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**Bret** 00:06

Hey folks, welcome to the Dark Horse pod cast cat extravaganza live stream number 38. With Dr. Heather Hyang. And myself, Brett Weinstein, we are continuing to hurtle through 2020. As we expect, are you?

**Heather** 00:24

So we certainly hope so. Yes, exactly.

**Bret** 00:26

It's really better than the

**Heather** 00:27

alternatives as they say stagnating and 2020. Not anyone's choice

**Bret** 00:31

where you want to stay? You want to get through this as quickly as possible. Just head down? Go for it. Yeah. All right. So I understand we have a correction off the top.

**Heather** 00:40

Yes, we do have a correction at the top. But let me actually, before even going right there at the top, say, because we have many new viewers, there have been questions about how it is that people get questions to us. So if you're watching this live on YouTube, you can do a super chat question which involves paying to YouTube and we will take as many of those super chat questions based on how much you You gave in the first hour. And in the second hour, we will take as many of your questions as we can, based on the order in which you you put them in so and then each hour each each episode, we will take some of the few that we missed the previous time that we thought were particularly worthwhile. So it's about Super Chat. And if you have no idea what I'm talking about, but you're live in YouTube right now, we have I believe a moderator there who will be able to answer questions if you don't know what that means.

**Bret** 01:41

So so I should also just say, we don't love asking for money. But since we were so colorfully ejected from the Academy, this is a large fraction of how we keep our family afloat. So we very much appreciate the support that you give us through this mechanism. And so far, it has been working pretty well, we are hopefully going to deliver a mechanism that will improve the functionality even more in the near term. So keep your eye out for that.

**Heather** 02:10

Yeah, exactly. Okay, so correction right off the bat. Last time in Episode 37. We talked about a paper published in Nature, finding that UVC light in the 207 to 222 nanometer range has proven to be effective against several coronaviruses. They did not actually checks RS Cove two, but two, they have also found it effective against influenza. And so extrapolating, they thought, okay, maybe this is maybe this is actually going to be effective. And we then had a discussion Island discussion, this is not on you at all, in which Well, I didn't explicitly say I basically implied very strongly that, that there this is one more piece of evidence than being outside is going to be effective against Coronavirus. And there is there is lots of evidence that being outside is actually productive. But UVC light and this was actually I first was alerted to this in a super chat question from last time. UVC light actually doesn't get to the earth surface, that UVC is in the 100 to 280 nanometer range. And between 102 100 nanometers or so it's totally blocked by oh two by just diatomic oxygen. And between 202 180 nanometers it's blocked by try atomic oxygen, which is also known as ozone. So the ozone layer also blocks a lot of the UVB light, which is up to 350 nanometers. And UVA is almost entirely unblocked by the atmosphere. And so it's the ground that's in the 315 to 400 nanometer range. So all of that is a little bit a little bit technical and maybe more than anyone wants to know but the point is that germicidal UV light in H fac systems and closets in you know in a number of places could be very effective. But this is not a place It seems that spending time outdoors is actually going to be directly helpful in combating either trans getting being having code source code to transmitted to you or having a lower lower variance of the disease COVID-19 should you get it.

**Bret** 04:24

So I just want to unpack this a little bit because the message here is complex. It's an error correction that as far as I can tell has zero implication for what you should do now is zero still very safe, especially during the day when UV light does some purifying though that's apparently not the only reason that Outdoors is safe. Even at night you have the large volume of air which reduces the viral load below the threshold that you're likely to get it so Outdoors is great and as we keep saying the clock is ticking. If you're in the Northern Hemisphere, the sun is shining. Spend some time outside now because Winter is coming and you We're going to be driven indoors much more than you'd like. So just even at the level of your mental well being drinking as much of that beautiful outdoor stuff as possible so that when you're stuck inside in February, you don't feel like you've been trapped for a year. Yeah,

**Heather** 05:15

speaking of a bit, we had talked early, you, you had suggested that you were concerned in, you know, April May, about what was going to happen to the homeless communities, because there was so packed together, and they basically have nowhere to go. And, you know, interestingly, we're not seeing vast outbreaks among the homeless, well, what don't the homeless have access to its indoor spaces for the most part, and even when they do, they often aren't choosing to to go there, right. So populations, even within sort of tent cities are being exposed to high airflow almost all the time, and so have relatively low density of the viral particles, which are, which are necessary for both being getting the disease and having worse outcomes. higher density means higher likelihood of contracting and worse outcomes.

**Bret** 06:09

Now, if I might, I would like to tack a couple things on to this important correction with no implications for your behavior. So the point of that study, then was that we could introduce this UVC into our indoor environments where it would be useful, but it would have to be done technological. And

**Heather** 06:24

it's it seems to have as far as we know, it has no adverse health effects UBC. So all of the you know, beware of UV that we hear about with regard to skin cancers itself requires an asterisk for sure, because there is good evidence, and I haven't pulled it up. So I can't, I can't pinpoint exactly the papers. But actually, the protective effects of the UVA UVB light seems to outweigh the risks of skin cancers. So that that is an aside, but UVC even among the people, even among the the many dermatologists who will say absolutely never should you be exposed to UV light and inside yourself with sunscreen and wear hats at all times at all this. No one is saying at the moment that there are adverse health effects to exposure to UBC. But of course, given that we haven't been exposed because we've always lived on this planet. Who knows who knows what we aren't noticing,

**Bret** 07:15

right? Now, a couple things I've got to tack on here because during my telomere phase, as you'll recall, there was a a discovery that gave me particular joy associated with the fact that dermatologists were talking themselves silly about the following observation. The expectation was that exposure to UV causes cancer, every everybody who was dermatologically aware, I knew that. But it was becoming clear that people that have very sun damaged skin, farmworkers, Cowboys, people who work under the hot sun enough that their skin is visibly sun damage, have very low rates of cancer, right. And so it happens that my Tila mere work gives us exactly the reason for this, and it tells you where to draw the line. So first of all, sun damaged skin is damaged, right? It loses its elasticity, it doesn't do the jobs that skin does, it's healthy young skin does as well as it doesn't do it as well as healthy young skin. But if you are exposed to the sun continuously, and it is damaging tissue such that you are basically turning over your cells at a high rate, but you are not getting so much intensity that it is causing genetic damage which causes mutations which cause tumors, and then what you are doing is effectively aging your skin artificially quickly. But if you're aging it without mutating it, then the point is that is expanding your lifetime capacity for repair. And your lifetime capacity for repair is what gives you the danger of tumors because the capacity of one cell to reproduce itself many times after it's had a mutation gives you a big patch of cells that can get a second mutation that will turn it into a tumor. But people whose skin is artificially old because they've spent a lot of time in the hot sun without getting sunburns. They are they when they get a mutation, it creates a much smaller patch of cells and so they are actually protected by the damage so

