Bret and Heather 90th DarkHorse Podcast Livestream\_ Weave We...

Sat, 10/9 12:10PM • 1:29:45

**SUMMARY KEYWORDS**

women, vaccines, fact, sex, question, point, men, pandemic, piece, vaccinated, corruption, sterilizing, recognize, unvaccinated, find, scientists, book, understand, talk, long

**SPEAKERS**

Bret, Heather

**Bret** 00:10

Hey folks, welcome to this early morning edition of The Dark Horse podcast live stream. We apologize for the early hour to those of you who live in Hawaii, we also envy you for living in Hawaii because what a marvelous place to exist. It is live stream number nine D, is that correct?

**Heather** 00:30

That is correct. Yes.

**Bret** 00:31

Isn't it amazing how I've begun to iterate by adding one each time we do a live stream, and that seems to generate a pattern that matches your understanding of what live stream. This is

**Heather** 00:41

middle age dogs learn.

**Bret** 00:44

Learn old tricks slowly, but eventually, Yeah, somethinglike that.

**Heather** 00:48

Yeah. 90 trial learning.

**Bret** 00:51

90 trial learning. That's beautiful. I like that. Yes. All right. Well, we have lots to do today. And I have a plane to catch later. So we should probably get to it.

**Heather** 01:03

Indeed. Let's start with announcements, talk a little bit about where we're going. We've got two ads today, and then we'll launch right into it. So we're going to talk a bit about, about about SARS, COVID, two and COVID, which is getting old, old, so old, and we wish the virus was getting old. Instead, it seems to be rejuvenating itself rather a lot. And we're gonna talk about sex and gender a bit today, the chapter of the hunter gatherers of a hunter gatherers guide to the 21st century, which is our book coming out in September that we will be talking about today is chapter seven, sex and gender. So we'll do an excerpt from that and talk about some issues arising, those that have courses, I mean, as everything in the book, but that is very much a recurring theme for us. So we will come back to it frequently. Okay, so if you're watching on YouTube, consider switching over to Odyssey the link should be in the description. I think, Zachary. And if you're listening, don't switch at all. Just Just keep on listening as you are. You can ask questions at dub dub dub, Dark Horse submissions.com, where there are facts to allow you to understand what you're doing, please consider joining our Patreon, either or both of them. It helps us out a lot and you get benefits, including smaller live conversations with with Brett at two of the higher tiers. And at mine, we do a private q&a once a month. And earlier in the month if you're at a slightly higher tier, you get to ask a question that we will consider and those are a lot of fun. Actually, we did ours last last week. Can I say it wasn't last week? Nevermind.

**Bret** 02:45

It was it was it was in the past?

**Heather** 02:48

was in the past? Right?

**Bret** 02:49

How to speak carefully. So you can't possibly be wrong. I mean, it was in the past. Yeah. Can I add something about the okay, but we're not doing that. I know. Okay. The Patreon I just wanted to say that we are very grateful for people joining those. And we know that we have asked you to help us out as YouTube has clobbered our main source of income, and you have turned out in force. And we want you to know that we greatly appreciate your doing that and that enables us to continue to fight so thank you for doing that.

**Heather** 03:26

Okay, let me just say that while I was looking at you, our producer came in and change something I think and now we appear to be totally washed out at least on the camera on the screen that we can see

**Bret** 03:34

washed out but not washed up.

**Heather** 03:36

I couldn't hear either of you. And learn to love the bomb. Right, right. Exactly. All right. Okay, and we have those glad t shirts that we that we put out a couple of weeks ago, are doing brilliantly on store Darkhorse podcast.org. Unfortunately, they have been copied and a lot of other people seem to be making money on our idea as well.

**Bret** 04:00

Yes, I want to point out something though they have been copied. However, as far as I know, nobody has figured out that the punch line is on the back of the shirt. So if you want the genuine article, including the awesome punch line, check out the store and go look at at what's the

**Heather** 04:18

end if you want to honor the creators and put you know, support the people who actually came up with the idea. Please go to our store you'll also get the actual the actual article including the back. This week I launched my new substack natural selections, you can find that natural selections.substack.com and we'll be talking about the second post on that in the first part of our podcast here. But without further ado, we have two ads for you today.

**Bret** 04:47

We are waiting the border that will tell you that we are engaged in ADS. There it is. Alright. We're going to start off with our excellent sponsor public goods. public goods can simplify your life as a one stop shop for high quality, everyday essentials. Their ingredients are carefully sourced and affordable. public goods as towels, glassware, sponges, razors, shampoo, toilet paper, mustard and coffee, coconut oil, and other things that you need. They've got niche items like bone broth concentrates, gluten free pasta and small batch marshmallows. And you will find that their goods are packaged in a tasteful way. So you don't have this phenomenon of gaudy items accumulating on your shelves, making your shelves look like a supermarket where everything has been designed by people who think that products are also advertisements. Now these things look good, and they do not call attention to themselves. Finally, their subscription service is efficient and simple and easy to use. public goods members can buy all of their premium essentials in one place, it really is an everything store. For Dark Horse listeners, we have the following offer receive $15 off your first public goods order with no minimum purchase. They are so confident that you will absolutely love their product and come back again and again that they are giving you $15 to spend on your first purchase with no minimum. Go to public goods.com slash Dark Horse use the code Dark Horse at checkout that is public goods p UBLICGOD s.com. forward slash dark horse to receive $15 off your first order.

**Heather** 06:32

All right, and I am going to bring to your sponsor Oh Max cryofreeze Oh Max cryofreeze. Is provides pain relief. So let me first say a few words about pain. It's useful. Pain is adaptive. It's a signal from your body that something is a mess or has been pushed too hard. But sometimes pain is too much especially in our modern world with the hyper novelty hyper novel environments to which we expose ourselves. And as long as you don't push yourself harder after alleviating your pain, it can be useful under some circumstances to get rid of it and in fact it can just allow you to live your life. If you have chronic pain that's all the more true chronic pain can be debilitating we understand and there is little upside. So I for instance have been spending far too much time on my computer typing and my hands in positions that is everyone now knows are not neutral or not particularly good for you. I've been told that I've got the equivalent of both tennis and golf elbow without actually having enjoyed the pleasures of either tennis or golf I've never enjoyed the pleasures of golf but you know it seems to me that if one is to get those things one should actually have enjoyed the the fun that they are named for. But nope, this is from typing. So omaxe cryofreeze though, provides temporary, quick relief for for the pain when I needed to go away. And as for the product itself, it's easy to use. It doesn't smell it's not greasy or sticky or gooey. It rolls right on and dries quickly. And it's 100% natural and it has menthol and it has CBD, one of the ingredients in marijuana not the one that gets you high. It's designed to block pain receptors reduce inflammation and improve muscle and joint flexibility. So Oh max health is offering our listeners 20% off a full bottle of cryofreeze CBD a pain relief roll on which is the product that I have used. This discount also applies though towards any product site wide. Just go to Oh Max health.com today and enter the code, Darkhorse that's Oh MAX health.com and enter the code dark horse to get 20% off cryofreeze and sitewide. And in service, being on YouTube and feeling that YouTube is infantilizing its viewers a little bit by making decisions about what it is that that we should and should not be allowed to see. Today's episode is brought to you by the number 90 and also the letter G and while we are going through these chapters of our book, one at a time up until the launch day in mid September. The letter G is is in I'm going to read the index for the letter G i every I'm not sure I can go wild eyed but I'll do my

**Bret** 09:25

oh you gotta

**Heather** 09:25

okay. So letter the G G index from our book gasoline. Gato. JOHN Taylor. Excellent guy. Gay men, generalists genes genome culture his genome expression regulator epigenetic genital mutilation, genocide, geographic frontiers germ theory of disease gestation Gibbon's I don't know why glossary is in the glossary. I feel like that's an error. It just spun myself into it. We will

**Bret** 09:55

we will know something has gone wrong if the first copy catches fire

**Heather** 10:00

Well, gluten sensitivity glyco alkaloids, GMOs golden colored mannequins Golden Lion tamarins, totally different kinds of organisms they're good all Jain Good Samaritan story gorillas great bowerbirds, grief grip stability growth, Guatemalan farmers and last but not least, Guinea yams

**Bret** 10:19

glossary, see glossary.

