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**Bret** 00:08

Hey folks, welcome to the 33rd Dark Horse podcast live stream. I am here with Dr. Heather Hyang. Lots of things are occurring, I think we should get right to it. All right. All right. Go ahead.

**Heather** 00:24

So I was gonna you we talked about me setting up some of what we've been discussing and then launching into a conversation about Sam, should we do that? Should we start there?

**Bret** 00:33

Yeah. How about I set up your setup? Okay. Okay, so

**Heather** 00:36

like the English English translation, man.

**Bret** 00:38

It's it's right on target for English language translation. So what's what's happening here is that I had what seemed to me like an epiphany last night, and I explained it to Heather, and she said, That's everything. We've been talking about what's there. And we wrestled about this for a while. And it turned out she was absolutely right. And there was stuff that needed to be brought to the surface in order to find what was new. And so anyway,

**Heather** 01:01

well, I think but then therefore, I wasn't absolutely right. Because there is something new here. I wasn't seeing it at first. I don't know how much of that is because you weren't saying it at first and how much it is because it felt like it was the same stuff and a slightly different clothing?

**Bret** 01:16

Well, let's put it this way. The nature of consciousness and discovery and emergence being what it is, I think I was not saying it in such a way that what was new, I did have the inkling of something new, but I hadn't figured out what it was. And so anyway, I think a very normal process of wrestling something into some kind of useful form occurred. Yeah. And anyway,

**Heather** 01:38

and Zach got to witness the whole thing. Toby, our other son left at some point cleaned up after dinner, and slunk away. Well, he

**Bret** 01:45

can watch the live stream, either now or later. That's right.

**Heather** 01:49

All right. So should we should we launch into let's do it, okay. So we this to the position that we currently find ourselves in, in society, we want to start by saying two things, not axiomatic Exactly. But two things that are true and a number of situations, what the background of our current environment is, and then the current situation with regard to the protests and riots in the streets. So I'm gonna set all that up, and then we'll then we'll talk more, and we'll have a look at Bell throughout everybody, cat Bell, cat bell. So the first two things that that we that we know to be true across a number of domains, not at all limited to right now, are the Ponzi schemes. Ponzi schemes exist, also known as pyramid schemes, and they carry a pattern of behavior from one individual to an exponentially expanding number of individuals until they collapse? And the usual incentive, of course, is currency accumulation like actual literal dollars. And that functions within the system. As long as the layers below you exist, those who are effectively feeding you their currency have to exist or else you don't, you know, join. So that's one thing, right? We have pyramid schemes.

**Bret** 02:54

So pyramid schemes collapse on the late adopters. Exactly. So they are not a fiction. From the point of view of early adopters. The fiction comes from the idea that it can continue to function. Yep.

**Heather** 03:06

The second thing that is that is true across many domains, but highly relevant to the situation we find is a idea formalized by Nassim Taleb, in a piece well in his insert, oh, and a piece that he calls the most intolerant wins the dictatorship of the small minority. So just to quote him the best example I know this is to lab writing. The best example I know that gives insights into the functioning of a complex system is with the following situation it suffices for an intransigent minority, a certain type of intransigent minorities to reach a my neatly small level, say three or 4% of the total population, for the entire population to have to submit to their preferences. Further, an optical illusion comes with the dominance of a minority, and I Eve observer would be under the impression that the choices and preferences are those of the majority, if it seems absurd, is because our scientific intuitions aren't calibrated for that. Forget about scientific and academic intuitions and snap judgments, they don't work and your standard intellectualization fails with complex systems, though, not your grandmother's wisdom. So we have pyramid schemes, the existence of pyramid schemes and the existence of this this truth that many people do not Intuit, especially those who think they like to play a numbers, but actually, you're kind of innumerate. The idea that actually a tiny tiny percentage, he puts it at three to 4% can actually be sufficient to convert an entire system. Add to this, the background situation of just social media, which is a kind of online ecosystem, which can has its own Ponzi schemes. And features include trafficking and a kind of social currency as opposed to monetary currency, which is quantified in ways that we can all see you know, followers and likes and subscribers and views, which you know, we're playing in that landscape here. And of course, in social media, the product evolves culturally by very standard cultural evolution mechanisms. Just to add a few more Things to the setup before we we go further with it together, the current situation with regard to the protests and now riots on the streets with regard to the movement that is formerly called Black Lives Matter, although many of the people who are advocating for change on the streets don't know what that movement actually stands for. Note that only Tellabs point with regard to the dictatorship with small minority, only a tiny group of people could actually believe and this was your opening salvo to me last night only a tiny percentage of people could actually believe that it would be a good idea to abolish the police. Or that logic is a function of whiteness, which are two of the things that are being being said. That's and yet and yet, it's gaining ground. Okay, so add two more things, and then we'll, we'll engage, we'll engage with each other and the cat here. We have a public relations issue that is different from most Ponzi schemes, in that while many people have never heard, abolish the police or logic as a function of whiteness, they believe that they're fighting the next civil rights fight. They think they're being righteous, they think that they're actually fighting for change. That is not what the intransigent intransigent minorities is advocating for. And then finally, there's a payload here, there is there, this is not just about being able to make a little cash off the off the backs of the people who follow in the pyramid scheme. The payload in this particular one has the chance to actually take over and frankly, destroy civilization. Right, it may be able to restructure the real world, and not just the online world.

**Bret** 06:43

So let's unpack this a bit. Yeah, the idea what started the discussion last night was that nobody could possibly believe this, that the number of people who actually believe, as you said that eliminating the police would be a good idea that it would increase the safety of the public is tiny. If you then figure Okay, well, what's the percentage of people who might think that opening the borders would be a good idea? Right? Also tiny, right? So why don't

**Heather** 07:09

you mean, like abolishing the borders, opening the borders? And borders? Yeah.