**Heather** 09:18

so once your skin is no longer capable of repair, you won't ever have youthful looking skin again, but you're also very unlikely to get cancer in that skin

**Bret** 09:27

if you didn't get sunburns along the way. That's that's that's the key. And so this also explains the other interesting phenomenon which was long known, which was that sunburns are the thing that leads to cancer but it's early sunburns that lead to cancer later in your life. So the early sunburns, you get a mutation in a cell from UV light, that cell then starts reproducing in an unregulated way it becomes a patch of cells which is a mole basically, and then it stops at its steel Americ limit. Well the bigger the patch of cells is when you It reaches that limit, the greater the chance that one of those cells will get a second mutation that frees it from the limit and turns it into a tumor. So, anyway, that the bottom line here at some level is, biology is always a complex system. And the answers aren't necessarily what you expect. And you know, turns out sunscreen, which we were told that we, you know, shouldn't dare go outside without it during the summer, it has many negative effects, that going out in the sun has many positive effects, that those effects are not necessarily ones you'd predict, like the vitamin D protective effect against COVID.

**Heather** 10:34

So let's, let's actually just talk a little bit more about what what we have done and what we did with our, with our kids early on, when all of the advice and every time we'd send him to school or camp or something, we were telling you that you have to pack a tube of sunscreen or probably come back empty and all of this and we we didn't do this. So I'd like to share just a little bit about you know, how and how and why. But also say that your point that early sunburn predicts later cancer does raise the issue of Okay, what is the boundary between a burn and a tan. And your tan is this protective response by the skin. But of course, almost everyone has had the experience of you know, spending a little bit too much time outside thinking you got away with it thinking it went to tan, and then finding that it was actually a burn underneath. And so this like, basically boundaries between categories, and every complex system that you can name is fuzzy, right? And so you know, you want to avoid getting too near that that border between tan and burn as well. Well,

**Bret** 11:40

I agree. The problem is it's fuzzy in the moment. In other words, you will have a burn before you have evidence that you have a burn. On the other hand, my

**Heather** 11:48

experience is analog, but the actual like did it mutate or did not as digital Well,

**Bret** 11:53

it's not even did it mutate, because you may not end up with a mutation Did you damage tissue such that it requires replacement so that you end up with the sloughing of skin that comes with the burn. The alternative being your skin anticipates damage based on detecting a lot of sunlight and dark in this if you're light skinned, it darkens the color of your skin in order to protect the cells that are there. And so the tan the sweet spot is where you got enough sun to trigger this, but you didn't get so much sun that you damaged tissue. And then genetic damage is one layer beyond that. And that's the thing that you have to worry about. Now, here's an interesting phenomenon. So I used to burn very, very easily. And I did get some of those sunburns in youth that tend to predispose a person to skin cancer. But I've also learned just by observing my own interaction with the world, how to manage it without sunscreen, right. So that hat on my Twitter profile is part of my strategy, when I'm in the field, especially in the tropics is that's great. It's also great for rain, keeps the rain off of off your face, which is

**Heather** 13:00

really very useful. But it's a great conversation starter.

**Bret** 13:03

It's a terrible conversation starter, people assume it's some sort of a prop, right. But anyway, the the thing that I learned about myself, which I've now taught my kids, and when they think of it, it works for them too, is that you can get a lot of sun exposure where you're headed towards a burn. And then you can take a short break, like a five minute break in the fade. Or if you there's no shade you can turn to a different side of you is facing the sun. And it seems to reset some sort of counter. And the thing that I think is interesting is it suggests and a process that is analogous to what we now about COVID infection. So COVID infection, at least as our current model looks, there's like a bucket. And that bucket as long as it doesn't reach the top means that even if you encountered some COVID, you're very unlikely to get sick. It's only when the bucket overflows, because you've had exposure over some period of time and the bucket filled up that you're likely to get, which means if you're outside, which is constantly emptying the bucket, you're very low risk.

**Heather** 14:02

So viral particles fly away from you.

**Bret** 14:04

Right. And so there's something and I'd be hard pressed to tell you what it is, I don't know. But there's something about the the mechanism with respect to the sun damage. There's something about the skin that is able to tolerate a certain amount of sun intensity. And if you just keep building it up, you it's like it's like a bucket that has a hose in it that's bigger, you know, that's putting in more water than the leak in the other side of the bucket. The bucket eventually overflows. But if you allow it to drain and draining in the case of the sun exposure is just a matter of giving it some time in which you're not bombarding it with new sunlight seems to reset something. And so the thing that's surprising to me is that it's not, it's not like you can't just run the sun, you need to half an hour in the shade. It's half an hour in the sun, you need two or three minutes in the shower,

**Heather** 14:53

nor can you just count up the number of minutes you want to spend in the sun and say okay, I'm just going to take that all at once. You know, say say you have skin that can tolerate three hours that you have calculated can tolerate three hours in the sun at a time. Well, that's that's youthful and extraordinarily sun resilient skin. But actually say you did it for three hours, you could probably take a break, and at three hours you didn't maybe 1520 minutes and go back out again. Yeah. Now this, this really does seem to be the experience I have I have less direct empirical experiences, because I don't I don't tend to burn. But we've seen it with you and both of our children as well.

**Bret** 15:31

Yeah. The other The last thing I would say, first of all, this is just my experience. It's not, it's anecdote at best. So your mileage is almost certainly going to vary, and you have to figure out your own pattern. But I sometimes find that when I blow it a little bit, and I go too far. And I know this because when I come in Finally, you know, my skin is hot, like I did is that a burn, you can go a certain amount too far. And then it doesn't end up being a burn. So there's some sort of you have exceeded tolerances, but not so much that it's gone critical phase, which allows you to actually know where you are in finding that border

**Heather** 16:12

that requires that you pay attention to the feedback your body is giving you. Yeah, it requires that you have a sense of what your skin and your breathing and everything else about your physiology normally feels like so that as it begins to send you warning signals. Excuse me, you are in a position to read them and to receive them.

**Bret** 16:30

Yeah, absolutely. And a lot of things work this way. Medically speaking, we're paying attention to patterns, even if you don't know what the underlying mechanism is. You can manage things. Absolutely. All right. So we get on to the I'll let you introduce the topic.