**Heather** 10:23

I missed that the first time around. Amazing. Alright, I think that's it for our announcements and stuff. Do we want to start here?

**Bret** 10:33

Or we could let let me Maybe I'll say a word of a word of precursor. Before that. I will just say we have received a ton of pushback, as you've seen, which is not unusual. And actually, in general, I would say pushback is useful. And something I think we we like, but the kind of pushback we're getting is remarkable. A lot of it is quite vicious and unkind, I would say. And I must say it has put me in the frame of mind of, let's say, staring into the abyss. And when one stares into this particular abyss, what one sees is what physicists might call a quantum superposition. Do you continue to fight for what makes sense? Or do you walk away and do something else? And so it's sort of a it's an either or kind of a decision. Which means as you stare into the abyss, and you look at this question of what to do, it's like a simultaneous or chasm. Oh, no, that wasn't worth it. It wasn't worth it. No, no, I thought it was actually pretty good. I think the delivery was bad, but okay. This is actually both a good pun, and a correct reflection, I think of what the experience is like, it's the second all of us through that for that delivery. Dude, there were people groaning across the earth. I think that was worth it. Now, no,

**Heather** 12:04

I don't because in fact, we, we are going to be talking about all this a little bit less, but not for the reasons that you just described. So I mean, I think I think that's a setup that presents the wrong the wrong idea.

**Bret** 12:19

Well, I mean, I accept what you're saying. And I obviously you and I have talked about this, and I agree, but I also think, well, I don't know my sense is that terrible pun? That groan worthy pun is also in some sense an accurate reflection, at least of my personal sense of where we are okay, well,

**Heather** 12:44

some people don't have any idea what we're talking about because no no content words have been said there's no nouns in what what you've said. Okay, so can we can we just show this and and then you can launch into what you're going to launch into. So Zach. As I said, I launched natural selections this week. The very first post is called fact checkers aren't scientists too often their sensors. And the second one, which is co written by Brett ennemi, on driving SARS, kobie to extinct why we need a multi pronged approach. This is a variant we just published this yesterday evening. It's very long, sometimes technical, not as much fun as a lot of what I'm going to be posting on natural selections. But it serves both as the response to that misinformation filled article that was published by Berlin's kin Deegan, and Collette A few years ago, and also to some degree by the response to the Sam Harris and Eric Topol podcast that we talked about last week, which largely I, you know, they, there weren't a lot of errors introduced by them that I think they didn't pick up from the article. So this in this piece, it is it is not, the original draft was really a sort of a rebuttal. But we decided, you know what this is, this is not what we should be doing. This is not what anyone should be doing. What we should be doing is laying out what we see is the evidence, what we see is where evidence is missing, where we need more why we need clarifications, so that all of us can actually remember that we are on the same team on the same planet, and that we need to have policies that actually serve all of us. maximally, so far, is that as possible. And so what we lay out here are really, I guess, six, six different sort of organizational frameworks. Organizational topics, we explain why, why it is that we've landed where we have by going through the evidence for the effectiveness as of ivermectin as prophylaxis against COVID, the safety record of ivermectin, the safety record of the novel Coronavirus, vaccines, and the effectiveness of the novel Coronavirus back vaccines we then talk some about natural immunity, and why people with natural immunity are not being considered in the discussion. Rather, we have been presented by the media, for instance, with these, with this simplistic and frankly absurd dichotomy of vaccinated versus unvaccinated, and we speak some to the politicization of, of the discussion and just a little bit more on some of the some of the many errors that are in that are in some of the pieces that have been produced, as if they are good faith criticisms. And, you know, as we as we have said, many times, you know, we, we need, we want everyone should need and want good faith criticism, but at the point that your critics are making false claims about what it is that your selves have said or done or believe that should tell you more about the critics, and it tells you about you.

**Bret** 15:51

So yes, it's one of his one of two things that I find particularly disturbing about the critics is having to portray us as believing things. And having said things that we didn't believe or don't believe in didn't say, is obviously evidence of something. And we can talk about what is evidence of, but it's clearly you know, having to defend against straw man attacks is obviously, crazy making but there's also this question about

**Bret** 16:19

the implications, right, what we are being held responsible for I find, particularly onerous, and destructive. So in essence, you will find many people saying, Well, you know, lives are at stake. And what you're saying on your podcast is going to result in the death of people. And this is, on the one hand, as we ourselves have said, before, anyone else said about us, obviously, there are lives at stake. And so we take this very seriously. On the other hand, it is cheating. To hold us responsible for this, the correct honorable way to do this is to recognize that lives are at stake in the public health policy questions and your personal health decisions with respect to how you choose to protect yourself from COVID. That is true. What that means is that a great deal rests on how the evidence is interpreted. And it is true, you can certainly protect yourself from the accusation that you will be responsible for other people's health consequences and possibly deaths by not saying anything, that's true, you can simply not say anything, or you can embrace the conventional wisdom as dispensed by public health authorities. And then who could possibly hold you responsible. On the other hand, you've watched those public health officials fail again, and again and again. And we can talk about why they might be failing. There are at least two reasons on the table. One of them is incompetence in the ability to read what is taking place in the world. The other is corruption, which is something that you and I have talked about from the beginning. And both of these things are rendering the advice we are being given publicly feeble. So the question is what to do about it. If you're in a position like we are in? Do you talk about what you see, or do you keep quiet so is not to be blamed? Right? Now my feeling is we are morally required to the extent that we believe we can see something that is failing about the public health analysis, we are morally required to engage in talking about this. You are not required to listen, you are certainly not required to extrapolate from anything that we say on this podcast and adjust your behavior, you can just listen into a discussion. Imagine it's a seminar taking place in which we are talking about whether or not the public health analysis makes any sense. Now, if you find yourself persuaded by something that we say it may indeed affect your behavior, but that's because you have been persuaded we don't have the power to dictate any policy. Nobody has to follow what we're saying nobody has to listen in. So people are choosing to listen in. They are rightly frightened by the fact that the advice they are getting from public health officials doesn't add up not even superficially. And so I would just simply ask, it is not the case that we are putting people's lives at risk. It is the case that lives are at stake in the COVID pandemic, and that it is true that lives will be lost if we do the wrong things and not the right things. The question is, what are the right things? And how would you know now what do you do in a case where you have rampant corruption? And I do think one of the things that is afflicting people's comprehension of what's taking place here is that many people who have not been inside academia or conversely are so deeply enmeshed in it that they are dependent on it are incapable of seeing that the same corruption that has rendered our governmental structures so thoroughly broken so that they do the bidding of others instead of the bidding of the public. Same thing is true inside of academia more subtly, it makes its way into papers, it makes its way into analyses, it makes its way into the advice that we get from many people who are involved in that structure, but you can't see it. And if it hasn't been your home, you don't recognize it. So you think somehow you think everybody on earth must all be agreed that the right thing to do is to drive Cyrus COVID to to extinction, or at least manage it really well. And that must be the source of all of this advice. But I'm telling you, that can't possibly be right. It can't be what's generating this advice, because in many places, that that advice doesn't add up even superficially. So there are certain questions that I would advise you keep your eye on certain things that tell you that something other than public health or private well being is driving the policy. Why are we argued Why are we told that we should vaccinate those who are naturally immune as a result of having had SARS, COVID to already? That doesn't make any sense. We know that the immunity you get from the vaccines is narrower. And we know that it fades, we now know that it fades to why are we treating the young, the same way that we are treating the old with respect to the need to vaccinate? There's obviously a very different cost benefit ratio. And why are we not using safe tools that appear to have some effectiveness to close the gap left by the vaccines? Those the vaccines can't reach those the vaccines won't reach those who need treatment? Because they have a breakthrough case? Why wouldn't we use those things? Alright, you wanted to say something now you moved on?