**Bret** 07:13

What is the fraction of people who think it's a good idea to abolish prisons? Right? Now you take the intersection of these things? What are the chances that you believe all of these things, right, this movement at various times espouses all of these things? Now take what what percentage of the population thinks that the nuclear family is somehow a mechanism of white oppression of other people? Right? The intersection is a fraction of a percent at most, right? People don't actually believe this stuff. It's too dumb. But it is now threatening to alter policy. And so the question is, how did that happen? How does the tiniest of minorities end up dictating terms to society terms that will ultimately cause the collapse of civilization if they are broadened? Right? Why is it that in Seattle, we are apparently discussing the abolition of prisons and police simultaneously? I mean, even if you were dumb enough to think that those were a good idea, you would want to figure out whether they were a good idea together. In other words, you're going to open the we're going to abolish the prisons. Do you believe that psychopaths exists? Are there any in prison? I think they're actually pretty likely to end up there. Right? So you're gonna release some psychopaths? Is it possible, you might want more police in that case? You don't know. But the point is, however dumb it is to abolish the prisons, it would be even dumber to do it, as you defunded or eliminated or abolished or whatever your terminology is, the police and yet we are discussing these things. We have the mayor of LA, broadcasting on Twitter, his solidarity with the protesters in Portland now, frankly, I went to school with the mayor of LA. I didn't know him well, but I did go to school with him. Before he was the mayor Pete Oh, quite a bit before he I think he was a few grades below me. But in any case, to have the mayor of Los Angeles, broadcasting a message of support for people that I believe are putting the rule of law in jeopardy in my hometown is a remarkable turn of events, right? How could somebody have ended up in such a position of power and be persuaded by such low quality arguments. And so in any case, where we arrive is that actually this isn't about persuasion. This is about a Ponzi scheme in which you don't Well, let's put it this way. The mayor of La has apparently signed up for this Ponzi scheme. And he's signed up early enough that maybe it doesn't collapse on him and he's seems to be okay with the idea that it might collapse on Portland and that it might result in violence again, against people that he doesn't know or doesn't care about, or whatever it is. So the point is a Ponzi scheme, actually Ponzi was a guy, the Ponzi scheme started with one person right? Now maybe critical theory isn't one person, it may be a small discipline of people who believe amazingly foolish things. But they are managing to spread those things, not by virtue of the arguments being the least bit compelling. But by two mechanisms. One of them is that you are better off signing on and letting it collapse on other people. So standard Ponzi scheme, stuff. But also by virtue of the fact that we have this evolutionary phenomenon taking place online, right, you have the characteristics necessary for adaptive evolution, on Twitter, Facebook, everywhere else, which is you have reproduction, you have variation, you have heritability, and differential success, and so on. Again, those four, that's what's needed reproduction, you've got variation, the variation is heritable. And you've got differential success, which means that the messages are evolving. And I want you to ask yourself a question. Do you know why it is that we mustn't open the borders? Can you explain it? We probably can't, you know, we shouldn't, you know, it would be a terrible idea. But the problem is, unless you have the language of game theory, unless you have at the tip of your tongue, the phenomenon of a tragedy of the commons, it's very hard to explain why that would be a bad idea, and who will be harmed by it, it happens that if you open the borders, you can predict the following thing. People who fled over the borders, because there's opportunity here, more so than elsewhere, they are not going to take corporate jobs, whose jobs are they going to take, they're going to take the lower wage jobs, the lower skilled jobs, right, so who is going to get hurt by what floods over the border, right, it's going to be people who are most disadvantaged, not the people who are at the top of this ladder.

**Bret** 11:55

So it's a very, it's a very regressive move to expose the lowest rung of the ladder to intense competition from people flooding over the borders. However, it is very hard to explain why you mustn't open the borders without then opening yourself to the accusation that you were anti immigrant. Right.

**Heather** 12:15

And I mean, I think when you were talking about the idea of abolishing prisons, and that, you know, if if that was successful, that would likely result in the actual need for more police because you would have actual psychopathic criminals, which is hardly the entire population of prisons, but it almost certainly represents a higher population of prisons than out in the rest of the world. abolishing prisons would require more police in order to keep people save, but these two moves are happening at the same time, abolish prisons with these two movements, abolish prisons and abolish police. And it reminded me actually of the, I want to imagine unintended consequences. But at the time, it seemed insane. In the 80s, when reagan basically went after a lot of mental health hospitals, closed them down, shunted a bunch of people with actual mental health problems onto the streets, and boom, we get a rise in homelessness. And there was there were no, there were no things put in place to accommodate these people who had no ability to help themselves, because they had just been thrown out into the street. Yeah, it's a very

**Bret** 13:23

good analog, we've got the population that can't fend for themselves because of mental disorders. And then here, we've got a population of people who won't play by the rules, because they're not built for it. Now, as you point out, we immediately step into this trap, right? Oh, you want to keep the prison industrial complex? No, I don't. I'm

**Heather** 13:43

police reform, prison reform, mental health reform. We're not claiming that any of this is being done right. Food reform, like almost none of our modern systems are being done. Right. And this, you know, this is something we've been this has been our, our bread and butter our wheelhouse for decades now and is, in fact, what our book is about. And you know, what is it that we should be eating that we're not doing? How should we be sleeping, that we're not doing? How is the hyper novel environment of the 21st and late 20th century, destroying human life, everything from relationship and childhood to school, back to food, and sleep and health and medicine on to society and how to be an adult, it then hyper novelty is destroying all of it. And part of what we have now is a a empowered minority, tiny minority who know that change is necessary and are being handed solutions that aren't solutions. And all they can do is shout those things. abolish the police abolish prisons? No, that's not going to work.

**Bret** 14:41

It's not going to work. And people who say that's not going to work are not inherently conservatives, you and I are you know, lifelong liberals. We are progressives and you know, I don't I don't know where you would put yourself but I would say I'm a radical because I believe we need radical change. That is not the same thing as All changes, good, maximal changes good, right?

