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**Bret** 00:17

Hey folks, welcome to the Dark Horse podcast live stream, our 31st. I'm here with Dr. Heather hying. Many, many things are afoot including on this channel, because we released a number of things in sequence. You may not get notifications of them all based on the vagaries of how YouTube functions so I will call your attention to them now. The black intellectual roundtable has been tremendously successful people are really excited about it and has been covered by the spectator. So check that out well worth a look. I've also just released an interview with Matt Taibbi which I thought was great. He is long been someone I have admired. And it was a excellent conversation. he endorsed unity 2020, which I consider a very important bit of progress. So anyway, check those videos out. Oh, and the third one that we have recently released is an interview with the world's most interesting orthodontist. And I know that doesn't sound like

**Heather** 01:19

you called him the world's most hated or both. He is absolutely hated is a more interesting word than interesting.

**Bret** 01:25

Okay. He is the world's most hated orthodontist. And the thing is the only people who hate orthodontists are people like me who have been damaged by orthodontist and other orthodontists who don't want the truth out about that kind of damage. So anyway, check out this podcast with Dr. Mike mew. And if you are puzzling over how an orthodontist could be interesting, you know, think through that a little bit, and then check out what he what he says on the Dark Horse because he is truly a dark horse. And

**Heather** 01:57

he doesn't appear to be hated by his patients or by other patients. It's it's within the field that he is dismissed and disliked,

**Bret** 02:04

dismissed and disliked and threatened with the loss of his license and things for saying things that to me sound extremely reasonable evolutionarily, whereas mainstream orthodontia, frequently says things that are evolutionarily preposterous about how well our genes have suddenly gone bad. And that's why teeth end up crooked and things like this.

**Heather** 02:24

That's what genes do they suddenly go rogue. suddenly go there on the fritz. You're humming along hundreds of millions of years, and then boom, your jaws all

**Bret** 02:33

caddywhompus? Yep, you've got sleep back. End and all that. Yeah. schemes for Yeah, exactly. All right. Well, that was good. That was sort of light on a day that I must say has been a bit heavy. Because there's there are things afoot on Twitter, which, in general, when there are things afoot on Twitter, it is often best just simply to ignore them. But in this case, I think there is actual physical danger emerging from them, which forces us to react to things that we might prefer not to. So in this case, what I'm referring to, is what appears to be an invitation from the majority report, with Sam cedar delivered by a producer for that program. But in making this invitation, if that's actually what it is, the producer in question delivers knowing false hoods about me. And these false hoods look like they will incite potentially violence against us. And so you know, we live here in Portland, where things are quite tense, and there's daily violence down town. And basically, this producer has made an attempt to portray me as somehow on the other side. So I have tweeted back and insisted that the proper remedies be taken that this be retracted that we be given an apology, and that the producer in question be fired. Because obviously, if he did this without the program's knowledge, then this is a rogue producer. If he did it with the program's knowledge, then there's an even bigger problem. So in any case, we will see what they do. But I did want to look at a what the, the libel in question is, and then pursue the actual truth behind it, which we can see because there's evidence so the the particular claim that is being made is that I have been consulting for the Department of Homeland Security. Now, this claim is being hung on the fact that I have talked to an officer with the Department of Homeland Security, which of course, many of the viewers here will know because I've talked about it openly here. There's no secret about it. In fact, Zack, would you put up the photo of the DHS officer

**Heather** 04:57

so that's not from

**Bret** 05:00

I sent it to you. Okay, so we're going to try to get that photo up for you. But in any case, to remind people who did hear the story, and for people who were perhaps not here for that episode, a Department of Homeland Security Officer contacted me, saying that he wanted to tell me his viewpoint about what he was seeing. It was, in fact, his last day on the job as a DHS officer in Portland. And so I went downtown, and we had a conversation. And anyway, this

**Heather** 05:35

is a while ago, this was this is before, before the most recent.

**Bret** 05:40

Alright, so here is the officer in question. As you can see, our meeting took place in the open this is in the park directly across from the, the federal buildings. In fact, while we were talking, we had a conversation that was an hour and a half, possibly two hours. A citizen journalist with cop watch came over, the officer knew him, they talked, I was filmed by him with the officer, there was nothing in the least bit secret about this. And I wasn't talking to him in any official capacity. Nor was it my instigation, he wanted to tell me things that he thought I needed to know. So the idea that I'm consulting for the Department of Homeland Security is preposterous and inflammatory in light of what DHS is currently engaged in, in downtown Portland. So for those of you who don't know, that story, what is apparently happening is that the Department of Homeland Security has unmarked vehicles, rented vehicles, and it has what appear to be officers who are not in uniform. And what they have been doing is they have been grabbing people from the crowd during the day. And by the way, these things are falsely portrayed as protests. They are in fact nightly riots which have gone on for something like 50 consecutive nights. So these on these out of uniform officers are pulling people out of the crowd without apparently arresting them, and they are transporting them somewhere, which apparently is into the federal buildings. And those people are then, in one case, at least delivered their Miranda rights. And then in that same case, released hours later, without any explanation of whether or not they've been charged with anything. Now, I do think I know what's going on here. And of course, as a citizen, I find this very troubling. This does not sound like a constitutional process. It sounds extra constitutional. However, I would point out that I was warning about this very possibility. I have been warning about it for many years, but I warned about it specifically in June, I think June 1, Zack, can you put up that tweet? Okay, I say in this tweet, I don't think people understand the significance of the president declaring and Tifa a terrorist organization, the Patriot Act and provisions of the NDA of 2012 make this frightening. Because an Tifa is informal, it puts all protesters in danger, like declaring them on citizens. I want to fill that out and explain what it was that I was concerned about. Back on June 1. The term terrorist is a magical term, it is a bit like the terms that we see deployed by the protest movement in the streets, where the terms have multiple meanings, and dodging between those meanings allows things to take place, that would not be normal, that would not be possible with normal terminology. So terrorists to me and in fact, if I recall correctly, years ago, before I was in the public eye, I wrote a piece in the aftermath of the attacks in France, about what terrorism is, and why we are reacting to it incorrectly. And the point of that piece was the terrorism is basically a psychological up to its society. And the idea is a an enemy that does not have the power to overwhelm you with force can fool you by hijacking your fight or flight response. It can fool you into doing more damage to yourself than it would be capable of doing directly. That's what terrorism is. That's the white terrorism, the heart of that term. And so my point was, when somebody engages in a terrorist attack, you need to be very, very careful about your reaction. Because whatever your instinct is to do may well not be in your interest. It's like the allergic reaction to a bee sting that is much worse than the bee sting itself and can actually cause your death. So terrorism is about using fear to get people to hurt themselves. I do not believe that that is an accurate description of this protest. This protest move Is wielding a threat. But it is not, to me a terrorist threat, it is different. And so the instinct to throw every term that suggests that it is awful at it, including terrorist is a problem, because the term terrorist triggers changes in your rights.