**Bret** 21:39

You're sure. Okay. So I wanted to make a couple of points. The defense that we need is simply that we are trying to do the right thing, right. This is well understood in the law, there are many places where good Samaritans are protected, for engaging in behavior intended to help rather than harm even if harm is done. That is the defense necessary for what we are up to we do not have some other thing motivating us. In fact, we have paid a very substantial price for speaking out publicly on this topic. And we would ask that you just simply recognize that whether we are right or wrong, we are intending to do good. And we are also interested, as we make very clear in the piece that we published yesterday, we are focused on the long term well being of humanity, that means not just the well being of people who are alive today, but people who will be alive generations from now who either will have to deal with SARS Coby, to continuing to circulate in some new form or won't because we've succeeded in driving it to extinction. That's a deep question, we have an obligation to them, they cannot speak for themselves, we have to act on their behalf. And so Oh, go ahead.

**Heather** 22:56

Well, I guess I will say to, to your to your point about Institute, institutional capture with regard to academia, the way you talked about it, it sounded like people will be shocked to hear that academia has become captured. And in fact, you know, most of our audience will be well familiar with that concept. But in a limited frame, right. in, in, in the frame of grievance studies. Right. And also, you know, administrators, you know, there are a lot of ways that people have begun to become familiar with the idea that actually higher ed isn't what it's supposed to be, and it's helping to destroy and make fragile. Excuse me, and Mike, fragile, you know, so many of the people who go through higher ed at this point. And indeed, we have even your years ago, a few years ago, at the point that our friends you know, the people who did the grievant studies were Peter Bogosian, and Helen pluck rose and James Lindsay, we're, we're doing that we were saying, Yes, for sure. We see that we see we see the sort of the the bastardization of post modernism from the 90s and those people coming around and you're becoming faculty now and indoctrinating rather than educating students. And it's, uh, you know, that's a big part of the explanation of what went wrong at evergreen. And what is, you know, the, all of the, you know, the big, ridiculous kerfuffles on college campuses seem to be about that. But what we said then, and was harder to convince people who aren't actually in the sciences was, there is a different problem within the sciences. It's been brewing for longer. It's about the the, the economic model of how scientists and scientists scientists are funded and how institutions are funded by those scientists, therefore providing perverse incentives for scientists to only do do big science, expensive science. And it has rendered scientists also not just people with PhDs. Some fields that probably shouldn't exist. But many scientists incapable of actually doing solid, careful evolutionary thought, and so credentialism as it rises where people say, Well, you know, that person is a professor, that person has a PhD in science, they must know what they're talking about the number of people who actually have these degrees, and we're never expected, in fact, to get those degrees to do a complete piece of research from beginning to end to make an observation, to pose all the alternative, the possible alternative hypotheses, to figure out how you might address those hypotheses what the predictions that are downstream of them are, and how you would address them, and what the experimental design would be, and go out and collect the data and analyze the data and figure out what it means and reveal it and communicate it both in speech and in writing. Many people don't experience that in order to get their PhD, they walk into someone else's lab with someone else's funding with someone else's questions already on the table, and they do a little tiny piece. And why do we expect people like that, to be able to think broadly about the entire scientific process and to walk in and say, actually, that that doesn't make sense, actually, actually, you know, when you when you do widespread vaccination with non sterilizing vaccines during a pandemic, there was likely to be a selective pressure for new variants to, to start to spread. And this is something that we've talked about before that you had on Garrett vandenbosch to talk about has been talking about it, there's a paper that that we cite, in what we just published from 2015. That goes through the long established theoretical considerations for why to think that, and the fact that there are lots of models out there that demonstrate it, but then they also do the empirical work, and they're looking at chickens. And they find indeed, that the that non sterilizing vaccines produce an environment that actually helps the spread of new variants of previously unfamiliar and rare variants.

**Bret** 27:06

So I want to go back to the place that you started, I agree with everything you've just said. It's vital. But the the piece I want to highlight is the when the the the grievant, studies work emerged, we actually did say to them, the problem is, you didn't do this with the sciences also. And so you can't see that the that there is a parallel kind of corruption in the sciences, that the scientific work is not pure. And in contrast, right, the the grievant studies stuff is particularly egregious and obvious, it's transparently wrong. The problem is that the scientific stuff is cryptically broken. And, you know, it's not just the fact that these people have been awarded a degree for work that doesn't actually make them expert in the way science is done, because they've done too small a piece, that's a common problem. But there's also this issue, the same reason that people end up doing a very small piece of work in order to get their degree is that there's this incredible pressure that has to do with the way the university is, is paying for its its work by effectively giving people degrees in lieu of money. That's how it makes itself profitable. And so that creates this incredible pressure to do work that pleases those in a position of authority in order to, to get any hope of a job. And so what you get are these positive feedbacks where some bit of conventional wisdom, the school of thought that owns your field is in a position to make sure that only work that matches that school of thought and doesn't challenge it emerges. So it becomes anti scientific. And until you've seen the effect of that corruption, it seems it's impossible to imagine,

**Heather** 28:53

and frankly, that that truth about how science is funded and has been for decades at this point, at least in the in the Western world, certainly in the US and the UK, and Canada as well. And I think more widespread than that, that necessarily preceded the rise in the grievant studies fields and the capture by them of many University administrations, because scientists are encouraged to and I've talked about this on a previous on a previous episode. But because scientists are basically the the moneymakers for universities, because the universities get such a substantial overhead percentage of any grants that got brought in. They are given effectively, scientist, academic scientists are given the gift of not having to do some of the other work that they would have to do. And broadly, there's three sorts of things that academics are expected to do its research, its teaching and its governance. governance, meaning everything from sitting on the committee that decides who's going to do the catering for your campus, to admissions to hiring to decisions about you know, restructuring of organizations of Have departments and schools within your campus? Well, if the if the money's coming in because of your research, you're not going to give research science, research scientists to pass on the research, but you're going to start to minimize what they have to do in those other two camps. And so you give them fewer teaching responsibilities, which also means they have less and less interaction with with students who are actually incredibly useful in terms of giving Yes, a bunch of naive pushback, but also a lot of sophisticated pushback, because they don't know what questions they're not supposed to ask. So that's a drawback of being less exposed to the the teaching part of it. But it's even easier to say okay, you you don't have you know, the the more money you bring in, the more focused you are on that we understand you're busy, you don't have to do as much governance, which means that the governance positions are filled more and more, there is there is there is representation within governance at many universities that is widely skewed towards non scientists, and towards people in fields that are actually not making any sense at all. And so all the grievance studies, kerfuffle is actually downstream of this failure of scientists to continue to be scientists, but instead be captured by this economic forces.