**Heather** 15:03

Well, I'm down, this is another one of the linguistic traps that is set right? We have a we the movement, the protesters whatever are going to claim a goal. And if you do not sign on with that golden, clearly you are nantai whatever you know, you are do you are against us. But snuck into that is we have methods, and you have to not only sign on with the goal, but an artist with the goal, you have to sign on with our methods. And we have seen for years now over and over and over again that the methods are often actually maybe designed, maybe inadvertently, often some combination of the two, but the methods will actually achieve the opposite of the stated goal. Therefore, when you stand against the methods of many of these movements, you are actually saying no, I do believe Black Lives Matter. I am anti racist, and you are acting in a way that is the opposite of that. But by standing against a movement that is cleverly branded itself, that's basically one the PR game, we appear to be the people who are regressive when it's actually quite the opposite. Yeah.

**Bret** 16:11

Now I'm going to push back a little bit on this question of methods, because I find that the methods thing is a retreat that people who can't find the courage to object to obviously stupid and dangerous things go to and they force us to it by saying so you agree with the objective, but you don't agree with the methods then, right. And my feeling is, the problem is with a leaderless movement, what you don't have is any ability to say what they are actually pursuing. And some of the people pursuing this are actually not well intentioned. And so the point is, no, that's not an issue that I disagree with the idea that we should be even listening to these people, let alone correcting them about methods. The majority of people who are sympathetic in some way, have some vague idea, right? But the basic point is, evolution has created a set of arguments that dumb as they are, are very difficult to challenge. How did that happen? Our online environment has created a new mode for the evolution of discourse. And it explains a great deal about what we are seeing it explains what is I hate the term but being called canceled culture, right? canceled culture is about the evolution of mechanisms to tear down something that stands in your way. Right? How is that evolving? Well, lots of people are experimenting with arguments. And when something goes viral, when some argument catches on, boom, that thing becomes the new argument. And that process, that evolutionary process, builds this bulwark of nonsense that is nonetheless difficult to challenge. And so those of us who know better are busy saying, Well, I don't I don't understand even why we have to establish that, for example. Men and women are different, right? I don't understand how we fell to a level where that actually needs some kind of a defense. And as you pointed out last night, there was a standard that applied when we taught college students how to make proper scientific arguments, you want to say what it was,

**Heather** 18:24

yeah. Now, when I was when I was teaching people how to write scientific papers. And you know, the question would always would always come up, which is a totally legitimate question, and one that most people haven't considered formally. What do I cite? When do I reference something that I've written down? And you know, the answer is, it is a judgment call. And if it's entirely your own idea, you don't cite it. And that is part of why you must cite every idea that is not yours. And that is new, so that the reader can know that when you aren't citing something, that's your idea newly. But what you don't cite, you cite anything that is new enough to be attributable to a person or research program. But once things have become so accepted within the dominant scientific culture, and that's not to say that some things couldn't be overturned, but once things become so accepted within the dominant scientific culture, you do not cite them. We no longer have to cite Galileo or Darwin, right when we when we speak to the very important observations and truths that they revealed to all of us. And in part, the reason that we know who those people are, is, is a testament to why we no longer have to cite them because they were so those were such universal and enduring truths. So you don't occasionally and this men aren't women and women aren't men argument. I will receive well you know, show us your receipts show us the citation. And you know that no, no, what is writing this because there's no it's just, it's just been understood accurately, for Since the Greeks before that, and that was it, the men aren't women and that women aren't men. And I can point to papers that suggest that 1.2 billion years ago, sex evolved and that about 500 million years ago, our lineage started going down a path of sexual reproduction that's uninterrupted. But that's not a citation that says, men and women are different, right? That that doesn't exist in the scientific literature, because

**Bret** 20:26

we wouldn't know who to cite. I mean, it doesn't exist, wouldn't know who to cite wouldn't know. You know, it's too obvious. And so the point is, yes, this is just another trap. Can you explain why you don't have a citation that explains that men and women are different? Well, no, I can't exactly explain that. But it's hardly an indictment, right.

**Heather** 20:44

So one thing with regard to this, this particular pyramid scheme that makes use of this intransigent intransigent minority in Tellabs words, to make a tiny minority position appear to be the majority is that many pyramid schemes are basically opt in, you get approached, and there's this external motivator. And external motivators tend to be either carrot or stick. And this is part of why external motivation is not nearly as effective or honorable as internal motivation. But external motivators tend to be characteristic. And a typical pyramid scheme is using the carrot of your own greed, right? Your own greed for wealth. And, and therefore, you know, when it's carrot, it can be opt in and be like, come come to the carrot. But these, this one here, it seems to be opt out, and it's using the stick, it's using fear. It's using the fear of being hurt if you don't succumb if you don't get in line, as the way that it motivates people to join. And

**Bret** 21:45

it's not even it, there's an opt out component, but we opted out. I mean, it seems to me, we've got live stream after live stream talking about the fact that we are not on board with this thing. But we cannot affect the fact that the mayor slash police commissioner of our city has decided not to enforce the law locally. And the New York Times has decided to portray federal action to enforce the law around federal buildings as a fascist incursion. So we are being set up, right. So as much as we would like to opt out, we can opt out of the narrow thing of participating in spreading the Ponzi scheme, but we cannot opt out of its consequences. They have opted everybody in and so what I think needs to be understood is nobody has any idea what fraction of the population of Seattle actually organically believes that abolishing the police and abolishing prisons would be a good idea. It's not a large percentage, it's not a large percentage of black people. It's not a large percentage of anything. What it is, is contagious. And so the the question is not how many people will say Black Lives Matter, therefore, these downstream consequences, because those people are rationalizing their own participation in a Ponzi scheme, right. And you can actually see this in the history of Ponzi schemes. The National Ponzi scheme involves stamps. Then there was a bunch of pyramid schemes you and I remember, as kids, that there was this part, this pyramid scheme moment where the FBI started busting pyramid schemes. And you know, there was like the late 70s, early 80s. Yeah, I think it was 70s. It was, and there was all of this footage of like these, you know, rooms full of card tables, people had rented these spaces for their for their pyramid schemes. And people were marched out in handcuffs and all of this stuff. And then there was this next phase, which was the multi level marketing version, where instead of just having a pure pyramid scheme, you pretended it was about a product, right? And so anyway, this