**Heather** 10:21

Let me push back on that a little bit. And I'm not sure I'm out of my depth here with regard to the legal definitions of these various terms. But given what you just said, about what terrorism does, your analogy was to the body's inflammatory response. When foreign toxin foreign substance comes in like a bee sting, it's the actual the body's response, the the, the anti inflammatory, notice the inflammatory response that is inflammatory. That is actually what kills you. And this is how terrorism works as well. Whether or not that is the method of action of an Tifa. The, you know, which is to say, maybe some of those were originally protesters, but now many of them are rioters. Certainly that would appear to be the mode by which they are getting so many people to remain quiet.

**Bret** 11:16

I do not disagree, that fear is at the core of this, but I think actually, this movement is delivering a credible threat inside of institutions. It's not a so you know, in the case of let's say, 911 3000 Americans were killed, but then we lost more than twice that number in the military response in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we spent trillions of dollars, you know, in order to engage in those responses, and so the harm we did to ourselves, just as a matter of fact, was much larger than the harm that was done to us. In this case. I don't think it it is the method of action. In other words, the threat is credible. It's not a it's not misleading.

**Heather** 12:02

So I guess, but maybe we're talking about two different things. Yeah. That the threat on the streets is is violent. Yeah. And is destructive of property. And in some cases, humans as well. The threat that is accompanying this that predates this the critical race theory and bastardization of post modernism and white fragility, and all of this nonsense, is actually being being wielded as a very blunt instrument that is, in fact, incredibly effective. Oh, it's incredibly effective. I mean, those things aren't identical, but they are very much hand in hand. And it's hard for most people to separate out those two things. In fact, they shouldn't be separable. When we tried to figure out, you know, how do we move forward? How do we, how do we get our democracy back?

**Bret** 12:55

Right? Here's the point, though, let's say I'm wrong. About which about whether or not this was a terrorist threat.

**Heather** 13:03

So whether or not an Tifa is a terrorist threat. Okay,

**Bret** 13:06

let's say I'm wrong. Still, what side of the issue of my I am trying to keep the federal government from using the word terrorist about this movement. Right now I am as troubled by this movement as anyone, right. And that should be very clear to anyone who has watched this podcast. However, even as troubled as I am, I do not want it labeled terrorist, because I know what happens next. You know what happens next. People get dragged off the street by people out of uniform without their rights being read in unmarked cars. And you know what, it gets worse from here? Because chances are, you don't know about the NDA 2012. And it's two provisions, right, these two provisions are so frightening and so draconian, and frankly, I've been through this right, you and I were part of occupy, right, occupy was also declared a terrorist organization occupy, there was nothing terrorist about occupy, right. It was just something that was a vile stigma that was thrown at us that turned out to have these legal consequences. And so let me just run through a little bit of what we're really dealing with here.