**Bret** 31:13

Right. And effectively, what we're saying is you can see the effect of capture inside the Academy. And of course, it has a particularly academic look to it in that context, it looks very different than whatever takes place where lobbyists are persuading legislators to do things. But the point is, it's a variation on a theme. And one thing that just occurs to me at this moment, is you and I have observed in traveling in other parts of the world, especially developing nations, that one of the things that makes it impossible to govern these nations is that everybody is so pressed for resources that they're very cheap to corrupt, right? So you've got somebody who's in charge of forest policy in Madagascar, let's say, and they maybe they make 10,000 bucks

**Heather** 32:01

a year, right? I don't know now, but it wasn't anything close to that, let's

**Bret** 32:05

say they make 10,000 bucks. And let's say that they're supposed to prevent you from logging some Peninsula, and there are 10s of millions of dollars at stake in the lumber there. And the question is, well, how easy are they to persuade to betray their public obligation, if it's going to actually enable them to, to, you know, put their family on a substantial footing, it's very hard to prevent that kind of corruption when people are not made immune by having decent salaries. And so this is exactly the case inside of academia you've got this incredible insecurity that comes from the fact that there aren't nearly enough jobs and the fact is it causes people to be easily corrupted even if that they don't understand what they're doing. There's no bribe on the table but there are many many other mechanisms

**Heather** 32:53

Yeah, well I mean they're it's it's not a it's usually not a physical thing but it's offers of of goodies, right and academia and I'm you know, the, it will be obvious that it's a bribe when I say that when I was going through all of the normal channels and doing everything by the book, and I really wasn't cheating at all, and trying to get the permits that I needed to do the work I needed to do in Madagascar I was asked by the person with the stamp like literally it was a stamp right I remember us having to wait for three days to get into this room where the guy with the stamp was finally going to show up at the same time as the stamp one day the guy wasn't there the next day the stamp was the third day like well, the keys to the door weren't there and he was gonna have to go in but it was it was a comedy of errors but actually true. But you know, I had done everything correctly. I was not trying to cheat the system at all but and in a different time when I was trying to get the permits for a different field season in Madagascar I got asked for a Land Rover while I was a graduate student making it that point you know $13,000 a year and I didn't have a Land Rover nor did I have any inclination to give the guy a Land Rover if I'd had one. But he accepted in lieu of a Land Rover a bottle of whiskey, which I came back with the next day well which I had to also say that but that's an obvious set of like we think it's going to look but in academia it doesn't it

**Bret** 34:10

doesn't it doesn't look my way I should just say that the Land Rover sounds preposterous except that we knew cases in which Land Rovers had been used because some large project with a million dollar grant needed to get some stuff done and you might as well ask right so yeah, Land Rover right? So the problem is that the corruption of science which is because it's subtle, it's very destructive, because weed can't even it's very hard to even diagnose like, which stuff do you trust, right? That's that's a that's a harder job than it should be. But the overarching corruption anywhere where there's something at stake, like money, right, like this is liable to be much less of a problem. And I'm going to find out that I'm wrong if I say geology because maybe mineral resources, but if you know, presumably, astronomy is going to be better about the kind of Corruption is going to have a kind of mundane corruption. And then things get really bad. As I discovered when I did the Tila mirror work, as you get closer to medicine, right, things get really corrupt a messed up. But the, the, the overarching impact of that corruption of in all of its forms is to render the science feeble, right, which has a paradoxical weird effect that if you don't want to win in its terms, is actually something you can make use of right? It means that field after field, which is corrupted, are relatively easy to beat, right? If you're free of the influences that corrupts it, you can look in and you can say, this makes sense that doesn't add up, and you can begin to follow a pattern. And so what I would say is one of the things that I think we are faced with here is that in effect, we have no power. We are not telling you do this or don't do that. We are just simply talking about what we see. And I'm sure some people are persuaded. I know lots of people aren't I mean, we have conversations and in the Patreon discussions that I have, once a month, we've talked about vaccination. I think almost everybody in those discussions is vaccinated as we could have ended up vaccinated if we hadn't been paying attention to certain signals that became alarming a little quickly. But the point is, why would somebody listened to us at all? Well, one reason that they would listen to us is that we have actually seen ahead, and that if you listen to us, you were ahead on thinking about masks, you were ahead on thinking about the importance of the volume of the room in terms of infection from COVID. You were ahead in thinking about variants, you were ahead and seeing the narrowness of the immunity that was likely to come from spike protein s one subunit vaccinations, you were ahead in recognizing the outdoor environment as safe and someplace that you should go You were ahead and recognizing the importance of vitamin D were ahead with respect to the lab like hypothesis, you were ahead with respect to the massive significance of comorbidities. That's not even a complete list. That's just a bunch of places where if you were watching us, you were paying attention to these things really early, at the very least. And so I will just finish this by saying for some reason, when we talk about things like foreign policy, we have a term for war profiteers, right, war war profiteers, nobody gets all bent out of shape. They don't accuse you of conspiracy theorizing, if you say there are war profiteers, and we need to be aware that they may have an effect on our foreign policy that could push us into wars that we would be better off, staying out of everybody gets that even when there are lives at stake in the context of war, that there are people whose perverse incentives might cause them to mislead us. Why do we not understand that that same thing is at least plausible with respect to a pandemic? Are there pandemic profiteers? If so, what might they have us do that we shouldn't do? This is something we need to ask ourselves and our ability to predict things is something you could judge us on. But you at least need to recognize that we are in a landscape where potentially people have perverse incentives that might lead us to do things that will result in in deaths that don't need to occur.

**Heather** 38:29

If I can just restate in a sentence what you just said. profiteer is a general category, and war. profiteer is a subcategory that is well understood to be to be out there, regardless of whether or not you believe that, you know, incident X or Y was an example of it. war profiteering is a subcategory of profiteering. And so what you're saying is, there are of course, other types of profiteering and pandemic profit hearing is likely to be one of them.

**Bret** 38:58

Right, it's likely to be one of them. And frankly, it's not a very big leap from what we've seen from the pharmaceutical industry. in other contexts, we know that very often, we see advice, we know that it makes it into the academic literature and then is only later revealed to be harming people. So come on what part of this is shocking, right. The question is, how much of an effect is it having on the public health advice that we are getting? And one thing to pay attention to is the public health advice? Doesn't make sense? Right? Not saying none of it makes sense. But a lot of it doesn't make sense. Even on its face. Why are we vaccinating people who've had COVID? That's a question I've not heard a good answer to and the CDC is answer you can look it up. doesn't make any sense. Why is that? Is that ineptitude? Or is it corruption? Right? could be either could be both but at some level, it's a question that needs an answer. And until it has an answer, there's a there's some issue about how bad is that rot? Whatever rot it is that resulted in us putting people in harm's way. Giving them a vaccine we don't know very much about with respect to the safety when they don't get a benefit from it. Why would we do that? Well, we could we could prevent them from taking that risk. And the fact that we don't raise as a question, How bad is the rock? How far does it go? And one indication is, if others outside of that apparatus are predicting things about the pandemic better than that apparatus does, then that is a reason for alarm.

**Heather** 40:26

So we're, we're most of the way through an hour at this point. And we have a lot to do that's not about this, but I think I thought the place you wanted to start is someplace you haven't even gotten to yet. So do you want to? Do you want to go there without me stealing your thunder?

**Bret** 40:39

Yeah, I think so. So I wanted to gently respond to something published by andrew sullivan that I believe came out yesterday. At least saw it yesterday. You want to show it? Yeah. Zack,

**Heather** 40:52

do you have the couple you can put it on my screen.

**Bret** 40:56

Okay, so this is Andrew Sullivan's piece yesterday. And actually, Zach, could you show that the screenshot I sent of his tweet? And then could you enlarge? So this is a quote from? Boy,

**Heather** 41:13

I can read out? Yeah, you would you read it. So what am I reading though?

**Bret** 41:17

Yes, this is Andrew Sela. This is a quote from andrew sullivan.