**Heather** 23:58

is now some cards has something inside of it, right? You're

**Bret** 24:01

selling some objects rather than selling an opportunity to participate in a pyramid scheme, right? So that you can rationalize that this is really about knives or water filters, or whatever the hell was being sold next year, right beauty products. So now we're in a new phase. And that's kind of the point here is the new phase is there's no product, there is a message that is being carried forward. And that message is structured, so everybody can sign on. Right? If you can't sign on to Black Lives Matter, there's something wrong with you. And I actually agree with that. At the slogan level. Yeah, Black Lives are undervalued, anybody should be able to sign on to that. But having signed on to it, what have you dragged in with you, you've dragged in all of these nonsense proposals, these civilization ending proposals, right, which you can disavow you can say no, no, but you know, I got attacked on Twitter. You know, nobody is saying abolish the police. Really I could read in the New York Times, right? It's right there. But you can tell yourself what abolish the police means is defined, which means reduced the militarization yada yada, yada all of the rationalizations. So

**Heather** 25:12

the but you see on on the official blacklights website, which is the one thing that they have given to, you know, those of us who would like to make them accountable for what they're doing, right? You, you see, as we've talked about in past live streams, them going after the nuclear family, them conflating trans black lives with all black lives and right, you know, rising in the ranks, trans lives, you know, over over all sorts of other lives. You see official Black Lives Matter accounts, going after Israel. So you know, in what way is anti semitism about black lives matter? And what in what way are trans lives about black lives matter? In what ways the nuclear family an attack on black lives matter? I mean, really, I mean, that's, that's the most obvious one, say, What are you guys doing?

**Bret** 25:58

Right? Yeah, it's preposterous. But okay, let's go to the next phase. So you've got absolute nonsense arguments, you've got policy, which is moving at an incredible rate, right? Portland, Seattle, is now playing with the most dangerous moves based on the idea that there is public outcry demanding these things when that public outcry is itself based in part on fear and in part on a pyramid scheme. And there's no way I mean, we are literally not supposed to be making policy on the basis of people being violent in the street. Right? And yet, that's what we're about to do. And it yet looks very much like to lab's point about the tiniest minority being able to drive policy, which is absolutely undemocratic. Do you want to show this letter that emerged yesterday?

**Heather** 26:49

Yeah. So this before you show it, Zach, I think we need to set it up a little bit. I think in mid June, the Seattle City Council voted unanimously. In a let's see, city council ordinance 1198052. Actually, you can show it now, Zach, to ban Seattle Police officers from using less lethal tools, including pepper spray. Parents bands, yep. And what and that goes into effect tomorrow. So that was voted on unanimously. So that does suggest that either the tiny minority is all in power, or it's now becoming or or this fear, this mechanism fear, the stick motivator, has caused people to fall in line voted on in mid June goes into effect tomorrow. And so the police chief in Seattle sent a letter to deer to business owners and residents of Seattle yesterday, effectively saying we are going to be deploying police differently and less when we get calls. Because basically, because we cannot, we cannot keep ourselves safe. And the way that we would basically want to have before and this is the letter specifically says we are not going to we are not going to put ourselves in harm's way to defend property. It does not say we are not going to put ourselves in harm's way to defend you if you are under duress. But but that that point looks like a slippery slope. Oh,

**Bret** 28:24

well, it's clearly a slippery slope. And there are two blocks in Portland where the police will not defend you. If things happen to you. This has now been demonstrated on video. Now there are times of day when it's perfectly safe to go there. But there are times of day when it is reliably not the police know exactly where this is. And they I think can't intervene based on the constraints that they've been handed by city government. So yes, we are not yet at the position of the police failing to defend people in a general sense across the city. There are places and cities where that's true. But it is not yet general. But the rate at which we are moving in this direction is absolutely staggering. And as a result of the phony impression that this is what the public is demanding. Right? So maybe let's talk a little bit about the Portland situation. So can we do that slideshow? Zack I took some pictures and I don't know what order they're in but it almost doesn't matter actually. Can you start with the Can you start with the image from Reddit of the notice that was posted on the fence? Okay. So what you have now for those of you who are listening is a removal notice for the fence that has been placed in front of the courthouse. This is the city government placing a notice on the fence that is used to protect the courthouse from knightly incursions by the protesters may be

**Heather** 30:05

cleared the fence was erected by federal officers and the City of Portland. This the Portland bureau of transportation is declaring that the fence that was erected by federal officers is a hazard and must be removed hazard. The fence was erected by federal officers. That's the piece I didn't hear you say.

**Bret** 30:21

So the federal officers have been left to defend these buildings because the city is not enforcing the law. So the federal officers are defending the buildings and instead of defending them against incursions that come right up into break into the building, start fires, all of the stuff, they put up a fence to reduce the access of these nightly riders. The city is now saying Oh, you're blocking traffic, which is actually nonsense. It is true that they do come into a lane of traffic. But it's not like the traffic doesn't move. It moves perfectly well. But the city is now effectively signing up with the rioters to get the fence removed. The riders tried to remove the fence every night and they frequently succeed. So the city has now taken a position on these riots. Okay, now do you want to go through the slideshow? Yeah.

**Heather** 31:10

These are slides that you took. These are pictures that you took this morning?

**Bret** 31:13

Yeah, so these are pictures I took this morning. So here are calm, absolutely calm, which is a reliable fact. They are calm every day. during daylight hours. This is in the park directly across from the courthouse. This is a concession stand in which you can get free ribs. They've named it Riot ribs, which is funny. But nonetheless, this is an autonomous zone. Okay, it's undeclared, but it clearly is an autonomous zone. These concession stands are there every day. Okay. Can you advance one? Here, our city workers cleaning up the nightly mayhem

**Heather** 31:55

is that we can't tell which you're showing us two different pictures. We don't know what people can see at the moment.