**Heather** 16:48

Yeah, I guess. Yeah. Let's talk about the Seattle Police Chief resigning. Laws is Carmen best, who announced her resignation in a letter to her staff. I think it was yesterday. So on August 10, to be effective September 2. This happened after the Seattle, Seattle City Council voted to significantly cut her pay. As reported in the Seattle pie, the post Intelligencer also yesterday, she had been critical of the Trump jazz job, especially in the wake of killings of two African American men. And so Zack, if you would show them in it have

17:29

yet another murder in this area identified as the top two African American men dead at a place where they claimed to be working for Black Lives Matter. But they're gone. They're dead now. We've had multiple other incidents, assaults, rape, robbery, and shootings. And so you know, this is something that's going to need to change. We're asking that people remove themselves from this area for the safety of the people. If they care about people, they're gonna have to try to help us to make it safe. not opposed to anybody's issue of concern. They certainly can demonstrate, you know, and peacefully anyplace, but they can't possibly take over a neighborhood and cause the crime levels to go up like this. Two men are dead. Two men are dead. And a child, a 14 year old is hospitalized. And we don't know what is going to happen to that kid. Enough is enough here.

**Heather** 18:27

So we can't hear that when you guys can. But she finishes with enough is enough. And this was back on June 29. This is a press conference that she held on June 29. And, and now she's done. She just she is not going to take it anymore.

**Bret** 18:46

Well, she is faced some he has had a significant pay cut. Yep. And she has also had her home protested. And so in some sense what is taking place is you have a police chief who's being hamstrung in her job who is now being exposed to very personal attacks. I mean, imagine having people protest you doing your job at your home. That's a very threatening phenomenon, not just socially. And then these insane demands to defund the police are actually which resulted in

**Heather** 19:29

her having to accept a pay cut if she has significant pay cut if she was to keep her job. Right.

**Bret** 19:35

And so this is now it's the mirror of the starve the beast strategy that the right has employed against governance, where the idea is, well, maybe you don't attack the structures themselves, but you eliminate their ability to function you strangle them financially.

**Heather** 19:55

No, if the point is, let's render these institutions so bad Add that everyone can agree that they are not functional and therefore need to be disappeared entirely. defunding them first is a brilliant first step. So, you know, how can you guarantee that policing will get worse rather than better, you give it fewer resources, you give less time for mental health checks an actual legitimate and real training. And you lower the pay so that people who are considering going into the force are less likely to choose that job. And you will therefore as fewer and fewer people want to join the force have to lower the standards of people you accept into the force. This is guaranteed the defund the police, even if we only accept it as a, even if we accept the you know, the mild version of what defund the police means, which we've talked before about whether or not that is actually what what is being argued for. But even if we just accept that what people are arguing for is that money has to be pulled out of policing, you know, is is there access in police departments as in every other bureaucratic department in the world, certainly, right. But the idea that we are going to pull money, and therefore make it a less attractive job for people, thus guaranteeing that the people who go into it are going to be less likely to be the highly empathic and skilled people who we want as our policeman is guaranteed to make police brutality. worse rather than better.

**Bret** 21:28

Yeah, and the simple fact that we are being asked to consider how we would like to see police resourced in isolation is, is evidence that this is not an honest conversation, we are involved, it is quite possible that you could get away with half as many police, but you would get away with half as many police by virtue of the fact that you had taken care of the things that the police are now forced to take care of, by other mechanisms. And of course, we will be told that well, that's what we're saying, just shift that money into community programs, you cannot start there. If you want to render the police less necessary by fixing other parts of society, you have to start with that if you pull the police first, even if you shunt stuff into other programs that you think are going to work. First of all, you don't know if it's going to work, you don't know that the political structure will end up maintaining that money there. What you're simply going to do is reduce the level of enforcement and therefore you're going to increase the brutality of it, because in part, the brutality of policing is a mechanism for doing it on the cheap. Right.

**Heather** 22:37

And, you know, it's it's absolutely true, it's been noted by many people that police have begun to do you're untrained for this work, and never what policing was supposed to be about some of the basically first responders on mental health issues, right? And this is not where what we what we should want our police to be doing. And I can basically guarantee you that it's not what the police want to be doing. Yeah, right, dude, no one wants to be called in to respond to mental health situations when they are not themselves when that is not the career they have chosen, nor are they trained to do it. So do we need systems in place with people who are trained to actually be dealing with the mental health crises that we are seeing revealed on our streets? And you know, the many domestic abuse calls, for instance? For sure, but that that money, those those systems have to be functional before you start to unravel? The policing system?

**Bret** 23:30

Yeah. So that's not really what's being debated. Now. It's not this is this is a movement that has discovered that it has power and your willingness to accept that the police should obviously be defunded is a litmus test to see whether you are for us or against us?

**Heather** 23:48

Well, this reminds me rather a lot of what happened at Yes, evergreen, right. I mean, we we we had this Kerman best, as far as I understand, it has been the police chief in Seattle for not too many years, but she's been on the force for almost 30. And I think she was Seattle's first African American police chief. And of course in in a movement just as she says in that clip, and a movement that is declaring itself to be a black about Black Lives Matter. Why is it that black men are being killed? And you know, in a movement that proclaims to be about Black Lives Matter. Why is it that sales first African American police chief is feeling it is that is necessary for her to step down? This is clearly not, you know, being being black isn't sufficient to be to be exalted in this movement, you have to be of a particular political bent in order to be exalted in this movement, and police chief Stacy brown at evergreen was I know more about Stacy brown than I do about Carmen bass, but Carmen best appears to just be a good and honorable cop and Stacy Brown. Absolutely. 100% was and still is, she's just no longer a police chief on a college campus. She was herself an evergreen alum. She He was explicitly about working on a policy of anti police brutality and trying to fix relationships between police and their constituents. And she took no end of abuse from from moment one from her swearing in ceremony from the people at evergreen. And sure enough, she was stood down. And she ended up having to resign because because she had the authority to do her job taken away from her by, in the case of evergreen, the president of evergreen, and she felt that if she remained in the job, someone was going to get hurt, or worse, and that that she would feel responsible for it, even though she had had all of the ability to do her job taken away from her. This, I am sure is what police chiefs all over the country are now feeling.