**Heather** 41:20

This is andrew sullivan and his piece posted yesterday. And this seems to me to be the key question here. Do we really want to get back to living? I do. So take the rational precautions, a solid vaccine and go about your business as you always did? Yes, I'll wear a mask and doors if I'm legally required or politely asked, but I don't really see why anyone should. in a free society. Once everyone has access to a vaccine that overwhelmingly prevents serious sickness and death. There was no reason to enforce lockdowns again, or mask mandates or social distancing any longer. In fact, there's every reason not to.

**Bret** 41:53

So what I wanted to say and I, this is offered with full respect, Andrew, I really like a lot of what you say. And frankly, I understand and resonate with the point that you were making here. I get it. But I don't think it's right, because it's predicated on a couple of things that aren't accurate. So you are imagining that you are being asked to CDC yesterday or the day before said that it wanted people who had been vaccinated to wear masks? Why? That's the question. Now the answer that many people are arriving at the answer that I believe we are being led to is that you are wearing them to protect unvaccinated people. And there is a degree of truth in your wearing a mask protects unvaccinated people. But I think the clearest reason why you're being asked to wear a mask is to protect you a vaccinated person from the escaped variants that we now see circulating. And secondly, from you want to jump

**Heather** 42:54

with the first reason for you to wear a mask as a vaccinated person is to protect you against the escaped variants, which are on the rise. And about which the vaccines which you've already been vaccinated are very little protection

**Bret** 43:08

are very little protection, which points to selection exerted by those vaccines on the virus. So we are ultimately going to find ourselves in an argument about evolutionarily why we are seeing variants now what their implication is, but the fact that those variants are good at creating breakthrough cases among the vaccinated implies selection by those vaccines has produced these variants. That's one reason that you need to be protected at this moment more than the CDC recognized you did a month ago. The second reason has to do with the fading of the immunity from the vaccines so these vaccines it turns out not only do they providing narrow immunity, but they also provide a short lived immunity that appears to fade so Oh, go ahead.

**Heather** 44:02

Well, I thought you wanted to show this evidence as well as your third

**Bret** 44:05

reason Yeah, there's I was gonna say there is there is also a third reason so in your piece, Andrew, you repeat a piece of wisdom that has been almost universally embraced. And this piece of wisdom is the vaccines protect you from getting an infection. They are not perfect. They also protect you from getting sick protect you from getting very sick if you do contract a breakthrough infection. Now what we want to call your attention to is a piece that emerged two days ago. Yeah, two or three two or three days ago on substack by a creature euphemistically called

**Heather** 44:52

sexually my screen when I was not ready for it to be shown.

**Bret** 44:55

That's alright. Okay. This was published by Dr. Roller Gator. Who I should point out is not actually a PhD as far as I know, he's also not an actual alligator and his leather jacket is fake. But his analysis This is a person who has published a very serious analysis

**Heather** 45:14

of these a person, you know, to be a real person, yes, alligator,

**Bret** 45:18

I do nothing to be a part of a person and a ferociously high quality intellect. But anyway, he has a, an ironic personality on Twitter, which he is using for his substack as well. In any case, it is an analysis of the question of the benefits of the vaccines. And what he posits here based on a thorough mathematical analysis that appears to us at least to be robust. is the question about what the vaccines do in the case of breakthrough cases do they reduce the likelihood of getting seriously

**Heather** 45:52

ill? So if I could have my screen back for a minute, Zack, I was just looking something up what he is fat, if I can just I'm just gonna read the section here rather than us. Yep. So this is this is now from our piece that we published yesterday, the little bit of it in which we are talking about his in this off sided study, which is Hoss at all 2021. Looking at the effectiveness of the two dose Pfizer vaccine in Israel, they purport to find extremely high effectiveness against both infections and in breakthrough cases in reducing hospitalizations, severe disease and death and that that is the work that has been transmuted into the into the mainstream media and the larger the reason why people who are vaccinated feel safe, not just against getting the disease once they're vaccinated, but in having a reduced reduced case of it should they get a breakthrough case. But But Dr. Brother Gator here provides an analysis in which he finds that it is true that the risk of infection is far lower in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals. However, if a person is both vaccinated and infected, the correct math reveals no reduction in deaths compared to being unvaccinated. And in less you are old. And with regard to hospitalizations, there is a tiny reduction in hospitalization for the 45 to 64 year olds, and a larger reduction for the old. But for people under 45. Again, no reduction at all. So let's just show his his graphs here. This is where the guard to with regard to death, the probability of COVID-19 related death if infected for ages 16 to 14. Basically the the confidence interval I think this is I'm not remembering is much broader for the vaccinated but but they're effectively the same thing

**Bret** 47:52

as to say their their mean is the same. Yep.

**Heather** 47:55

And for Hold on. So that was 16 to 44 year olds, for 45 to 64 year olds, there is a you know, it looks like a slightly higher rate of death if you're vaccinated. But really the you know, the numbers are are sloppy enough that there's no reason to think that that is true. But there's certainly no protective effect if you get a breakthrough case. But that's but that flips. For the for the old for 65 years and older people, you do indeed have both, and this is just deaths, and I'm not going to scroll through and find the hospitalization graphs that that he has produced here. But if you're over 65, and you get a breakthrough case, because you're vaccinated, but you get exposed to COVID need a breakthrough case, being vaccinated does does predict a better outcome with regard to you not dying, and you're not being hospitalized. But for people younger than that, that pattern falls apart.

**Bret** 48:58

Right? So let's say this work has just emerged, it will be interesting to see if anyone finds a flaw in it. But the basic point that that this paper makes is that in fact what we are being given is something like a sales pitch in which the reduction in deaths and hospital

**Heather** 49:16

labor, relegate is paper, yes, really gators giving us sales. But now he

**Bret** 49:20

is alleging that we are being given a sales pitch and the sales pitch is that you have a reduced likelihood of infection, a reduced likelihood of severe disease and a reduced likelihood of hospitalization and death, when in fact those are the same reduction. That is to say, if you don't get COVID, you obviously won't go to the hospital for COVID and you won't die of COVID. But it is not that if you get an infection, you also have a much reduced likelihood of these things. You don't unless you're in this very old age group.

**Heather** 49:48

Right, exactly. So you know, effectively then the way that the numbers were analyzed, amounts to either just a naive misunderstanding. of how they should have been analyzed or hopefully not an intentional, erroneous signal put into the world.

**Bret** 50:07

Right. But But I think the point about Andrew Sullivan's piece is if you can see, even in that quote that we read, that what he is imagining is that he's going to go about his life. And if he gets a case, it's going to be much reduced. And so why should he be wearing a mask? And the answer is a because your likelihood of getting a case is going up as a result of the fading of the vaccine immunity as a result of the narrowness of that immunity and the variants that are now increasingly dominating the pandemic. And the benefit that he's imagining, should he get a case is likely to be close to non existent if this analysis is correct. Yeah. So right, so I guess the sum total of all of this, the way I would sum it up is, I believe, we have to recognize that we have been given a bunch of intuitive sounding wrong, things that many people believe, right, we are facing increasing frustration. And in fact, I believe we can see an orchestrated campaign to blame the unvaccinated for the continuing pandemic, as if there was ever a plan in which these vaccines, were going to end the pandemic, which is inconceivable in light of the fact that even if you were to vaccinate all of the Western world, you couldn't reach the entire world with these things, which meant there was going to be large populations, that we're going to continue to have this virus. So

**Heather** 51:32

you needed effectively sterilizing vaccines that were rolled out simultaneously everywhere. And, and you know, I hope that we all wish that we had sterilizing Vax. Absolutely. And, you know, we arrived at the pandemic, with the vaccines that showed up, sort of, and, you know, still hoping for, you know, good solid sterilizing vaccines to show up, that would be great. But also the way that these vaccines were rolled out, at least in the US, was very slow. And if, you know, you will remember it was you know, it's healthcare, there were all these tears, it was healthcare workers first and the elderly, and people with comorbidities and people were, were, you know, vying to break rank and, and get vaccinated early, but there just wasn't enough to go around and had the goal Ben to eradicate the virus and stop the pandemic, there would have been a concerted effort to, to wait until there was enough vaccine supply and concentrate the vaccine rollout so that as many people as possible got vaccinated all at once, as opposed to providing this sort of rolling target for a selection to act on.