**Bret** 31:59

Okay, can you go one more? Okay, here you see a huge number of barbecues. Okay, this is absolutely an autonomous zone. These barbecues are there, they're being used to cook food. Keep going. Okay, that one is not in the correct orientation. But you can still read that it says Get out of my city Feds go home. Now remember the rioters nightly attack federal buildings and the police. The local police are not enforcing the law. Therefore, I would argue that actually, the feds have no choice but to defend those buildings. I mean, legally speaking, they have no choice. And so in effect, we are being set up to imagine that there is a federal incursion now there are things about the way that the these this influx of federal officers is going about their business that make me uncomfortable, but it's also not as portrayed. They are taking people into unmarked cars but they themselves are clearly labeled as federal officers. And so more pictures Yep, keep going. This one says there's no police force like no police force. So when people tell you that nobody is arguing for no police force, in fact, it's right here on this tree. Keep going. Okay, our mayor funny our mayor is being taunted by these people, right Ted squealer, and he's depicted as a pig and of course pig means cop to these people. Above it is a sticker that says gas me, Teddy. Now I want to talk a little bit about this term gas, right? The term gas is being used to make everybody squeamish about tear gas. Now, I don't like the idea that tear gas is being used in Portland. But the thing is, tear gas is an irritant. Right? The term gas evokes mustard gas, it evokes Nazi gas chambers and zyklon B. So the point is the idea that Ted Wheeler is gassing people is being used to make him squeamish about doing what he absolutely must do as the mayor and police commissioner which is enforce the law which he is not doing. I'd see the final sticker here says talk to plant talk to plants not cops. Now this is all very humorous, except that this don't talk to cops thing is being used to make a an incident a violent incident between the police and the protesters slash rioters more likely it's

**Heather** 34:42

it's divisive, it is dehumanizing. We saw the bits of this during occupy.

**Bret** 34:51

Of course it was considered treason to talk to the cops even though it is necessary to talk to them. Frankly, they are citizens too and it is necessary to They understand that they are not up against some monolith, but that they are up against

**Heather** 35:03

people. I believe that you had a conversation with a policeman during occupy in Olympia, in which you talked to him, and I think maybe even a couple of other other policemen came around and we're engaging about the need to not follow orders when orders are themselves immoral, immoral orders, this is the conversation that you were having with police and you were being decried by fellow protesters for engaging with police.

**Bret** 35:32

Yeah. And that was a peaceful protest. I wasn't. But you know, that was

**Heather** 35:36

when we were being told to get off the lawn. So we didn't hurt the lawn, right, like this, that that was, that was what this is pretending to be.

**Bret** 35:43

Yep. It is pretending and that is, from the point of view of the New York Times and all of your standard democratic outlets, the portrayal makes one move, right. The idea is this is all a reaction to a federal incursion, therefore, this is effectively Trump deploying troops to the streets of Portland, because we always were told that he was going to do this, this he was it was going to be a power grab. But the fact is, no, no, there were federal officers defending these buildings, because that's legally required, there are federal buildings, and then this surge of new federal cops is the result of the fact that these city cops aren't doing their job. Yeah, I should point out the notice saying that the fence was impeding traffic and therefore had to go is actually part of a deeper plan. I am told, I told my home, while there were two people who had a sign out, saying that they were offering free legal advice to people who had been released from jail after having been arrested in the search

**Heather** 36:49

on a Portland near in downtown Portland early on a Saturday, when there is no activity really, but, you know, patently sympathetic to the protesters and no evidence that they themselves are, you know, adding to the chaos of the anarchie.

**Bret** 37:03

Nope, I would say these people look looked like they were probably folks who knew what they were talking about legally, probably had been to law school. I don't know.

**Heather** 37:13

But okay, so what did they say?

**Bret** 37:14

They said to me that the fence was impeding traffic where it was, but to move it back towards the building would violate the Americans with Disabilities Act. So effectively, they've got the feds right where they want.

**Heather** 37:32

Oh, God. The Americans with disabilities are needing to go inside the federal like, bit like what I mean, what is the access? That is?

**Bret** 37:44

That's apparently the access, but I mean, but but okay. Yeah. I mean, I don't know it's hard. It's hard to counter the argument, because, I mean, presumably you and I would both want Americans with disabilities to be able to access this building. On the other hand, I don't want

**Heather** 38:00

Well, they bought the bike lane earlier. And I know we bike and we don't want bike lanes blocked, but

**Bret** 38:04

but for God's sake, so here's the thing. If you're gonna argue that this federal incursion is illegitimate, then it is your obligation to explain what is supposed to be happening because it looks to me like they have gone up against every tear and the last tear, the only tear that won't give by the feds, right? I don't like that. That's not what's supposed to be going on in downtown Portland. But if the city is going to abdicate responsibility, and they're going to attack a federal building, which obviously they are doing to precipitate a federal response.

**Heather** 38:39

Now don't get me you get rid of these smaller, more local, more empathetic to your particular phenomenon, hometown police, and what you will get is a police state, this is what will happen. Yep. And that's not what I think is that doesn't appear to be the goal by anyone here. But this will be the effect of going after the smaller jurisdiction policing, which is happening not just in Seattle, in Portland, but in lots of places.

**Bret** 39:07

So let's talk a little bit about the are there more slides, there's act, you want to go through the remainder of them and then I'd like to talk about the next level here. And the police occupation of Portland. I don't see that the police are occupied Portland, I see that rioters are occupying Portland. I mean, we've got effectively two months of nightly riots against federal buildings. So this is a false narrative that this is the police occupying Portland and it implies Of course if the police leave everything will be hunky dory. When effectively we can see that the people who are demanding this are attempting to light these buildings on fire shall be allowed that right. Okay, keep going. Trump Nazis go to hell. Okay, now this, I think is the crux of it is that we have a situation in which The fact of Trump in the White House and the fact therefore that everything federal looks to people on the left like Trump means that there is a total loss of coherence. Right? more slides. So here you can see this is clearly an undeclared autonomous zone. Right? These are this these are concession stands set up in a public park, across the street from this courthouse, where knightly there are riots. It's clearly an autonomous zone anymore. Here is where rioters have attempted to cut through the barricade, there are many of these breaches. And it is not difficult online to find video of the protesters shaking the fence down ripping it apart on a regular basis. Anything else? Ah, this is actually part and parcel of what we were talking about. Before this model in which the messages are being evolved, online, okay, here's a hashtag spray painted. Tear gas, Ted. Yeah, okay. Tear gas, Ted, keep going. Okay, all cops are bastards, no justice, no peace. And that that bit of graffiti on the far end says Fuck you, which in some sense, I think maybe the best description of what this means. Yeah, here we see on the Justice Center, abolish USA. Now, you know, be one of

