** 1:25:19

It's there. All right, and we are here but only for another minute or so which way we are going to go outside so we want to remind you of a few things. We'll be back next week with Episode 74 it's gonna be a different sort of a thing going on and we're not gonna say anything more about that, but it's going to be different from our usual by fair bit for Episode 74 so tune in that we should have said that the end of last hour didn't go well.

**Bret** 1:25:48

To be done,

**Heather** 1:25:49

nothing to be done. Let's see, please consider joining us at my Patreon. Tomorrow at 11am Pacific we'll have our two hour private q&a and we will you know maybe get the giggles or be slightly less distracted by animals of color hiding behind trees. Yeah, join breaded his Patreon you'll have your first conversation of the month before our next live stream right before our next live stream. Yeah, various various other truths, but maybe that's what we should stop.

**Bret** 1:26:23

Yeah, go outside. winter's coming. The sun is shining some places like here and I hope where you are

1:26:30

you well