**Bret** 14:14

In the aftermath of 911, there were many changes made to the structures that protect citizens, NDA 2012 had two provisions that resulted in I would argue, the elimination of all of your constitutional rights, with the exception of your third amendment right? Not to have soldiers quartered in your house. And the reason that I say that is because those provisions allow the executive the moment that's Donald Trump to declare someone terrorist and at the point that you have been declared a terrorist, the federal government has the right to remove you from any street in the world. They have the right to remove you you do not have the right to review the evidence. against you, you do not have the right to confront witnesses, you do not have the right to cross examine. So you can be disappeared under these provisions. Because you have been declared under this special term. Right. So I believe what is happening in the streets of Portland is that they are the federal government is firing across the bow of the protest movement, and they are alerting them what provision they have now triggered right now they're basically involved in some kind of NDA catch and release program, which is vastly better than being disappeared and having nobody, you know, having lost your habeas corpus rights. But nonetheless, it suggests what legal landscape we have just entered, which is exactly what I was warning about on June 1 with that tweet. So if you are concerned about what is going on in the streets of Portland, please understand it. What we have is a situation in which our mayor who happens also to be our police commissioner, a disastrous structural error in civilian governance. Our mayor has coddled this movement for years, he has allowed them to take over intersections to declare themselves the police, he has kept the police out of their way that has set up a dynamic over the last 50 days in the heart of downtown Portland, in which two federal buildings have been under persistent attack every night with all sorts of things including incendiary fireworks, and the police who guard them have been targeted with all sorts of improvised weapons that include really dangerous things like slingshots with babies, right? Think about how much damage you can do to somebody if they're not wearing a helmet, and you hit him with a BB from a slingshot. So you've got this dynamic where the mayor refuses to enforce the law downtown, you have riots reliably happening every night. The target is two federal buildings that the federal government is charged with defending, and now you have Donald Trump playing politics with the situation in which somebody does need to enforce the law. And if the city and the state won't do it, then it makes sense to the federal government, at least as far as those buildings go will do it. But what are they doing? Right? They're using this extremely draconian stuff that some of us challenged from the very beginning. You know, in fact, if you think I'm exaggerating, of course, the charge will come back that my interpretation of the NDA 2012 is incorrect. And that's not what it means, of course, the language is meant to be ambiguous. But Chris Hedges sued the Obama administration over this, a Federal Court declared that he had standing, what was the basis of that decision, that he had interviewed al Qaeda members as a journalist, and that that meant he could be declared a terrorist and he might be disappeared. So a federal court agreed that that was true. And then a three judge panel, reverse the decision, triggering this law to be the law of the land to restore a restored it to that status. And as far as I know, it's the law of the land today. What can you do about it? Well, you could challenge it in court, or if something happens to you, there's nothing that can be done, right? You don't even have a legal Avenue, because the very nature of these provisions is to eliminate that legal Avenue. So we find ourselves in a terrible position. We have feeble law enforcement as a result of a political entity, that is to say, Mayor Wheeler, and the governor refusing to enforce the law, which means that the only entity that can enforce the laws, the federal government, and you have the federal government, taking these abusive powers that it set aside for itself and using them predictably. Because we have invoked the word terrorist, which we never should have done, and which I tried to prevent. So

**Bret** 18:54

if you think I'm on the side of DHS violating the constitutional rights of Americans, you just don't understand where we are and how we got here. Right. I tried to prevent that from happening. And so I absolutely insist that the majority report correct the record, retract what it has said, if you want apology and fire this producer, it seems to me that at a minimum those things are necessary sorry, alright. That wasn't as funny as I was

**Heather** 19:29

hoping. No, no, sorry. I'm just I don't I'm not sure what we should do next. One of the things that this producer who you haven't named so I don't know if that's intentional. I don't know if I'll name him that well, let's

**Bret** 19:41

let's name him.

**Heather** 19:41

He's a I don't know how to pronounce it. Matt. leche.

**Bret** 19:44

I think either. They both work. Yeah.

**Heather** 19:48

That's, that's not necessary. What? One of the things that he says in this in this thread is a I mean, he's playing with words. Of course, you know, he says you're consulting with DHS, which, at the point that either of us says, For God's sake, it's not consulting because consulting obviously implies payment implies some sort of remuneration. He'll say no consulting means a totally different thing also. So there's there's clever wordplay here. But one of these tweets, Zach, maybe you want to show this now? says do not question Brett Weinstein sources on the ongoing Portland racewear that he is consulting DHS about. And it has two pictures. One with you, Brett and me. And Andy know from actually the day that we met him that's the picture has clipped out Helen pluck rose, this is at the James d'amour panel that Peter Bogosian moderated that James and Helen and I did with Andy, no organizing, he was a student at PSU at the times that was at Portland State University in February 2018. And then there's a second picture here of you, Brett with Andy, in Portland, I don't know maybe a year later, or so maybe that's sometime last year sometime between

**Bret** 21:15

Yeah, we can just move to Portland. And Andy asked if I wanted to see what was going on with the protests. And so I went to both the anti facade of the protests and the proud boys side of the protest in order to observe them both. And anyway, this is being portrayed, obviously, in a particular light.

**Heather** 21:34

So I mean, it's, and we met Andy, on the day of that, that left hand picture and we became friends. And fact is we don't share his politics. He doesn't share ours. And we talk about that. When we see each other we don't see each other very often, but by as it happens, I actually did spend a couple of hours with Andy about a month ago, walking around outside, as one needs to do now and one's meeting people outside of their home for the most part happened to be raining. So we both ended up totally drenched. Because like good Pacific northwesterners, neither of us have brought an umbrella. And one of the things he asked me in that conversation from sometime mid June, I think, was does this look like a race for? This is like a race war to you. And that's exactly the language this producer from the majority of report is claiming Portland's ongoing race war. To which I say bullshit. This is not a race war. And that's what I Andy asked me that question in good faith he was wrestling with, is this a race war? And I said, No, I really don't think so. And you know, or will this become a race for these race riots? And in part, I think I think not. But that is exactly what the instigators want us to think they are trying to pit us against one another. So so you know baldly really. And so, I will say here that we have a I guess you don't have to show this sack but we'll post in the show notes, a half hour ish interview with a black Portland Police Officer these days, not NHS, he's a Portland Police officer in which he is being asked what's what's the experience? What is the experience on the streets now and one of the things he says is, quote, this is a black police officer on the streets in Portland, who has been out there on you know, I don't probably not every night, but these these protests that have become riots that have been taking place downtown and elsewhere in Portland now consecutively for, I think, more than 50 nights. Now he says, it says something when you're in a Black Lives Matter protests, and you have more minorities in the police side than in a violent crowd. And you have white people screaming at Black officers, you have the biggest nose I've ever seen. Now, this man, was himself educated at PSU, he appears to be a good and honorable police officer. And he is he is angry. He is legitimately and justifiably angry. And one of the other things he says in this interview, and it's a short version that I tweeted a day or two ago that I think you did as well. But the longer the full interview is is quite compelling. And one of the things he says is whenever I try to talk to protesters when another person of color comes up to me and tries to talk immediately what happens is one of the white protesters comes and tells them that all cops are bastards and they can't talk to me. And he in fact relates a story anecdote, yes, but he relates a story in which a young I think it's black woman comes up to us as Why don't you talk to us? And he says to her if I try to talk to you, I will be stopped some white protest Just going to come and take and tell me you can't talk to me and exactly he's saying that exactly this thing happens. And this this woman is this protester. woman of color says, My God, that's exactly what he just said, What happened? But it's it's it's read only this is this is read only activism read only rioting protests, but this is also exactly what we saw at evergreen This is part of the tactics and is part of what makes the overall strategy so successful. You will not take in new information. Yeah, so this, this isn't actually about race, we are being told it's about race to divide us to keep those people who can see it, who look like we're supposed to be the ones feeling guilty and ashamed of the color of our skin right now, from saying, actually, no, I'm not racist. I do think that there are problems with policing, certainly, historically and still today. But that doesn't mean that I need to sit down and shut up when I see a divisive movement that is pretending to be about race, create division in society. No.