**Heather** 41:40

many of these people have ever been outside of this country. I mean, this is this has been my my point for months now. I mean, years actually, because we saw, yes, we saw this at evergreen, that the the most susceptible to this batshit ideology, were the people with the most naivete about what the world actually looks like when different people sound like and, and think like, and eat like and what their music is, and what it is to be on the ground in someone else's culture. abolish the USA, try going somewhere else, and living with other people for a while in the conditions in which they live and come back to your home. And let's talk

**Bret** 42:20

them well even talk that even that. I mean, I agree with you that, you know, it's not people who have seen the world who are arguing to abolish the USA, but even that those other countries are stable, if you abolish the USA, so I have heard recently, what does the world look like where you've abolished the police? Right? It looks like a beautiful white suburb. No, it doesn't. Right?

**Heather** 42:46

It does not look like same people who believe in noble savages. Frankly, it's the same level of analysis. It is will will utopian nonsense.

**Bret** 42:54

It's nonsense. And the thing is, it looks like you know, Mogadishu right or

**Heather** 43:00

what not. So it does not look like Bel Air. It looks like Mogadishu

**Bret** 43:04

looks like measure D show, right? It looks like you know, war torn Afghanistan, right? The point is in a power vacuum does not serve the downtrodden. It serves those who are amoral and willing to wield violence in their own interest. And

**Heather** 43:20

that's what we saw in the one official autonomous zone that was established in Seattle, the jazz job before it was actually disbanded by the Seattle Police when they still did have some power to do so which may, you know, which may stop tomorrow? That No, it didn't it wasn't all roses and unicorns people

**Bret** 43:37

know it's nonsense. And the fact is, we should not have to test this on civilization in order to discover what kind of nonsense it is because frankly, you don't need to be that smart to extrapolate to what actually happens when you tear the structure down that is keeping the peace.

**Heather** 43:54

It's Well, I think, once again, I've used this phrase before, but I think it's the comic book ification of people's moral sense, that they think that there are true heroes who do nothing but good in the world. And there are true villains who do nothing but evil in the world. And I think people have also slotted every single other human being into Well, they may not rise to having a cape, but they're actually all heroes. So we've got a whole bunch of people who simply do good in the world, and then a few people who simply do evil, if we just get rid of the evil, then we'll be fine. It's like these people have never spent a moment alone with themselves themselves. Every single one of us has thoughts and proclivities that aren't as honorable as they might be every single one of us. And the idea that you can imagine that a vast majority of humans are purely good. begins with the idea that you can imagine that a single human being can be purely good and frankly, this is part of this is part of the same ridiculous foundational belief that gets us to actually To use another Talib ism, what he calls retrospective bigger tearing. Okay so this is the idea that all we have to do is find something in important historical figures past that rendered them a bigot or somehow not pure by today's standards and we can cancel them. So this actually let me see if I can pull up his actual language because it's good. Here we go Zack, accusing ancient individuals or groups of violating today's ethical norms, saying Aristotle was sexist or nature was racist should only be used and what problems do is call filtration at time t Okay, I'm not going to read the whole taylorism here. He does say, let me see I think I can get to the whole tweet here. He points out the New York Times suggests canceling Aristotle, this is retrospective beta tearing implies that moral values do not evolve which we know they do. People need to be judged with respect to the morals of their own time. But this is the important thing, parenthetical intellects tweet, but we can be harsh when the Polian because he reinstated slavery. This is what we need to be doing, looking at when people actually were regressive for their own time made decisions that were that were that were bad on their own time, or, on the contrary, were perhaps forward thinking and progressive and moving towards greater unity and less division for a number of people in their own time. Even if they simultaneously did things that were of the norm of their time, that would not be regarded as honorable by today's standards.

**Bret** 46:32

And, frankly, even in the case when they were regressive for their own time, right. Unfortunately, I don't have the evidence for it ready to display, but I saw an important move at the highest levels to remove the names of important scientific figures because of their own moral failings. Fisher

**Heather** 46:58

that's this that's this retrospective bigger tearing this is exactly what I was talking about. But here's

**Bret** 47:02

my feeling. Look, we are evolutionary biologists are a Fisher was deeply anti semitic. Okay. I don't want ra Fisher removed from biological history because it will set us back 70 years, right.

**Heather** 47:20

I mean, it's just it's not even possible. Right, right. I mean, not not, not only are his thinkings completely embedded in evolutionary theory, he's also by many measures, the father of modern statistics.

**Bret** 47:33

That's exactly it. Not only is he the guy who figured out sex ratios, which are the basis for understanding of sorts of important phenomena, including why men and women are different and meaningfully So, but the father of modern statistics, yes. Was he morally compromised? Yes. Like why?

**Heather** 47:50

Did he have some reprehensible ideas? Yes, yeah, too bad.

**Bret** 47:53

Likewise, some Conrad Lorenz, you know, and if we want to, you know, go after Darwin, Louis,

**Heather** 47:59

agassi and darling, pretty much anyone from more than 100 years ago is going to have held some beliefs that we in retrospect can say, No, I wish he didn't I wish I hadn't, right.

**Bret** 48:11

But the thing is, history is what it is. And so the thing is, I'm not looking to obscure what was wrong with these people's belief systems. I don't want you know, the idea that Fisher was anti semitic, eliminated from his Wikipedia page, I want that front and center. So people understand that somebody who was morally compromised was nonetheless clear headed in a way that's so important. We still invoke him regularly today, right? So

**Heather** 48:37

certainly, we can retrospectively forgive him his sins, if he did not. If he did not act on them in ways that did damage to people, and we can appreciate what he did bring to our understanding of the world.