**Bret** 25:48

Yes. And we also have the obvious test of the insight of those who are demanding these changes. So those who have now driven chief best from office, have instituted their utopia at small scale, it very quickly resulted in shootings, including a fatal shooting. It resulted in extortion from shop owners, and basically rapes and assaults. Right? Yeah. So the point is, this is a test of the claim that the community can police itself better. No, it can. Some of us knew that was coming. But okay, now you've tested it in a major American city, and you've seen what happens. You saw this at evergreen, inside of hours of the president of the college standing the police down, you had a violent mob, students were attacked. You had them stopping traffic looking apparently, for me. And then we've got a third case, we've got Portland where the mayor who is also the police commissioner has hobbled the local police, resulting in nightly violence at first against the Hatfield courthouse. And now it has moved into neighborhoods, there's very shocking video of these riders now telling citizens that they will burn their apartments down. Apparently the crime is for looking out the window at the riot going by on the street. So anyway, how many of these would you need before you got the message that all these people who claim to be authorities on how much policing is necessary? And how easily and how much better things will be if we eliminate it? How much evidence would you need that they have no fucking clue what they're talking about when it comes to the role that policing plays in our country. Yeah, they don't. It's obvious every time they try it. They can't keep it together for you know, a week.

**Heather** 27:41

That's right. And just we might introduce this, this is from a week ago. Now, Zach, if you would put this on screen, New York Times op ed from August 3 2020, by Chuck Lovell, who is the Chief of the Police Bureau in Portland, newly so the former police chief stepped down and I think appointed him. He skipped a number of rungs in the usual hierarchy to obtain this position. He is himself a black man. And he says I mean, this is a this is a honestly a pretty weakly worded op ed. But even so it says things like people here's this year, people protested peacefully, while others engaged in dangerous activities that could have resulted in injury and even death. So we have, we have the police chief of the city that we happen to live in, that has been at the forefront of the media fight for narrative. And neither of the polarized sides of the mainstream media narrative have gotten this right. And you know, we've we've talked about this before, and, and and so have others know, the city was not on fire. Nor was it limited to two square blocks. No, the protesters were not the only people on the streets reliably like clockwork, relatively shortly after the sun went down, and sometimes later, the protesters became writers. Some of those are the same people, many of them are not it was like a change of scene.

**Bret** 29:18

Yes, actually, I want to put something up here is that could you put up the thing on propaganda? So what I'm going to show you here is a blog post that came up on the Portland subreddit today. Can you scroll up a little bit? So this is a remarkable piece in which a strategy called darboe. Is that right? In the second paragraph there, institutional darboe Yeah, so what this piece

**Heather** 29:54

R stands for deny attack and reverse victim and offender

**Bret** 29:58

Yes. So your brain is about to hurt if you try to puzzle through this, this is somebody associated with this protest slash Riot movement, who is arguing that the government is now engaged in the kind of propaganda in which they are attacking innocent people, that they are reversing victim and victimizer for the purpose of gaslighting the world into thinking that the protesters are violent. Now, the problem here is that this is the exact inverse of the story. I can't say it's the exact inverse in every instance, has any cop misbehaved during this probably, we know that we know that's true, but but the point is, they are describing the exact strategy that they're involved in, they are pretending to be a non violent movement, but there's a reliable shift each and every night. And really, I think it's each and every night for the last 70 there's been a reliable shift in the direction of violence, that violence has been directed at federal buildings. Now it's being directed at the police, union and neighborhoods. And the point is, look, there's not even a set of demands here that we can evaluate, right? The demand is effectively Oh, get rid of the police. Right? How many what fraction of the population actually thinks this is a good idea? Tiny, if even that, but get rid of the police is the excuse for a violent attack on the structures of civilization that demand some kind of response. Now, I'm not excited to see that response in my city. I don't like seeing police dressed up in riot gear, you know, roughing people up throwing them into vans, any of this stuff. But the alternative apparently is letting them do what they want, which doesn't make any sense. So it

**Heather** 31:44

doesn't and you know, one of the things I've seen in the local press is this claim that oh, well, I literally Portland is a protest city. Like anything that happens and people just go out on the streets. people show up because Portland is about protest. And frankly, I'd never heard that before we moved here this and you know, now looking back at some of the history like Yeah, actually, this this seems to be kind of the ethos that you know, if you if you have any kind of grievance at all, you're going to people are going to protest? Will that be exacerbated under conditions of lockdown? 100%? Of course they are. This is where people go instead of clubs and bars, because there are no clubs and bars slightly at the moment, but not still really. But you know, the idea of that's what we do, we protest really puts the lie to the legitimacy of any given protest, like how like people could be sort of categorically less likely to protest or more likely to protest. And that's a legitimate thing to recognize about a population, I suppose. But if, if the local media is saying without any irony whatsoever, well, of course there's protests, that's what we do. Doesn't that then mean that maybe taking people at their word that they are protesting, because this new thing happened, is less legitimate? If protest happens for anything and everything, then the any given reason that is trotted out for why protest is happening? seems less legitimate, because actually what you've already told us as you protest, because you protest, you don't protest because there's a cause for it.

**Bret** 33:20

This is the flip side of the thing that I always say which is that yes, I'm a liberal but I'm a liberal that wants to see change that will make society so good that I get to be a conservative and the point is, if your point is no I'm always going to be demanding change then we can't take your a man for change serious little liberal

**Heather** 33:38

because you want to be a liberal, you're not a progressive, because change is inherently the right thing you want we we want to obtain something that is stable, and still changing and moving because the environment will change but that is stable, such that we can afford to to love the state that we're in

**Bret** 34:00

Well, let's let's just put it simply change for its own sake is stupid, sometimes what you are going to do more harm than good with change. Now, that's not where we are, we've got a lot of positive change that we can engage in from here. But we should be frightened about the downside of this is the thing liberals tend to miss is that the unintended consequences of well intended policies are sometimes sufficient to to argue against implementing those policies at all. But

**Heather** 34:28

I would say the flip and we've we've talked about this before, but I would say just the flip side of that is that conservatives are more likely to miss the unintended consequences of their innovations in the marketplace that then cause downstream effect