**Bret** 26:04

So I want to correct one thing, what I have said, and what I believe is that we are being headed towards a race war, that fringes on both sides are actually interested in such a thing. And that what is happening is that this desire to categorize us by race on the left, is now being enforced through all these institutions onto everybody.

**Heather** 26:26

So let's go in there now, but it's not but it's not it's not what not what the thing is on the streets right now, you don't have a word told it is right. But But protests are mostly white people, right? But telling the black people to shut up because they're not falling into line, it is

**Bret** 26:41

white people behaving as another one of these terms with a double meaning, right, they're behaving as what they are told an ally behaves as which is being synonymous with something accomplice, right as if that doesn't tell you what the game is. And so the point is, these white allies, and that's the wrong term, because ally is actually a symmetrical relationship. And this is a subordinate relationship, but these white allies are enforcing this new orthodoxy, which is going to cause white people to view themselves as an entity, right? So the race war is being set up, we are being played, and we are going to be driven into this state. And that's extremely dangerous. So that's, that's

**Heather** 27:21

exactly it is being set up, we are being informed that this is about race, and therefore those of us who are historically on the wrong side of this issue, even though Well, just put put put put that aside, you know, we you know, our our ancestors actually weren't weren't part of that. Right? Yeah, certainly your none of yours. Were in any way you right, you

**Bret** 27:45

know, my ancestors were being persecuted in Europe, right? So yeah.

**Heather** 27:50

But we are being told it's about race. And that is going to make it become about race. And it's going to bring out the worst. It's it already. I hope it's brought out the worst of the pseudo left, but it's going it's about to bring out the worst of the pseudo right, it's gonna bring out the fringe lunatics on both sides. Yep. And there you have it, you know, there, you'll have your race work,

**Bret** 28:13

right. And so the thing is, what we tried to explain several times in the past is that the thing that is special about the us is that it aspires to be something different than this, historically speaking, lineages battle that's been standard, and all of the worst atrocities in history owed to this way of viewing things, or at least almost all of them. What we have now is the resurrection of that viewpoint, which is the uninvented one of the American attempt to put those things aside, and for us to collaborate as one people in spite of our lineage level differences. So this is a very unAmerican instinct, but the problem is, it has an advantage, America aspires to do this thing, which requires us to construct a different structure. We never got it right. But we were headed in the right direction. We made great progress on it. I do believe that progress stalled, which is part of why people are so angry, but going in the other direction is completely incoherent. It is the most foolish thing you could do. And that's before you get to the consequences that this will have internationally, which is to say, if we humble ourselves by battling lineage against lineage within the US, we are going to take our position in the world, and we are going to undermine it and what that's going to do at the very least, it's going to empower China, China, which at this very moment, is behaved in stuff that frankly, the parallel you know, as we are doing things, at least, some on the left are doing things that look Maoist and it's having exactly the expected consequence. The former malice are now doing stuff that looks Nazi, right? They have concentration camps full of people. organ harvesting? I mean, this is really, you know, it's not it's it's not goose stepping, right? Is that supposed to be the difference, but other than that it really looks like the same phenomenon. And so, as we humble ourselves, we are going to empower this. This Chinese entity, which has a race first view of the world, and is showing us how it thinks that should be dealt with. So this this couldn't be more foolish. All right, again, this is not the most light hearted, dark, worst podcast ever. But I guess we just have to deal with it. So is there more to say on that topic? Or should we move on to another?

**Heather** 30:42

There's infinitely more, but if you would like to move on, let's do so.

**Bret** 30:46

All right. So what's next Harper's letter, as you like, Alright, let's talk a little bit about Harper's letter Harper's letter emerged two weeks ago, something like that.

**Heather** 30:58

I have not, I don't know,

**Bret** 31:00

the harvest letter, don't know, caused a bit of a stir online and quite a bit of backlash. And it is worth thinking about a little bit. We didn't get to it in our last podcast. But in any case, what it does is it groups a number of people, was written by five people. It looks like July 7, Thomas catterton. Williams is the most prominent spokesman for the letter. But it's been signed by 100 plus people, many of whom are friends of ours from the long battle for civil liberties that we've been involved in. But in any case,

**Heather** 31:41

it's also got big names. On the left, in particular, who we are we have not yet come to meet. But people like katha pollitt and JK Rowling. And I'm just looking down the list really quickly. Oh, Salman Rushdie. So you know, it's, it's, it's quite, it's quite an impressive list of signatories.