**Bret** 48:53

I think the thing is history. It's got to be worked on, but you can't obscure it tearing, you know, tearing down George Washington does nobody any good. That's right. But so I want to sort of bring this full circle. Part of what is going on, on the left side of the spectrum, is that the shadow cast by Trump is so big, that it has blinded the entire left to its own failings, and this is going to actually wreck the US. And because of the role that the US plays internationally. The danger is quite a bit beyond that. Right? As long as Trump is in the White House, people on the left cannot understand that they actually have to balance concerns and you will actually hear people say this, right? Why are you focused on x when we still have this primary problem? Well, I have yet to hear anybody apologize for telling me he was Hitler. Right? I have yet to hear anybody say actually we were wrong about that. But still right. It's like that never happened. Right? That was regularly claimed. I haven't heard clone,

**Heather** 50:00

it's well, it's still implied in one of those pictures. You showed the Trump Nazis, right?

**Bret** 50:05

Yep, it's still implied on that particular tree. But nonetheless, in polite circles, it's rarely invoked anymore. So the idea is you'll still still hear fascist. Yeah, right. But Hitler? I haven't heard that one except from that tree recently, right.

**Heather** 50:19

So you are talking to the plants? He took the advice of that other side?

**Bret** 50:24

No, I will talk to the cops and I will also talk to the plants but the plants talk to you the listening and the right plants. I'm all ears or eyes. I said as it as it is, but But in any case, look, people. The problem isn't Trump. Okay, the problem is the confluence of Trump and the reaction, that thing is putting civilization in jeopardy. Right? And it is not. It is not reasonable, it is not smart, it is not logically defensible, to behave in this way to tear down the structures that we are now jeopardizing simply because you find the guy in the White House abhorrent. And likewise, as many people have pointed out, the fact that you find him a pourraient doesn't mean that he's wrong on every issue. And, you know, it's your responsibility to explain what is supposed to happen, especially here in the Pacific Northwest. When you have rioters clearly attempting to precipitate a federal response. You have the New York Times, portraying Trump as the instigator, when in fact in this case, he is at the very least he is responding to two months of riots, you know. So anyway, can we please get over this sense that just because Trump is in the White House, you're allowed to do anything, say anything, attack anything? Because that can't possibly be right.

**Heather** 51:57

That's right. Two less things. Yep. To pick up to lab again for the third time today, in the piece, where he originally writes about mega tearing, and then alludes to this, what he calls retrospective being a tearing. He also introduces a term called that he calls pedo. frosty so you can put this up if you will, Zack, and pedal frassati. He says, his definition is an argument involving children to prop up a rationalization and make the opponent look like an asshole. As people are defenseless and suspend all skepticism in front of suffering children, nobody has the heart to question the authenticity or source of the reporting, often done with the aid of pictures. We've all seen this. But in the current moment, I would add to this mat refresh team. The wall of moms in Portland is if it is legitimate at all. It is this it is it is Matra frassati which you know is not a word any more than Peter for st was before to lab coined it but I'm now coining Matra frosty which to use exactly his definition for children, an argument involving mothers to proper rationalization to make the opponent look like an asshole, as people are defenseless and suspend all skepticism in front of the suffering mothers. Nobody has the heart to question the authenticity or source of the reporting, often done with the aid of pictures.

**Bret** 53:15

Totally agree with this. Now, as you know, I've done a little attending of the the protests and I will say I have attended the protest because the protests precede the riots. And I've been warned, and I've now seen reason to think it's true that attending within

**Heather** 53:33

each day, you're talking about temporarily, yes, the protests happen. And then the sun sets and the

**Bret** 53:39

protest rally that happens. And then violence breaks out. Tear gas is used most of these things. But I saw the wall of moms, I would say maybe 20% of them appear old enough to be Moms. I'm not saying they're not biologically old enough, but they did not read as a wall of moms they read as a wall of yellow shirts. Now, interestingly, as I left to go home, the the day that I intersected with the wall of moms, I did see some people who were almost certainly mothers walking towards in yellow shirts. So I'm not arguing that there are no mothers among them. But I'm arguing that this is actually taking a small number of mothers and turning them into an outcry of mothers in order for the New York Times to to rant and rail against Trump's fascist incursion into Portland. And it doesn't read that way on the ground. It really doesn't and so had it I'd be telling you, but it doesn't. And I'm not saying actually this is maybe the most difficult part for me. The rally that preceded the riots the night that I encountered, the wall of moms was alive.

**Heather** 55:02

But what you mean what,

**Bret** 55:03

by which I meant you could feel the camaraderie in the air. Right. And, you know, I think what they're demanding is nonsense. I think that, you know, a rally proceeding a predictable riot in which people are attacking federal buildings attacking elk statues, occupying city blocks, that this is completely unacceptable. But as somebody with experience in the world, I'm telling you, the moms didn't look organic to me. But the sense of camaraderie was there it was in the Air enough that somebody who is as skeptical as I am of this, still felt it walking into that, and that should tell you something.

**Heather** 55:47

Yeah. Well, among other things, apparently we're supposed to talk to the plants but not to the elk.

**Bret** 55:52

Right? Well, exactly. Because what do elk eat? They eat plants, right? We err on the side of the plants and the angels.