**Bret** 34:39

right there, right? They miss market failure and things like that. But nonetheless, anybody whose ethos is Oh, I'm a changed person. Yeah. Change person. We haven't even told you where you are your change person, no matter what, right? Yeah, I'm, you know, I'm a restless person. I always want to be somewhere other than where I am. Okay, well, you're on a ship and you like to stay On the ship, or you want to just step off into the deep blue I mean, I guess right. So anyway, we, I, we are always wrestling with how to phrase this or where to stand so that you can actually see what's going on. And increasingly, I think we've got some of the right elements on the table, we've talked about an auto immune reaction, this a lot of this protest is attacking the very things that make things functional. We've talked about the verification ism, then allows people to arrive at these crazy conclusions. We've talked about the fact that the the movement itself appears to be involved in a kind of collective psychosis. But you've also talked about this. The sneetches analogy, yeah, that there's something about what is being said, that appears to be devoid of content. It's just group identifier, stuff, and it can be as arbitrary as a star on your belly. Right? And that we are confused by the fact that there's content like, Oh, we should definitely defund the police. Like that sounds like an argument, we should definitely define the police sounds like an analytical conclusion that arises from an analysis rather than, you know, like, you know, it could just as easily be Oh, I, you know, I hum at this pitch. Right? You know, Yes, you do. Well, I do now, but, but anyway, so I've been wrestling with how to put these things together, how to even think about them correctly. Yeah. And I came up with this model, which unfortunately, I'm going to hold up on a piece of paper, which is kind of old school. But anyway, let's see, here's my piece of paper. Here's the model that we are we live here in this gully. And the point is, the political winds can push this ball in one direction or the other, and it tends to revert back to the middle, you know, the liberals can get a little overly enthusiastic with some of their solution making and you know, things don't quite work out. And then the conservatives say, told you so was never gonna work and they drag things back a little bit too far. And we lose some of the gains that can go on indefinitely, because with this is this, this depression, there is, mathematically speaking, a stable equilibrium. Now, the points I have labeled A and B here, those are unstable equilibrium. And the point is, if you push this ball far enough, it reaches one of these unstable equilibria. And the next thing that happens is you end up down here, wherever that is, and my claim is going to be, this doesn't have to be fascism and communism. But it might as well be. The point is a historical process that pushes that ball up to either A or B results in a catastrophic destabilization, a disintegration of something that was keeping you safe. And so my point is, you don't always like it where you're in this gully here, but it's tolerable. And what happens once you go over one of these unstable equilibrium points, is you end up somewhere completely intolerable. And the real question for us is a, what does that and I'm going to argue that the sneetches business has a lot to do with it, that the thing that tends to push you over the edge is something that historically causes you instead of thinking about things analytically, to default to team.

**Heather** 38:26

Okay, but Okay, so sneetches, you know, massacring stages and stages without magga hat wearing stages and stages without all the same thing, right. But the tribes that are defined by the magga hat, and the masks and the stars on the bellies, and all of the rest, are then slotted by their enemies into particular buckets. And so you'll we have pointed out often that at least used to be I'm not sure if it still is, but on the official Black Lives Matter page, we see. And, you know, in interviews with the founders, we see them saying, actually, this is Marxist, we're trying to Marxist stuff, and that's what we're trying to do. And so you know, to your point, Oh, is it you know, is it communism? Is it fascism? Is it Marxism, is it fascism? It doesn't need to be, but those do seem to be the two polls that we are oscillating between, at least in terms of mainstream media right now. And part of the problem I think, this is maybe not exactly to your point. But I do think that part of the problem is there are many of us, actually, on the left, including many people on the right, who were saying, Oh, my God, that's that's that's Marxism that they're proclaiming because they're actually saying it and you should believe them when they say that that's actually what they're doing because it looks like it and also they don't deny it. So what the hell and by the way, look at these 18 examples from history where Marxism doesn't work, so let's not go there. On the other side, you've got people saying that Trump's ascendancy to office is clearly an indicator that we are about to descend into fascism and There are some people on the right who who see that there are pretty much everyone in the far left, you know, the people who are actually rioting, and some number of the people who are protesting on the streets see it that way. But there are also many of us on the left who say, don't like the guy disagree with these policies? Don't think he's fit for office. But it doesn't look fascist. Right. So we, on the left can simultaneously say, don't want that particular executive branch to maintain. But in terms of are we struggling between communism and fascism? It actually doesn't look like this thing over in the Republican Party right now is is fascist

**Bret** 40:41

Well, no. So I agree with that, to an extent. Okay, my real point is that there is tribalism that exists in this well, right in the well, there's normal tribalist, you've got elephants and donkeys under the best of circumstances, and it's not inherently bad, right? What you have is a tension between arguments, right, those who want less meddling and more freedom, and therefore are willing to tolerate more failure, more people falling off the bottom of the ladder, or something, our intention with those who want to make sure that bad things don't befall you. And so they will actually remove too much of the incentive for you to do good things, right. So those two things are actual arguments. Right? And where we are is something that reasonable people can disagree over and where we should want to be is someplace reasonable people can disagree, ever. My point is that those unstable equilibria the two high points from which you descend into madness, are places where there is no argument, what we effectively start doing is teaming up for violence. And this is the thing that I'm concerned about is that history has some mechanism. As far as I know, it doesn't have a name, right, we might have a description of it, when things descend into Marxism, we might have a description of it when things descend into fascism. As far as I know, we don't have a description for the general pattern of a functional society that is ebbing and flowing, has hit a tipping point. And that tipping point goes to this other type of behavior. And that other type of behavior ends in warfare, genocide, all of these things. And so that's what I'm hunting for is I think we are we are now watching and all of the people that we are in contact with are now grappling with how to describe what they are seeing, we are debating over stuff that literally I mean, you know, we've been at, are we really arguing about whether males and females are different at a biological level? Like, how could a conversation ever get that done? it's inconceivable that we are now doing this with two plus two equals five. Right? Is it possible the conversation will ever get that done? Yeah, it actually apparently is that dumb,

**Heather** 42:55

I will say that my own failure of imagination cannot figure out what gets dumber than that one.

**Bret** 43:01

It's hard to get done waiting. But my but my point is, you have hit that bottom, we have hit bottom on something. And that is the degree to which what we are arguing over has anything to do with an analysis of any kind. At the point you were arguing about two plus two equals five, you are declaring that you no longer care about what is actual, right. It's pure salep system. So my point is pure salep system is the adult version of stars on your bellies.

**Heather** 43:30

So to those who would say but the other side is fascism. Anything is better than that. It doesn't matter as much. Maybe that we say you know what, I don't even think that's fascism. It what matters more is actual intellectual solipsism is the end full stop like that, that is where you lose all access to the gains from the last 300 years. Right.

**Bret** 43:53

So this is this is the point about autoimmunity is that the people who are arguing against logic itself, right, and those who have signed up with them, and are making excuses for them, are arguing against what we have in favor of something they claim we could have. And my point would be every single test of their intuition about what we could have descends into madness almost instantly. So we are listening to insane people who have a claim about a world better than this one. And we are no longer listening to people who say, This world has a hell of a lot going for it. And the only right thing to do is to fix the parts that didn't get there to complete the project rather than destroy the project. We are in that argument. And we are losing ground to the people who want to destroy this world in the hope or in the expectation that something marvelous as they see it will arise in its place. The only we are losing ground because their argument is no longer an argument. It is

**Heather** 44:57

a threat, expand on that a little bit. We are losing ground up, we are losing ground because it's it. It all sounded to me to all of us like we were in conversation. And then it turns out No, actually what was maybe thinly veiled is now just full on threaten.