**Bret** 32:07

Yeah. Which is part of the problem with that. So you want to show the you want to scroll up and show the letter?

**Heather** 32:15

You want me to scroll up and you want to show the letter? Yeah,

**Bret** 32:17

there we go. So here's the letter. For some reason, Harper's debuted this to great fanfare online, but they're not going to publish it on paper until October, for some reason that's a conspicuous oddity about it. But in any case, as I see it, the problem with the letter is that it is incredibly tepid with respect

**Heather** 32:37

to sorry, but you know, it's presumably it's going on, it's going into the year hardcopy magazine in October, because that's right before the election. I mean, that's, that's what that timing is about, you know, they're gonna have say something about the timing of how long it takes to get things into print and all of this, but it's also you know, just it's, it's isn't an October surprise, but it's, you know, it's it's trying to be something like that. So, let's talk about

**Bret** 33:03

what the problems are. One, it is an incredibly tepid defense of freedom of expression. And, two, it is divisive twice over, the letter goes to great pains to put to portray the problem of sin seriousness as a right wing problem at a moment when in fact, the right wing contains many people who have been courageous in our defense, for example, while the left or the mainstream left was feeding us to the wolves. And so at this moment in history to say that actually, the problem that free speech faces a problem it comes from the right but in this case, we're seeing hints of it on the left is just simply not accurate. And it is unkind to people who have been courageous in the defense of people across the aisle like us. So for example, Robbie George has been very courageous in in our defense, you can see his testimony and all maybe you can't see it, because the minute the point the democrats took over the house, they eliminated the video, in which he testified on the same panel that I was on. If anybody has that video, I'd like it. We had it, I can't locate it. In any case, he defended us He is right of center. And he deserves to be recognized for that rather than to be portrayed as part of the political spectrum that doesn't understand the value of these rights. So the letter takes great pains to portray the right as the problem to suggest that the left is beginning to show signs which is not true. The left has a massive problem with these civil liberties at the moment. And then the letter divides a second time by bringing certain people into the list of signatories and not inviting others. So there are many of us on the left who never saw the letter until it emerged. We were surprised at its existence. Now if you and I had been asked, I don't, I am sure I would not have signed it. And I believe what I would have done is I would have responded that there was a lot wrong with the text of the letter and I would have tried to get them to correct it. And I don't know whether that would have had any success or not. But what I do know is that we were specifically not asked, while people like Matt Iglesias are prominently featured in the list of signatories. So we weren't asked. I know that Sam Harris wasn't asked and so consider the following puzzle. Sam Harris has been absolutely courageous and steadfast in his defense of free expression the free exchange of ideas. Matt Iglesias has been on the wrong side of this issue until the last few weeks when he has finally apparently woken up. Now, I would say welcome to him if he's finally gotten it. But to sideline somebody like Sam Harris, as you bring Matt Iglesias into what appears to many to be the forefront of this battle is preposterous. For one thing, it makes an implication about why Sam isn't there. I know from talking to a number of the people on the list, that they did not know who was to be asked and who wasn't to be asked to the absence of Sam Harris could mean he refused to sign it could mean that there's something about Sam Harris, that makes him an inappropriate person to be asked. And the thing is, I believe many people have that sense. But where did they get it? They got it from people like Matt Iglesias. So to have the the press portray people like Sam as somehow beyond the pale to stigmatize them. And then for this letter to exclude them on the basis that that stigma makes them controversial, when really all they were doing was defending the most central rights that we ought to all be defending is the height of lunacy. So in any case, the letter is troubling, I believe we ought to be troubled by it. And just to say one final thing, to bring all of these important voices, including Thomas Chatterton Williams, including Jonathan Hyde, Barry Weiss, to bring them all on as signatories to a letter that then divides us twice over, has compromised the movement to protect the civil liberties rather than enhanced, and that's, that's why I'm upset about it.

**Heather** 37:29

And in the final paragraph is a short letter. But on the final of three, I think paragraphs, one sentence is the way to defeat bad ideas is by exposure argument and persuasion, not by trying to silence or wish them away. Sure, of course, the next sentence, we refuse any false choice between justice and freedom, which cannot exist without each other. So that's worth that's worth a little exploration, isn't it? The the far left would actually, you know, publicly mock the idea of caring about freedom, because justice is the preeminent value. And the far right, tends to hold quite the inverse, right? inverse values, that freedom is paramount, and justice not be damned, but justice will suffer at the hands of freedom. And so we have, to some degree to the degree that the the polls left, right, polls and politics are coherent, you do have people sliding the trade off for, you know, increasing justice at some small cost of freedom on the left, and people sliding to you know, increase freedom at some small cost to justice on the right. But this suggests that there's that pointing that out as a choice, that as if they as if justice and freedom are in trade off relationship with one another is false. And that's that's facile, that actually doesn't have much representation in the world.

**Bret** 38:58

Well, I'm not I guess, I'm not sure exactly what you're saying there is a trade off relationship. But the idea that one needs to choose, you know, is obviously incorrect. The question is, where's the sweet spot? And, you know, what was the genesis of this letter relative to those things? And, you know, well,

**Heather** 39:14

so it's possible that they mean to say that there are people on the right who want freedom and no justice. I don't I've actually never even heard that caricature. I've never heard the caricature of the people on on the left, they want no freedom there, you know, the the far left or the people on the right one want no justice. So that would be a character that I don't think is what they're engaging in. So if I read this with a little bit more, more care, less desire to caricature, the intention here, the idea that there's that there's never a choice is is is wrong actually, because they aren't trade off with one another. And it seems to me that this letter is misunderstanding that point, which is in fact, I think, a point that is misunderstood across the space. I'm across the political spectrum, but particularly likely to be misunderstood in sort of left ish wing intellectual circles, the idea of trade offs being a not a desirable, but a a reality of the human experience and of the just the world that you can't get around No matter how much you don't like.