**Bret** 52:43

Right. And so you can imagine it like if we really had non corrupt highly competent public health authorities, you would imagine that as painful as it would be to delay vaccination because of course, there would be lives lost in the interim, that there would have been a delay to allow a sudden deployment of the vaccines universally, there would have been special guidance around how to behave while you were developing immunity. So even in the case of a sterilizing vaccine, the period of time in which you're developing immunity is a hazard. So you know, you know we can

**Heather** 53:19

I did see, I mean, I think the guidance was until you are considered fully immunized, which was two weeks after your final shot. If you've got the two shot vaccine, you need to behave as if you're not

**Bret** 53:31

well, but behave as if you're not doesn't doesn't begin to cover it. So my point is, we could have really high quality guidance and the really high quality guy, we could have really high quality vaccines. Maybe that's harder to get to. Yeah, I'm not, we don't know, we don't know. But

**Heather** 53:46

we should, we should certainly we hope that there is r&d, under going on right now for high quality sterilizing vaccine would be

**Bret** 53:55

lovely. But it would also be lovely to imagine that there's not going to be a fight between manufacturers over whose vaccine has the market and that that fight is going to have very little to do with which vaccines are best for humanity. I hate to say it that may sound cynical, but given what I've seen, I would expect jockeying for position, don't make profiteering right. pandemic profiteering is what I was expect would expect. But you could imagine very brief guidance, right, that you would get vaccinated, you will coordinate with your family maybe and, you know, isolate completely for some period of time. I don't know what the we would really want high quality analysis. But you could imagine a campaign but this campaign does not look like it was designed in any way that anyone could have imagined it was going to end the pandemic and yet that's kind of been the implication that we would have ended the pandemic If only it weren't for the holdouts. And that's just nonsense. It's it can't be right.

**Heather** 54:50

Yep. Should we pivot? Yep. All right. We're gonna talk about sex and gender a little bit. All right. All right. We're gonna start with this excerpt from chapter seven of a hunter gatherers guide to 21st century, Chapter being sex and gender. I'm gonna read a, what is it, you actually chose the section this week. So we actually read the audio, we recorded the audio book this week, both of us are going to be doing that when that comes out September 14. So I already read this aloud once this week. But this is the section you chose from the sex and gender chapter called division of labor. Already in the chapter, we've walked through sort of all of the all of the basic biology and evolutionary biology of what sex is what sexual reproduction is why there's too, you know why we don't change sex, all of that division of labor. In many modern households, women clean the floors and men take out the trash. In some households, those roles might be switched. And it might be true that both members of a pair bond spend equal time doing domestic work. But it's fairly rare for both partners to do every domestic task in equal measure. This is division of labor. from many angles, the division of labor makes sense. It is even been argued that division of labor by the sexes is what made us human. Even if we don't accept that conclusion, we can agree that it's efficient, and generally a good use of everyone's time. Saving Time by dividing up the work leaves more time for things we might want to do more of like play or sex. The division of labor can and has created rigid roles, however, many of which are outdated in the 21st century, it is useful to understand some of where those roles came from in order to determine which ones are unlikely to change, and which ones might. From the earliest inequalities and investment in gametes, females and males have engaged each other and the world differently. Among hunter gatherers, men have been far more likely to be hundreds of large game, women are more likely to be gatherers of plant foods and smaller animals. hunter gatherer women likely spent most of their adult pre menopausal lives pregnant or breastfeeding infants and toddlers. When breast milk is all or most of a child's diet, the mother is effectively on birth control. As she experiences physiologically induced amenorrhea. She cannot get pregnant when breastfeeding at frequent intervals. This keeps birth intervals relatively long and the birth rate fairly low. Jump forward to the human transformation of landscapes with agriculture, and gender roles become even more constrained. being tied to a particular piece of land. We are now more sedentary and an ample grain stores which supplement our and our children's diets at any time. agriculturalists women thus experienced a decrease in the birth interval, babies came at a faster rate. And so the birth rate climbed this increase in fertility tied women to hearth and home and we saw a concomitant decrease. It's concomitant, I think so too. Yeah, we saw a concomitant decrease in women's roles in economic, religious and other culturally important realms. Men and women exhibit so many differences, it would be impossible to catalog them all here. Before we mentioned just a few more another reminder about populations as an order. When we say that men are taller than women, the words on average are employed. pointed to the existence of your friend Rhonda, who really is quite tall, does not negate the statistical truth that on average, men are still taller than women. Some of the average differences between the sexes include that men have more investigative interests, while women have more artistic and social interests. Men are also on average, more interested in math, science and engineering. on tests, girls score higher and literacy while boys score higher in math. And although average intelligence is the same between boys and girls, the variability in intelligence is not, there are more boy geniuses, and more boy complete dullards than there are girls in either category. One interesting piece of neuroscience reveals that across several domains, including both emotional memory and spatial ability, women are better at details. Men are better at just this finding manifests. For instance, in the average man superior ability to remember a route and the average woman's superior ability to remember the location of the keys, the cup of coffee, the document and Nita being signed.

**Heather** 59:00

The differences between the sexes are found in babies and across cultures too. So this is not some weird, weird phenomenon. given a choice neonate girls spend more time looking at faces while the night boys spend more time looking at things. And across cultures work is gendered early analysis of 185 cultures and every culture studied some tasks are always gendered in the same direction. Iron smelting, the hunting of large marine mammals, metalworking, all of these are done by men only in those cultures that do these things at all. More interesting is the tasks that are highly gendered across cultures, but for which some cultures curtail female involvement, while other cultures curtail male involvement. These include weaving the preparation of skins and the gathering of fuel among others. This suggests that there's a value in the division of labor, even when neither sex is inherently better at the task. Consider also the Pueblo people who have long been understood to be masters ceramicists. It has been, it had been assumed given contemporary patterns, the pottery making was exclusive The domain of women in Chaco Canyon However, in the four corners area of the American Southwest, a different story is emerging. When Chaco Canyon was a rapidly growing religious and political center 1000 years ago, the population was expanding and with it, the demand for pottery, more and more vessels were needed to carry and store grain and water. So gender norms loosened, and men began doing this otherwise highly gendered work. What might we learn from these truths, we can learn that gender roles can be removed from maternity, some men will prefer hearth and home to a grueling career that is facilitated by having a spouse taking care of the domestic duties, and some women will prefer the latter. But many men and women we argue will prefer but many men and women we argue will prefer to be restricted to neither domain without being slotted into preconceived roles. Many people of both sexes will prefer a partner who is their equal without being identical. We can learn from a more nuanced understanding of gendered work that traditionalist appeals to women not working outside of the home, or to men being dominant in economic and business matters are regressive, without any nugget of necessity or truth. Historically, women and men have had division of labor, both in family units and in societies. But other than those tasks mandated by anatomy and physiology, gestation lactation, there is little in the modern world that some women might not choose to do. Similarly, men are ever more welcome and traditionally female fields such as nursing and teaching, although we shouldn't expect parity, they're either different preferences lead to different choices, pretending that we are identical, rather than ensuring that we are equal under the law is a fool's game. And one more so we have a corrective lens section at the end of every chapter. And the final one for this chapter, is recognize that our differences contribute to our collective strength. If we more highly valued the work that women are more likely to be drawn to, Eg teaching social work nursing, perhaps we could stop demanding equal representation of men and women and feels that women are simply not as likely to be interested in recognizing that we are on average different is the critical first step to building a society in which all opportunities are truly open to everyone. Equal Opportunity is an honorable goal in step with reality, whereas aiming for equal outcome in which every occupation, from daycare workers to garbage collectors has equal representation between the sexes will disappoint everyone involved.