**Bret** 45:12

Yes. And that the way that this looks, I mean, I'm beginning to get frustrated with with our circle, because our circle is seeing so much of this nonsense that it is just it thinks its job is to catalog it. Have you seen this crazy example? Have you seen that crazy example look at what this person claimed, oh my god, it's gotten even worse. Right. And my point is that

**Heather** 45:35

that will work for some people, people who haven't yet seen it being being presented with a list a catalogue.

**Bret** 45:41

I feel a little like invoking Yoda. And I'm not a huge Star Wars fan, but I am kind of a huge Yoda fan. There is no dry, there's do and don't do, right. My point is our circle being fascinated by all of the various examples is missing the boat because we're about to lose the thing that is feeding us that will provide our descendants with the place to exist and experience freedom and all of these things. And the reason we are losing it is because you know those who are good at analysis default to it when something comes in a form. We are purely being gaslit. Right? The argument two plus two equals five is purely gaslighting. Now I'm not saying that everybody who's saying it knows that. But I am saying that its function is to take all of the people who feel like no, wait a minute, let me explain to you why two plus two does not equal five and get them explaining it because they're not busy over here not paying attention, right? We're not paying attention to the real thing, which is holy fit. I think we just crossed that threshold that takes a functional entity and turns it into madness. And the other thing if I can just put the last piece in the puzzle as I see it at the moment, I think we need to stop saying that Marxism doesn't work. I think there's a whole lot we can talk about here. Because not work isn't really the problem. It's that when it works, it is completely unacceptable from the point of view of what actually makes sense to value as a human being. In other words, being existing as a homosapiens is not the valuable thing. Right, the valuable thing has to do with your ability to take the specialness that comes along with being a homosapiens and apply it to things that seem worthwhile. So, you know, does North Korea work? It does. I don't want to live like that. In fact, I would gladly I mean,

**Heather** 47:49

I think you're gonna have to define work, then. Well, it persists. Oh, well, mass famine and mass deaths and such.

**Bret** 47:57

Yeah, but but the point is, the entity persists. And we can say the same thing about China. In fact,

**Heather** 48:03

the the political entity persists, and the population even though

**Bret** 48:07

some of many individuals are lost along the way, in perfectly grotesque circumstances. it you know, it does look like it's sticking around. And China is not just sticking around. China's actually thriving economically and with respect to its global power. And so the point is,

**Heather** 48:28

is also moved into more of a capitalist model.

**Bret** 48:32

Sure. But my point is, if you're going to make the argument that won't work, then China actually tells you Well, that's not quite right, because whatever it thought it was doing, moved into something that made it quickly powerful and Ascendant, I still don't want to live under that system. And so, at some level, a communism often does fail be when it succeeds, it never does so without totalitarianism in tow, for reasons that I think we've described here. That, because it is group selection, thinking, to imagine that people will behave altruistically, the way that a communist system that functions works is by realigning people's incentives by threatening them. So you know, the gulags come along with functional communism. And the point is, this

**Heather** 49:20

so just to put this in the language that we've often used elsewhere, communism assumes that external motivation is the thing that is needed to get people to do the right thing. And then in the right thing is then is decided by defined by the state and, and the external motivators almost entirely stick no carrot. And we are not arguing that we should have a carrot based totalitarian argument but rather figure out a way to allow people to to know themselves well enough to motivate themselves internally, to produce and create and discover and heal. And do all of the other things that humans do when we are at our best, rather than creating a system that requires external motivators, especially in the form of the state, or corporations to impart on people what it is that they should be

**Bret** 50:12

doing, right? Or if I could put it a different way. And you know, on the one hand, folks on the right thinking folks on the right, love to hear it analysis about why communism does tend to come with authoritarianism, right? They're looking for that argument, and it's important to them, but they over apply. So what I would argue is that our system functions best, as a hybrid. And it's not really surprising that it functions best as a hybrid. This is a natural outgrowth of thinking about complex systems and diminishing returns, right? Any pure system has massive failures associated with it, because if you maximize one thing, you crash all the other values, that means that a good system will involve getting 85% of some value, but not seeking 100%. And then you can have 85% of a lot of things, right? So that principle is important, which is why I think people actually get the question of socialism wrong because their senses, well, socialism is communism, okay? And maybe there's an argument that really, they're flavors of the same thing. And that, therefore, anybody who has those inclinations is necessarily inviting gulags, which is not the case, because it can certainly be true. If you take my little trough model here, we can say that actually, there are times when you don't have enough socialism to make your system work, you're coming too close to one of these maximization places. So you need more socialism. Does that mean you're a socialist? No,

**Heather** 51:38

you need to pull enough of the risks to guarantee that the people really at the bottom of the socio economic ladder don't fall off entirely.

**Bret** 51:44

Right. So what Yeah, what we really need is a system that leverages the great part of capitalism, which is markets being applied to problems that markets are good at solving, while hedging,

**Heather** 51:57

that allow people to discover their internal motivations and act on it and benefit from doing so when it is in the service of the of the society. Hell

**Bret** 52:06

yeah, we want you to get paid handsomely, when you deliver something that improves our lives a lot, right? We want that to be the incentive. And that's the mythology of capitalists.

**Heather** 52:16

And again, there's so many routes there, it could be discovery, which is typically what what stem people are doing, you know, scientists on session, it could be creation, which may be more often in the realm of art and literature and, and entertainment, it could be healing, it could be so many things. It could be production, it could be, you know, organizing of those parts in order to create an emergent whole that is greater than this than the individual parts. There are many, many ways to actually add value, right? But you you need to discover on your own what your own individual talents and proclivities and passions are, and learn how to. And for this, we need a system that doesn't destroy children in school and doesn't drug them, it doesn't feed them screens, it doesn't tell parents, they need to keep all risk from children, all of these things, such that by the time, people in the bodies of children become people in the bodies of adults, they're actually adults, as opposed to still acting like unregulated on evil to be regulated six year olds,

**Bret** 53:19

totally. So I think that this is really it's like, it's tragic that we're figuring out how to phrase this at the point we are arriving at the possible uninvented of everything. But the idea that the purpose of the protective programs is actually to protect your ability to innovate so that you can deliver value which gets paid back in the market is really, I think, the right answer. And you can see how this works. I mean, it's obvious. The fact is, you want to be protected from failures that are not signal, right? If you're innovating in the market, you want your failures that you could have foreseen to haunt you a bit so that you get better at figuring out where the real value is, but you don't want arbitrary stuff to take you down. So you don't want you know, so

**Heather** 54:09

except people do want their good luck to raise them up. I mean, this this is this is the problem, right? That noise, luck is noise. And people attribute their success that was in fact a good luck to their own skill. And they tend to attribute their failures. That was in fact, bad luck to bad luck. And if we are going to try to even out the effects of noise, it's going to flatten out both the good and the bad luck, right? We do not want to flatten out the effects of excellent choices and excellent skills and poor choices and poor skills.