**Bret** 40:24

Now there are design constraints. And you know, we can have endless arguments about which thing is more important, but the answer is, how do you find the sweet spot in which you give up, you know, a small amount of justice for freedom and a small amount of freedom for justice, rather than keep pushing the slider around and suffering the catastrophes that result?

**Heather** 40:42

So I mean, maybe I'm reading too much into this. And it's just, you know, it's a short letter and, you know, with with two more sentences, there could have been nuanced. That was that was clear here. But I just, I do think that that, that reveals, again, the, the bias of the letter, which would slate anyone who is right of some line that is ever more difficult to draw, as not just a conservative and not just maybe Republican, but someone who is working with the forces of a liberalism. And yeah, that's it's not it's not a fair characterization.

**Bret** 41:17

Well, and in some sense, I don't think this is designed to be a fair characterization. What I have the sense has happened is that a bunch of people who, and I must say, in some sense, I'm borrowing heavily here from from Eric, the journalists seemed to have some kind of a carve out where things that were happening on campus were understood to be a separate phenomenon. And journalists portrayed them as unimportant, because they did not understand that they would be in the line of fire soon enough. And so having suddenly found themselves in the line of fire, you can read mapped ABS piece on this, and you can discover how all of these important newsrooms and including places that you would expect to be most immune, like, for example, the intercept are having these horizontal revolutions take place inside of them. So as that's coming for journalists, and they are suddenly discovering that they don't have the safety that they thought they had that that was that their appeasement is resulting in a predictable outcome where they're now suddenly being targeted. There's a desire to carve out some sort of new agreement. And that new agreement is, you know, why is the letter so deferential to the left, which frankly, has done a terrible job of policing these challenges to the free exchange of ideas? Well, in part because what this really is, is a negotiation. But I don't think Jonathan Hite would be negotiating, I think Jonathan hight. And I'm just using him as an example of an important voice, who I believe has been brought into this under somewhat false pretenses. But, you know, the, the thing that needed to happen was a statement in which First of all, everybody who had properly defended these rights was invited on and be that didn't divide us further, thereby by hobbling the effort to fight the censorious instincts. But what ended up happening is the attempt to negotiate some sort of agreement that would again, give these journalists and academics some kind of immunity from what's moving across society, has now taken the voices that were clearest and put them in this compromised context. So I think it's frankly, it's it's very unfortunate that it's happened. And we need to be very careful that it doesn't happen again, because all sorts of people are going to discover they're suddenly in the line of fire, and they're going to attempt to carve something out. And lots of people are going to look at it and say, Well, I'm in favor of free expression of ideas. Therefore, I should sign on to everything that comes my way that points in that direction. But the point is no, no sign on to the ones that are right, don't sign on to the ones where somebody is trying to accomplish something. And they put it loosely in the terms of free expression of ideas. And so you know, it's in the ballpark, because the in the ballpark stuff is not it's not refined enough to be useful. It's going to do exactly the opposite thing.

**Heather** 44:14

Yeah. What do you have next?

**Bret** 44:19

Let's see. Oh, do we want to talk about the the transcripts that emerged? I guess, be about a week ago.

**Heather** 44:30

I don't know when when they emerged, I know what you're talking about. So what you're talking about is the transcripts from the body cams have to I believe have the police officers in the George Floyd killing.

**Bret** 44:43

So do you want me to set this up, or do you want to do it?

**Heather** 44:46

I don't, you just showed it to me for the first time so I've read them but that's about as far as I've got.

**Bret** 44:52

Okay, you want to scroll up and just show what document we're talking about.

**Heather** 44:56

It's a long document. So Zack, you can now show Us. This was an 82 page document, which is two different body cam transcripts filed in District Court in Minnesota 10 days ago or so actually, same day, the Harper center came out looks like. And yeah, it's it's audio transcripts from two of the police officers involved and what I, what I was able to do, I read through them, and went back and looked at a little bit of the video and was able to map on a little bit in one of the cases to sort of where and the transcript we're seeing, because it's it's hard to know, without any sound, or anything, it's hard to know what is actually going on when Yeah, in this transcript. But what what, what do you see here?

**Bret** 45:49

Well, I see a number of things. So first of all, this covers a lot of territory that I spoke to Joe Rogan about that we disagreed over the interpretation of and so now we know a lot of the answers that we were speculating on back then, and I will just say I've read through the transcript and certain things. One, there's no indication that Shogun and Floyd recognized that they knew each other if they knew each other at all right? So there's no dialogue between them. That seems like people who know each other. I don't see anything in there about race. There's no overt racism in the transcript doesn't mean it's not there on people's minds. But it doesn't show up there. Excited, delirium does show up, but it shows up late in the interaction. So probably doesn't play a role as important as I suspected it might.