**Bret** 1:02:24

Yeah, I always wonder if those who apply these very naive equalizing kinds of remedy proposals if they have contemplated what it would be like to live in the world that they are imagining?

**Heather** 1:02:40

Yeah, I mean, and this came up in the in that event that that I did years ago now with James d'amour, in the wake of the Google memo, this, this was very much in this and that had Peter Bogosian and Helen pluck rose as well. And you introduced us back before we lived in Portland, but it was an event here at Portland State University. Exactly, exactly. This came up, right? Like, we also don't hear the cry from the gender activists, for there to be equity in the sexes, among garbage collectors, right? There's plenty of dangerous or banal or dirty work that men are far more likely to do. And no, that doesn't pay particularly well. And we're not hearing that we need equity there. What we're hearing about is in those fields, and I actually, in that event, I pushed back against James James d'amour a little bit. Because it is true that the work that men are more likely on average to be interested in doing does pay better. And this does have to do with historical record of sexism, like and we have inherited that. And this is, you know, in this way, unlike in many ways, the the modern manifestations of sexism do mirror the modern manifestations of racism, where you have inherited and historical set of policies, most of which don't exist now, but they're, but they're ghosts do right, the manifestations downstream still do? Well,

**Bret** 1:04:15

I believe what you've just said is accurate. But I want to add another category here. So there is some sort of structural inherited bias against work that has traditionally been female. But there's also an economic reason that that would exist that has nothing to do with any kind of bigotry, right? That because women are saddled with or privileged with whichever way you want to see it. The actual production of babies and their nursing. The economic model would predict that that would be budgeted in right and so that

**Heather** 1:04:53

Well, I mean, I think I know I interrupted you but you know, as we move to agriculture 10 10 to 12 ish 1000 years ago, you're most of us have ancestors that became agriculturalists 10 to 12,000 years ago, as that, as that began to happen, we know for a while everyone was working to support their own family, and that might have an extended family. But as trade became more common, the things that men were doing were tradable. And therefore monetizable. And the things that women were doing were less tradable and monetizable until very, very recently, and there are a lot of us who think that that monetary monetizing of things like you know, of reproduction and sex, obviously, sex has been monetized forever. But, you know, things like surrogacy is a brand new phenomenon, but for the most part, the things that are mandated by anatomy and physiology that women do, was not brought into the market, except for you're actually having sex, you know, prostitution is super old, as we all know. And so the the work that men were doing, you know, being able to sell the grain to allow for, to purchase things that you couldn't make at home was was something that tracked men's work and not women's work. And, you know, we can we could think of, you know, putting up the food, you know, preserving the food that was for a while anyway, more women's work, but it also didn't generate nearly as much of the potential revenue. And so you have this sort of, you know, initial inherent inequality, not based inherently on any bigotries, right,

**Bret** 1:06:31

not based on in any bigotry. Now, it doesn't mean it's not structural it is and it doesn't mean it can't be structurally corrected. It can. But the point is, let's you know, it's tempting to just simply demonize a system that has biases in it. And then those jumped to bigotries the only possible bigotry is the explanation. And then as long as you're doing that, the other temptation is to do it unevenly. So all the crappy stuff that men end up doing, you know, nobody's all that eager to democratize that right to the dying as you're fending off tyranny, the you know, descending into the sewers to break up giant globs of fat, right? Like, these are not things that were in general trying to break into. So anyway, there is something to be done, there's always questions of fairness with respect to access, but come on, these things just aren't simple

**Heather** 1:07:31

right? Now they're, they're, they're really very much not, like, I love that work that, that I was reading about the 185 pre agriculturalists societies or pre industrial societies, and, you know, I used to teach with us a lot, I used to use us that work to teach descriptive statistics, among other things, but I think, you know, everything in this book got so shortened because it has such breadth. But the point there about division of labor persisting in across cultures in across for many activities, but which sex does it varies is extraordinary. I love this the fact that in some cultures, weaving is very much a man's job and women shall not touch it because it wouldn't you know, solely the the weaving or the mat or something. And in other cultures, it's exactly the opposite story. And of course, the languaging around it will come will be different, both because it's different cultures and because the reasons that we say that women shouldn't touch things, and men shouldn't touch things tend to be different as well. But, you know, weaving well that's men's work weaving, that's women's work, okay? both things are argued in different cultures at the same time on the planet. And that tells us there's value in division of labor without those divisions of labor inherently having anything to do with underlying differences in ability or interest.

**Bret** 1:08:53

And the fact that one goes in both directions tells us that both men and women we've well enough alone,

**Heather** 1:08:59

okay, that one looks up to you. Okay, so there's a few there's just, there's always stuff going on in in culture about sex and gender. So I'd like to just talk about a couple of them right now. Okay. Actually, Zack, I didn't figure out which of which part of this five minute video to show so maybe we won't show it. Let me Don't pull up my screen just yet. Okay, I guess, I guess. Here. There is Harvard lecturer. I think she clarifies that she is not actually Professor Carol hooven who joined fox and friends for joint that's their language that she would not say that she's she's she's a liberal, who spoke to Fox for four or five minute clip to talk about the idea. algae that is happening in, in education and specifically the metals, medical schools, specifically the Harvard Medical School. And I think they found her through Katie Herzog's recent excellent piece that was in Barry Rice's substack. So that's a lot of names. But Dr. hooven, here talks about male and female being different, and us being able to talk about men and women being critical in medical school and being able to say things like pregnant women. And I will I will link to this in the in the show notes, but rather than Have you listened to the whole five minutes, you know, I listened to it, it's not that long. And there's exactly nothing transphobic or harmful in what she says. And yet here we have someone tweeting out this video, saying a woman by the name of Laura Simone Lewis saying, as the director of the diversity and inclusion task force for my department at Harvard hgb that some human evolution and behavior I think, I am appalled and frustrated by the transphobic and harmful remarks made by a member of my department in this interview with Fox and Friends. To which I quote treated as an evolutionary biologist, I am appalled and frustrated by the scientific illiteracy that is apparently being facilitated by our most elite institutions. I don't, I don't honestly know how we are going to continue to function. If this continues, I mean, this we're seeing in competence and inability to think through basic scientific arguments over in virus and vaccine space. At least, that's a little bit complicated. At least it takes walking through a few steps of logic to arrive where people should be arriving at. But the observation that everyone on the earth has made, that male and female are different. And the fact that in our lineage alone, we have at least 500 million years of uninterrupted sexual reproduction in our lineage. And sex has been around sexual reproduction has been around for, oh, anywhere from one to 2 billion years on the planet. And probably our uninterrupted lineage goes back that far as well, that 500 million years number that I quoted, that's just, that's me being conservative, like, yes, intersex people exist. And yes, gender and here you and I always have a slightly different definition for this gender is the behavioral manifestation of sex in non human animals, what we call gender in humans we call sex role. And you know, the way that you manifest your sex is your sex role is your gender, are there some humans who feel deep down that they are not the sex that they are born to? Yes, and they are transgendered, and we will treat them with respect, and we need to do so. But this, this has got to stop. Well, gotta stop. This is insanity.