**Heather** 56:00

Okay to finish this off, I'd like to read a few paragraphs from a a op ed, I guess, published in the Boston Globe. Actually, a week and a half ago, by Robbie George and Cornel West, Harvey George is a friend of ours and Robbie George who is conservative and Cornel West, who is a liberal, our fast friends as well. And they are sort of the I don't know if poster children is the right term, but for, for working across and friending across significant differences and actually seeing the value and honor in other people's positions. So they've written a piece called to unite the country we need honesty and courage. You can show it briefly although then I'm going to go back to my screen because I want to read just bits and pieces of it. So it begins. It begins fellow citizens, honesty and courage alone can save our wounded disunited country. Now we need the honesty and courage to speak the truth, including painful truth unsettled not only our foes, but also our friends and most especially ourselves. And it's a long and wonderful piece. In the middle of it, there are these six short paragraphs. We need the honesty and courage not to compromise our beliefs or go silent on them out of a desire to be accepted or out of fear of being ostracized, excluded or canceled. We need the honesty encouraged to consider with an open mind and heart points of view that challenge our beliefs, even our deepest, most cherished identity, forming beliefs. We need the intellectual humility to recognize our own fallibility, and that too, requires honesty and courage. Within the honesty encouraged to recognize and acknowledge that there are reasonable people of goodwill who did not share even some of our deepest most cherished beliefs. This is true for Christians like ourselves, or members of other traditions of faith, as well as for religious skeptics and atheists. It is true for conservatives as well as progressives for libertarians as well as socialists. We need the honesty and courage treat decent and honest people with whom we disagree, even on the most consequential questions as partners and truth seeking and fellow citizens of our republican order, not as enemies to be destroyed, and we must always respect and protect their human rights and civil liberties. We need honesty and courage to be willing to change our beliefs and stances if evidence, reason and compelling argument persuade us that they are in need of revision, even at the cost of alienating us from communities in which we are comfortable and rely on for personal information, solidarity and support. And finally, we need the honesty and courage to love in the highest and best sense to will the good of the other for the sake of the other to treat even our adversaries as precious members of the human family. We need the honesty and courage to resist the hatred, the spirit of hatred, that the zeal even for good causes can induce and we frail, fallen, fallible human beings, and that corrupts the human soul and leads inexorably to spiritual emptiness and to tyranny even among those who began as sincere advocates of freedom and justice.

**Bret** 59:00

So this is marvelous and fits perfectly with the guy we have come to know Robbie George is a truly amazing human being who has come to our defense many times despite being on the other side of the political spectrum from us. The I think there are two things that we need to add to cap this off, though, I will try to keep them brief. First one is that could you show that tweet that I sent you? Here's what happens if we went the video?

**Bret** 59:36

Well, what Zack is looking for is a tweet that find a way for images. Yep.

**Bret** 59:54

Can you put it on the big screen so we can read it? Okay, the tweet and I said, I must tell you, I wish I could just simply assume that the I know that the event is real. I cannot vouch for the source. I know nothing about them, they may they are more than likely just fine, but I don't know enough about the source to to say, but the tweet says Good morning from Louisville, Kentucky today and all black militia group called the not fucking around coalition hashtag. And f AC is holding an armed rally for Brianna Taylor expected at noon, conservative militias are already gathering to counter it, I'll be covering all day. So this is happening. I don't know if the images are necessary or not. The fact of this rally is significant. I have seen video of the rally itself, I have seen video of the militias that are coming to counter protests, I know that at least one shot was fired probably accidentally. Nonetheless, the danger to the Republic that comes from not listening to Cornel West and Robbie George is spectacular and immediate. And that is what we are playing with is that this will unfold badly one bad confrontation between one group and another that gets read as somehow an attack is or isn't attack, a single entity that decides to make an attack could set things in a direction from which we will not recover and we must not allow that to happen. Okay, final thing. With the death of Michael Brooks, I have held my fire with respect to the interaction with the producer of the majority report, Matt latch. But there's something that needs to be said here. So many will remember that Matt latch on leashed a false hood, about me and therefore, about us that I was somehow consulting for the Department of Homeland Security. And what he was referring to was discussion with a an officer for the DHS, which I didn't, I made no secret of I talked about it right here on the live stream. So he took that and he portrayed it as my consulting for the Department of Homeland Security. And then I said that he needed to apologize, he needed to retract and he needed to be fired. And I was challenged in a way that I actually probably should have seen coming. But I did not expect which is Oh I get it. You are in favor of canceled culture when it's about you. This strikes me as insane. Why does matlacha need to be fired, he does not need to be canceled. I never wanted him canceled. He needs to be fired for cause that's what used to happen in the adult world. When somebody if your pilot shows up drunk, they need to be fired for Cause if your surgeon refuses to scrub up before surgery, they need to be fired for cause that's not cancellation. This person does not belong in journalism. And if he just made an error, if this is a once in a lifetime, then he needs to own up to that error. Exactly. And nothing he has delivered so far is anything other than grudging. So I think he needs to be fired for cause. And I think Sam cedar needs to understand that his ability to continue in whatever he's doing, if it's journalism requires that he owned up to the fact that what Matt Matt ledge did his justification for firing and that that is actually the required action unless something utterly extraordinary happens. So I don't want to hear any more of this garbage about I'm for canceled culture. This has nothing to do with canceled culture. This has to do with the fact that the world functions when people do jobs properly. And some jobs do not accept failures like this, a drunk pilot needs to be fired for cause a journalist who lies about the nature of an interaction of citizens with federal officers needs to be fired for cause. Why? Because it put us in danger. There are nightly attacks on federal officers in Portland violent attacks by describing us as collaborating with the Department of Homeland Security that was clearly painting a target on us that was foreseeably going to end in violence against us on totally false pretenses. So anyway, I now feel that issue is clear enough and if you describe it as canceled culture, that's your failure.

**Heather** 1:04:36

All right. Okay, well, I think we are about ready to wrap up. Yep. Tomorrow we will have our private q&a for Dark Horse members, for people at my patreon at the $5 or up level, at 11am. And if you're interested in the private Discord server You can find you can access that by joining either our Patreon to the $5 acculevel What else is clips channel good channel unity 2020

**Bret** 1:05:09

there's unity 2020 big things are headed your way keep your eye out for that.

**Heather** 1:05:16

They just released the zubi conversation yesterday conversation

**Bret** 1:05:18

I was just gonna say to be conversation is great to be as a gem and totally worth your time so you should check that out. If you haven't seen the Matt Taibbi discussion that was also an excellent

**Heather** 1:05:32

like new black millennial Roundtable. It's, it's all good. This guy knows what he's doing.

**Bret** 1:05:37

All right. So we are going to return Yeah,

**Heather** 1:05:40

so we'll we'll take a 15 minute break we'll be we'll be answering as many of your super chat questions as we can taking the top monetary value ones from this first hour first and then taking what comes in next hour in roughly the order in which they come in. To do so,

**Bret** 1:05:59

yep. So tune into the q&a and we'll see you shortly.