**Heather** 46:36

I wasn't able to figure out early throughout the interaction, Floyd is saying things like claustrophobia. I'm choking, I can't breathe. Before I as far as I can tell before any officers are are on him. And he says things like my face is gone. And, and then what you can't hear in the video that we all saw, but you see in these transcripts, discussion between officers is, you know, is busy. intoxicated? What kind of pipe was that? Do you think it's PCP? Yeah. And what what you see, again, is no, no mention of race between the officers, at least from these two transcripts? Yeah. But what does appear to be a description of a discussion of them trying to figure out what is going on with this guy, and how it is that they can do what they need to do. It seems like while really trying not to hurt him, Well,

**Bret** 47:36

look, I I'm no expert. Yeah, please stop. But I do want to say in the transcript, it is clear, a that George Floyd complains about not being able to breathe before he's on the ground be that the officers don't prefer to put them on the ground, they want to put him in the car. He won't go and actually he asks to be put on the ground. Right? So

**Heather** 47:57

you've said that I didn't I didn't see that in these transcripts. And I read through it fast. But you know, so Floyd talks about, you know, this just happened to me, I don't want to get shot. And there's a whole lot in, in what he says that we can imagine. And you know, I just simply don't know the truth of his of his history. But we can certainly imagine that he is beyond spooked by the prospect of agreeing to demands by police when he he doesn't disagree when they say that he's passed a fake bill, I guess is why they were called to the scene. But that doesn't mean just because he did either nothing wrong to begin with or something trivial wrong. That doesn't mean that something bad what happened to him. So you know, is he legitimately worried and alarmed and saying things that are incoherent? Maybe, but he's also so incoherent and so unwilling to respond to what appear to be very moderate requests that that there. The police are being pushed and pushed and push?

**Bret** 49:02

Well, I don't know. They want to put them in the car. Yeah. He doesn't want to go on the car. He wants to go on the ground.

**Heather** 49:06

And why do they want to put him in the car for driving past a fake bill? Well,

**Bret** 49:10

I don't know. Yeah, I don't know. I think you know, I don't know enough about the law. I mean, obviously passing a fake bill, you know, potentially we're talking about a counterfeiter, right? Obviously, a $20. Bill is not a major metal matter. But counterfeiting is a federal crime. I don't know. I don't pretend to know, but but the point is, I mean, I think the real point is this. The transcript is complex, right? There are lots of things in play here. What we all saw on video was very troubling. But what it actually means is unclear, right? What you need in order to figure out what it means is a court that is free to engage in navigating those issues to have experts on the law on normal police procedure. On procedure under Special Circumstances on the drugs that appear to have been in his system. And whether or not they were present at the moment that he was being arrested or this was a trace toxicity is Joe Rogan suggests it might be, you want to know those things, and you want to have a court free to navigate these things. But above and beyond the fact that the transcript does reflect a an environment that has a lot of things going on in which a court would need to navigate. Here's the thing that is most troubling to me. That link to the document was sent to me by a friend. Right? We both thought it did not exist in the world. on trying to figure out if the document was authentic, it was on a New York Times server. Right. And so the question is Will is it authentic? Why is it an under your time server, it became quickly apparent that it had been published a couple days prior by the New York Times they had written a story on it. And they had linked to the document and it was sitting there on their server. So it is legitimate. But here's the question, why was it not a huge story? Why was you given all it is happening downstream of Georgia Floyd's tragic death? Why was the contents of the transcript not on everybody's mind? Because many of the things that have been said about the arrest are I don't want to say testable in a scientific sense. But they can be compared to the transcript and we can actually have answers about what took place. And there seemed to be very little interest in having that discussion. For some reason, and it's very hard for me to imagine I would have thought the emergence of that transcript would immediately have trended on Twitter, it would have been the focus of the news cycle for 24 hours, if not more, and there would have been all kinds of discussion and instead, somehow, the social environment I think, treated it as not important. And I worry that it treated as not important because it was complex, rather than simple story of murder.

**Heather** 51:58

Yeah, it is complex. I've got I've got a piece highlighted here. In which the officer is trying to officer lane, I guess, in this case, is trying to get Floyd to get out of the car. And we can't necessarily tell it looks like he's, Floyd doesn't want to do it. And he's not doing it. And the officer keeps saying, Get out of the car. And the woman who is with shawanda, Renee Hill finally says, Stop resisting Floyd. And this is this is early in the interaction. But you know, one of one of the people whom Floyd is with is reading what is happening as Floyd resisting the officers. What appear? You know, I'm reading into this, but it would appear from her comment here that she is reading what her friend acquaintance, whatever Floyd is doing as resistance that is not warranted by the situation. It's it's complex, like you said,

**Bret** 52:57

yeah, it's complex. But it doesn't mean it's not murder. But yeah, again, we have a structure that deals with this. It's called a court, it makes findings of fact and findings of law, it does so on the basis of evidence. And what we now have is a situation in which the public perception that it knows what it saw on that video that that is sufficient to determine what took place is, is a grave danger. You know, it is a grave danger to our system, to the extent that what we end up doing is using our courts to validate public perception, basically getting them to rubber stamp, the court of public opinions, judgment, that is, again, the invention of America. If if this is clear, then allow it to be found so in a court, rather than assuming the court has only one choice, because the answer is so simple.