**Bret** 54:38

But you know, you can think of it like a tennis court. Right? A really good tennis court is one in which the luck has been as eliminated as much as possible. That is to say the surface is perfectly even so nobody is benefiting from a clump of grass that causes a ball to take a bad hop. You know, the fact is, some of the bad hops would go against your opponent, hey, some of the bad hops would go against you. God dammit that thing was in the way I would have gotten the ball if it hadn't been there.

**Heather** 55:07

And there's something sorry. But there's something interesting to be thought about here with regard to you know, players who you know, every every player in tennis has a preference, right, hardcourt grass or clay. And they've got to be very like grasses got to be the noisiest of those surfaces, I would think although it's possible that clay also also the longer you play on clay catalog, you play on grass, the more changes whereas hard surface is going to remain entirely the same throughout the game, and throughout a competition anyway.

**Bret** 55:32

But something I keep saying that people are scratching their heads over is that bad luck. You're never gonna hedge it out. But it's got to be randomly distributed. Because if it isn't randomly distributed, it's not luck. It's something else, right? So you know, it's one thing if there are imperfections on both sides of the court, and you both accept that the game is going to, you know, the game is going to be less good at figuring out who the better player is, because it may go one way or the other because of something that was luck. But it didn't go in favor of one player the election be, you know, Venus Williams and not Serena, half the time be one and a half the time be the other. And just

**Heather** 56:07

I'm going to continue with tennis, this is part of why you switch sides. It's not just about sun angle and such play. Exactly.

**Bret** 56:12

So the point is a really good game is one that random that eliminates as much noise as possible, and randomizes its distribution so that what you actually get is athletic prowess. And the thing is, our market should be like this, too. You don't want the fact that you were innovating. The next big thing, you know, you were innovating, some sort of, I don't know, safety mechanism, or fusion reactor that would free us from energetic constraints. And then you got cancer and you couldn't afford, you know, to fight it. So it wiped out your research program. Right, right. So you want a system that basically leaves the positive incentives in the market, right, and eliminates the luck aspect. And what's more, if we can go back to your example about kids and what they face, you do not want people innovating badness. I've never, ever heard a proper argument that defends advertising to children. To me advertising to children is an evil, I have asked people to give me any valid argument in favor of allowing it to exist, I've yet to hear one that I found even a little bit compelling. And the basic point is look, in childhood, you should be protected from economic forces that are trying to persuade you of stuff for their good that probably isn't in your interest. And this is a corruption. So you know, do you want to be able to innovate anything? No, I don't want you innovating certain mechanisms to get inside my kid's head and get them to spend money. They wouldn't spend or demand things.

**Heather** 57:45

I don't that I want there to be regulations that prevent that, right.

**Bret** 57:48

And so the point is, good regulation is regulation that leaves the market to do things we want done and doesn't allow it where it accomplishes things that we shouldn't want done like the

**Heather** 58:00

those and what's in each of those buckets is what we should be spending our time arguing about. Right?

**Bret** 58:05

Yeah, right, rather than whether it is possible that two plus two equals four is a white people.

**Heather** 58:11

Yeah. So I we are we're closing on an hour here. And I think I will save a short discussion of ibram x Kendi for next time, because that seems not in keeping. But I did want to do a brief reading that I think is actually very much in keeping with what we were just talking about, although it may not seem so immediately. This is a book called The world beyond your head on becoming an individual in an age of distraction. It is an excellent book it is Matthew Crawford is from 2015. And his first book was called shop class as soulcraft, which I think I've mentioned on our on our live streams before, I'm a huge fan of this guy, he I didn't look up his bio again before coming on air. So I may I may get something wrong here, if I remember correctly, he got his PhD in economics from the Chicago School from University of Chicago and took a job basically as a policy wonk within the Beltway in DC and you know, wrote these important white papers and after a couple of years realize that he had he was sort of losing his will to live that he felt like two people maybe maybe at the most 20 are ever going to read into these things I don't think I'm actually having an impact on the world. You know, clearly a brilliant guy totally capable of being this kind of analysis analyst. But he left and he opened up a I think mostly vintage although I may have that wrong motorcycle repair shop in Virginia and hence the his first book shop craft as soulcraft which is kind of a ladder days and in the art of motorcycle maintenance, both of which I think are extraordinary books. This the world beyond your head on becoming an individual in an age of distraction. I just want to read a couple of a couple of expert excerpts from this today. First from a section he called The attentional Commons. We've all had the experience of sitting in an airport with an hour to kill and being unable to escape the chattering of CNN, the audio may be turned off, but if the TV is within view, I for one find it impossible not to look at it. The introduction of novelty into one's field of view commands with a cognitive psychologists call an orienting response and important evolutionary adaptation in a world of predators. An animal turns its face and eyes towards the new thing. A new thing typically appears every second on television. The images on the screen jump out of the flow of experience and make a demand on us in their presence. It is difficult to rehearse a rover conversation for example, whatever trains of thought might otherwise be pursued by those in the room give way to a highly coordinated experience, not the near simultaneous turning of a troupe of mechanics to face the Python that has appeared, but the involuntary glances of weary travelers towards the content on offer. Alternatively, people in such places stare at their phones or open a novel sometimes precisely in order to tune out the piped in chatter. A multiverse of private experiences is accessible after all, in this battle of attentional technologies, what is lost is the kind of public space that is required for a certain kind of socio ability. Jonathan Franzen wrote walking up Third Avenue on a Saturday night I felt bereft all around me attractive young people are hunched over their star tacks and Nokia's with preoccupied expressions as if probing a sore tooth. All I really want from a sidewalk is that people see me and let themselves be seen in a public space where people are not self enclosed in the heightened way. What happens that happens when our minds are elsewhere than our bodies may feel rich with possibility for spontaneous encounters. Even if we do not converse with others, our mutual reticence is experienced as reticence if our attention is not otherwise bound up, but it's rather free to alight upon one another and linger or not, because we ourselves are free to pay at our attention deliberate measures. To be the object of someone's reticence is quite different from not being seen by them. We may have a vivid experience of having encountered another person, even if in silence, such encounters are always ambiguous, and their need for interpretation gives rise to a train of imaginings, often erotic. This is what makes cities exciting. so remarkable, to my mind, especially in the era of COVID, when we have so many fewer of these spaces right now. But the fact is that even even before COVID, even before the lockdowns what he was writing about in 2015, is even more true at the end of 2019, early 2020 before COVID that it is very hard to find a public space anymore. Even when you think you're in public, you're alone together as opposed to maybe engaging, even with strangers with glances, with the understanding that we are actually sharing our minds and brains and bodies all in one space. One more brief excerpt from the end of the book.