**Heather** 53:51

Can we do something hopeful? All right, good. Yeah. So there's a relatively new magazine out of Philadelphia called root quarterly. It's an arts and ideas magazine. So it's called root quarterly art and it is from Philadelphia, and we became aware of it because the editor in chief, I believe, turns out to be a friend of your cousin. Allie, whose wedding we went to last year. And, and she the editor saw a picture of alley with Eric and went well my worlds are colliding I had I had an ad no idea and so so they sent us this is this is almost a brand new magazine, there's there's four issues and it is it is gorgeous. And whether or not you're in Philadelphia, I actually I want to highly recommend it as a it's not a glossy, glossy, aesthetically beautiful magazine, that puts that has art that has poetry that has fiction, that has cultural critique, and is just open to ideas across the board, and so on. Just a couple couple things from it. She Heather, Heather Shane Blakeslee, who is the publisher and editor in chief of Route quarterly, says in her summer letter, which came with a fourth issue ever. When I look back on the pieces in the magazine, I'm amazed at what we've asked ourselves. So these are just some of the some of the topics that they've explored and four issues. What does it mean to have lost your way in your life? What does grace mean to you? And what ways are we manipulated by our media? Must our identity be centered on our race only, especially if one is adopted and does not know one's history? And if people will, in any case, see us how they will? What does it mean to be an artist, mother and entrepreneur? To the stories we tell ourselves about our trauma affect our well being? Can we entirely change careers and deal with adult bullying at 60? What does it mean to be a successful professional, but to not be able to share your chronic pain with others as you suffer? What do we lose when we cancel art or artists? What is the hell of being a midwife who has undergone multiple miscarriages? What does resilience mean to a person recovering from addiction? What kind of country do we want to live in? So I've now read parts of the four issues that she sent to us and they're they're just they're glorious. And this this is exactly what we need right now. And it looks it looks like they're actually surviving but I'd love for us to help them survive. It's called root quarterly. And from from again, Heather Shane Blake sleaze initial essay in the initial issue, the very end she says, the constant state of heart of fear and of rage stoked by evermore divided media and entrenched ideology is a perfect breeding ground for further division. And for the type of widespread addiction we now see in the United States. 1000s, keeping the pain at bay on the streets of Philadelphia, hundreds of 1000s across the country, an army of walking dead shuffling around us with no spiritual tether, stripped of hope, and humanity. And then there were the larger hordes all of us addicted, addicted to the glowing rectangles of various sizes, crawling with spiders and bots, algorithms sucking us drive information, the feedback loop of ads and curated content meant to move us in this direction or that a little more to the right, a little to the left, a little more lonely and deeper in debt. It is social media's job to numb us and addict us explored our worst instincts and most based biology rather than give us anything that might actually heal us, unite us with facts or strengthen our ability to reason live peaceably with one another. We are animals, and they have trained us. However, we can be untrained to tune in to interesting ideas and honest disagreement, to contemplate art that illuminates our complicated humanity to see our city in a new light to enjoy a rootedness in our community. To that end, we offer you unplugged pages pressed with ink, which you hold in your hands right now. So we we can do this, we we can still do this, this is this is our better angels. And we owe it to ourselves and all of us and our future to to engage with art and with science and with truth and with beauty with honor and without division.

**Bret** 58:08

I heard in there, I think the central question, what country do we want to live in? What kind of countries and the thing is if you just play out these alternatives, you know, tear it down race First, it doesn't lead anywhere that you would want to exist. And it you know, frankly, it's not, it's not going to be good for the people who are advocating it either. It's not good for any of us. So I I tweeted this thing, which I got some pushback on which I want to defend here briefly. That basically we are all in this together, and that our enemies are the ones who don't know it. Now, I don't mean to put anybody in the enemy category, I would like nobody to be there. But I think what is hard for people to grasp is that actually, what we have is very fragile, it can come apart, and that those who treat it casually or hosley are putting everyone in jeopardy. The recognition that actually we are all dependent on features of the system, even those of us who are being unfairly treated by the system are dependent on that system. And therefore the only option we have that is rational is to make it work. To the extent that it has never worked for some populations that has to be fixed. That's part of its fragility, but tearing it down in the hope that something great will emerge is the road to madness. So somehow, we need to bring everybody on board with the idea that yes, there are problems they have to be addressed. But tearing the system down is it's like sabotaging ship on which you are dependent.

**Heather** 59:49

Probably at about an hour. Yep. Do you want to? Do you want to say something about unity? 2020 which seems like a decent segue from what you just said.

**Bret** 59:58

Yes, well, sure. Of course. I do. So unity 2020 is moving forward, we have big plans that will emerge very quickly we are working on the technical aspects of those plans so that we can deploy them. They will involve you they are active. So please come visit us at articles of unity.

**Heather** 1:00:19

On Twitter, there's also a terrific new animation that that came out this week.

**Bret** 1:00:24

Yeah, great new animation by a true patriot, who is like everybody else involved is volunteering his time. He does great work, and it's beautiful. So check out the animation, you can find that at our Twitter page articles of unity. I have also tweeted it, you could find it there. It's on our YouTube channel, which is going to be somewhat difficult to find until YouTube figures out what it is. But in any case, check out

**Heather** 1:00:51

the anime, including afterwards, depending

**Bret** 1:00:54

right? We have depending as exactly right. So let there's a lot happening. We we welcome Matt to a BS endorsement, we know that there are others waiting in the wings who have not yet come out publicly but are planning it. So this is all very exciting. You should stay put We will be back in 15 minutes to do our q&a. You want to say some things

**Heather** 1:01:22

kept so we'll we'll be answering your super share questions in the next q&a those that came in some of those that came in this hour and some of them that will be coming in next hour. A week from tomorrow we'll be doing our second private q&a for Dark Horse members, which involves signing up my patreon at the $5 or up level. There is also a private Discord server that's now available as a benefit at both of our Patreon ads at that same $5 up level and reports are that it's really going quite quite beautifully that this is that this is a community that knows how to talk to one another even when they don't agree and that's that's exactly what we are hoping to be able to facilitate. Anything else?

**Bret** 1:02:08

Nope. I think that's it. Like, subscribe, comment. Stick around. We'll see in 15 minutes.