**Heather** 1:02:55

What this boils down to, please don't install speakers in every single corner of a shopping mall, even its outdoor spaces. Please don't fill up every moment between innings and a lazy college baseball game with thundering excitement. Please give me a way to turn off the monitor in the backseat of a taxi. Please let there be one corner of the bar with a flickering delivery system for Bud Light commercials is deemed unnecessary because I am already out the bar. The attentional Commons is an idea that I hope will catch on among those who are in a position to make such sanctuaries happen. Building managers, commercial real estate developers and interior designers. Here is a modest proposal. Could the music be made opt in rather than opt out? Once every 20 minutes somebody in the room would have to deliberately hit a button to restart it and thereby actively affirm? Yes, we want some emo in here. We learned encouraging things to joy is the feeling of one's powers increasing the experience of hitting one's flow as a cook, or feeling one's awareness run out to the contact patches of motorcycles tires, seems to reveal something deep about the situated, embodied character of impressive human performance. This is slightly weird to be doing here because we are explicitly disembodied from those watching and from those who will only be listening. But you know, we're here embodied with one another and every day that we are smart enough to make it happen during the season, we are going outside, taking walks or bike rides, or getting our kayaks into the water, and just being there in our bodies, with our brands with each other and our children. And it is fundamentally different. And being out there when you guys are pulling the boats out of the water a few nights ago. And I was just sitting watching first the geese but then the other people on the dock. We were too far away to see them directly. It was too dark to make eye contact. But they were there and we were there and we were all there together in a way that doesn't tend to happen anymore.

**Bret** 1:04:49

Yeah, I agree. And there was an awful lot of what I would say is superficial camaraderie that used to be exchanged. Just the simple fact that you were involved in the same activity as somebody, you know, you would say something about how nice and evening it was for it or whatever. Yeah, and a lot of that has been lost. And I must say when it does happen, it feels really, really good. It feels to release human,

**Heather** 1:05:13

right, it feels like a reminder of what we are that we are social beings that we are not just our brains, we are not brains in jars We are, we are not just our bodies. So when we go out and actually engage in sport or physical activity, it's not a Now we put our analytical selves on hold our creative selves know, like this is this is often the place where the best ideas come from, right, when you are not actively working on an intellectual puzzle, or how to word the thing. It is it is this place where you can be in the moment fully

**Bret** 1:05:44

well, and it is very good demonstration of exactly the thing that is lost in this de individuated communal view, which is not to say that there's not a lot about what works that needs to be communal. But the point is, it's semi communal, the thing that's great about communal is the asymmetry of it, the different people with different perspectives find themselves in the same space. And you know, it just if you erase that by either forcing everybody to be alike, or policing what they say, so that the differences can't be seen, you just destroy such a large fraction of what's important about the humaneness of it. That's right, and But anyway, I would also say just on a bright note, it is totally true that many of these technologies just obliterate some important social interaction that once existed, but then others are arbitrarily created. So this podcast is obviously you all choosing to tune in a conversation between us that isn't exactly a conversation between us, because we're aware that there's an audience, and this is specifically something we do here so that you can tune it in. But we're also not, you know,

**Heather** 1:06:57

it's a total fabrication. No, it isn't. Obviously, we have conversations like this elsewhere and have been for decades else, we wouldn't have been able to show up on camera and start talking,

**Bret** 1:07:07

right. So the conversation is real, there's nothing inauthentic about it. You all know what you've signed up for. We know why we're sitting here. But the point is, it is a choice. And it is a semi social choice, because although we're not interacting with everybody who's paying attention, we get a lot of information back about what people are thinking. And we get lots of interesting communications that point our attention to things. So anyway, this is some new form. Right? It is, and it's, you know, it's hopeful that even as certain things are being destroyed, other things are wrestling their way into existence that in some ways compensate for what's been lost.

**Heather** 1:07:45

Yeah. May they continue into the future?

**Bret** 1:07:48

Indeed. All right. All right. I have a unity announcement, I probably should have done it at the top. Unity 2020 is humming along. Interesting things are afoot. We are going to hold our next campfire tomorrow, that is to say Wednesday, at four o'clock pacific time, we are going to have Nate Boyer and john wood Jr. together in conversation should be great. Please tune in. I will announce it on my Twitter feed. So we'll the articles of unity Twitter account, if you want details on where it's going to be. Our nomination process remains open, we are getting tremendous number of nominations that are excellent, I wasn't able to source an exact count for how many novel nominations we've gotten to date. But we are rapidly approaching the point at which we will put at first some and then all of the qualified nominees on a page on our site where you will be able to debate the merits of various candidates. So anyway, it's exciting times. And it's very gratifying to see the number of people who are thoroughly dedicated to saving the republic from the dire circumstance that we seem to be headed towards and are willing to invest their time and their their thought power in figuring out how we might thread this needle. So thanks to all the volunteers. And if you haven't joined us yet, please look into it at articles of unity.org and at articles of unity on Twitter.

**Heather** 1:09:26

Wonderful. So consider joining us at either or both of our Patreon 's were at either of them, you can access private Discord server and at mine You can also act become a dark horse member and get access to a private q&a on the last Sunday of every month. We have a clips channel Dark Horse clips channel, which has I don't know four, six, sometimes eight clips from each of these shows that go up and they are shorter, so more shareable. We probably will not be back on Saturday. Probably our next live stream will be Tuesday will of course have one in 15 minutes or so they'll be doing q&a. But there will be at least one Dark Horse podcast dropping between now and then. Hopefully in a few days. Yep. And maybe that's it. We'll be back in 15 minutes to answer your super chat questions.

**Bret** 1:10:17

All right, everybody. We'll see you soon.