**Bret** 1:12:59

It's it, you're absolutely right is going to result in the destruction of everything. As we pointed out, long time ago. You know, if your Schools of Engineering are going postmodern, then the point is, you're giving an advantage to any competitor who can manage not to suffer that same fate, right. And so basically, we're talking, you know, on a global scale of those societies that can resist this nonsense are going to have, you know, the gates of the city thrown open to them,

**Heather** 1:13:32

you know, but But in the meantime, bridges may start falling, right. And in the meantime, as medical schools are captured, and cannot agree to the like, really the easiest and most basic observable fact of human biology, right? I mean, if they started saying that humans have three legs, I'd find that more plausible, right, right. Like, if this is gonna, this is gonna be killing people. Because guess what, as we, you know, as we go through the evidence, you know, very, very briefly in a different part of this chapter, you know, the number of medical conditions that manifest differently, not just in frequency, but in, but with regard to ideology, that is what causes them and with regard to symptoms, how they manifest by sex is huge and growing all the time. And a, that's going to start disappearing, we're not going to be able to know about it, the researcher isn't going to be allowed, and people are going to arrive in hospitals presenting with things where if you don't even get to know as a doctor, what sex is, we're going and it's and it's largely, frankly, probably going to affect more women than men. So just as just as the vast majority of medical research until the mid 20th century was done on on men, and it was assumed that what was true for men was true for everyone. It was pretty recently that we started seeing a recognition that men and women reveal disease differently. And this improved women's health care. Well, this is just going to take us right back.

**Bret** 1:14:59

Well, I think It's even worse than that. So now, yeah, well, of course, what what if think about the game that we play politically, right, where we force you to effectively engage in a career of legal corruption before you can get to the highest echelons of leadership, right? So we force you to prove that you will make the mental the moral compromises in order to play that game, before we ever learn your name as a senator, you know, a presidential candidate or anything like that. In this case, it's effectively imagine that what we did was we just said, okay, from now on, we are going to ask people a question before we let them into medical school. Do you agree that men can get pregnant? Right? And if the answer is, well, no, men can't get paid? Sorry, you're not qualified for medical school? Right? Then you get a medical school in which everybody agrees, men can get pregnant? The question is, what is the quality of what will take place at a medical school where you had that as a gate, right? And the answer is, that's not going to be much of a medical school, because what you've just done is demonstrated that everybody there is a coward, or a fool, or some combination of those things. And if you you know, build a medical school of cowards and fools, it's not going to be a high quality one. So at some level, you have to empower people to be able to say, look, I get it, that it's really unpleasant, that there are, you know, two sexes, and that we can distinguish them, you know, immediately on birth, except in very rare cases, right? But the fact is, come on, who you cannot allow these things to take over essential functions and essential function. This means not only things like medicine and governance, but also things like the military, right, increasingly, we are feminizing our military which, you know, from the point of view of us empathizing better with each other, there's an argument to be made for it from the point of view of the ability to have a, you know, unique gender profile, what you really need is a powerful masculine Military To Protect the freedom that allows you to figure out how you want to live, right, if you say, well, that freedom should exist in the military, too. And why is this military regimen you know, so dictatorial? Shouldn't it be democratic and you know, shouldn't we figure out you know, let's not make a military move until everybody's had a chance to speak right? I mean, you can imagine applying these rules being well intentioned but my god you're going to create a system that cannot function Yeah, chain

**Heather** 1:17:30

of command goes right out the window. Yeah, it sure does. Yeah. Okay, share my screen just for a minute, Zack, here's a guardian article from when is it two days ago, IOC that's the International Olympic Committee praises weightlifter Laurel Hubbard before transgender athletes Olympic debut. If I may have my screen back, so this this person, Laurel Hubbard, I think is going to debut on Monday so has not happened yet. I'm just going to quote a few more places from the article but from my screen, so don't don't show. Zack. The IOC is medical and science Director Dr. Richard Richard budget said quote, everyone agrees that trans women are women. Hubbard's participation in Tokyo Hubbard being the athlete has proved controversial, with her supporters hailing it as a historic moment for trans rights, with the IOC. his critics believing that the 42 year old New Zealander, who had never competed internationally until transitioning at 35, has an unfair and substantial advantage. vile quote, recent scientific papers have also shown that anyone who undergoes male puberty retains significant advantages and power and strength even after taking medication to suppress their testosterone levels. And one of the papers you know, you don't say right, one of the papers that they cite here, or maybe the only paper is this excellent paper by Emma Helton and Tommy Lundberg that just came out and then we managed to just sneak into our book just before the final final edits were done called transgender women in the female category of sport perspectives on testosterone suppression and performance advantage. So one thing I want to say here is you know, slight kudos to The Guardian for actually you have this it's it's not it's by no means a perfect piece. But the Guardian has been a sort of canary in the coal mine of woke ridiculousness for a while now and is that can I think you has been a canary in the coal mine for woke of woke ridiculousness for a while now, but this piece actually has not just some nuance, but actually some truth. And you know, having just just simply putting it out there that the IOC is medical and science director says everyone agrees that trans women are women. Well, no, no, they don't. And if you've, if you've got a degree and you're the director of both medicine and science, the fact that you can say that means you're not fit for your job. Yeah, like you're just not and, you know, who cares? A 35 year old person transitions never having competed before. And now seven years later is in the Olympics in weightlifting. It's not like fencing, right? Which like, like everything is sex segregated. Everything is sex segregated. But weightlifting, for Christ's sakes. Yeah, like, even our pelvis as being differently shaped makes men more stable on their feet. This is insanity. Yeah. Like, I can't believe we're here. I can't believe we're here.

**Bret** 1:20:33

Right. And you know, it's heralded as a major victory for trans rights when it's actually a major setback for women, right.

**Heather** 1:20:41

So So, so disappear, women's sports, right. And in fact, I just want to read a small bit from this book, Helen Joyce's trans when ideology meets reality, this just came out this month, we got a preview copy, and I have not read the whole thing, I have skimmed it all and read some of it. And it is, as I was expecting, quite excellent. And she does a section on on basically a history of females, a female sports as well, which I didn't, I didn't know and is quite interesting. And basically, you're like with, like, with the recognition that women have different ideologies and manifestations of disease. And we need to recognize that in our healthcare practices in order not to be killing women, because we think they're just men, but smaller. So to have just recently, women been not just allowed to compete at the elite levels, but been given their, you know, our own places to do so. Because when women compete directly with men, in less, it's in something that is explicitly co Ed, like mixed doubles in tennis, or you know, the sport that we played a lot of ultimate frisbee really allows for wonderful games when they're co Ed. And you know, I played I played a lot of COVID frisbee, I played competitively on the women's team at University of Michigan, and watched therefore in a lot of tournaments, a lot of men's play a lot of women's play a lot of CO Ed play. And, frankly, in that particular game, and there are a lot of games that there are a lot of sports that don't allow for it. But in that particular game, co Ed, he's going to knock that over, just like that. co Ed play allows for the best of both, right? Like, well, well hold

**Bret** 1:22:19

on a second. For those who haven't played it, it specifically neutralizes the problem, right? If you take the big dude on the ultimate team, and he teams up against the

**Heather** 1:22:30

little man on he lines up against a woman, right, that's who he is, shut her

**Bret** 1:22:34

down. And that's considered unfair. So the idea is when you line up before a particular point, you line up against somebody with whom you are appropriately matched. So it can be a man against a woman if they're appropriately matched. But the point is, it neutralizes the ability of men to shut down,

**Heather** 1:22:49

right, but there I mean, also, if you're playing zone rather than man on defense, that that further neutralizes it. But you do need I mean, it's understood that you need to have an equivalent or usually an equivalent sex ratio on both teams, if you've got you know, and this is true in CO Ed competition where I think you're, it's been a while since I played I ruptured my Achilles tendon doing so I think you're always required to have two women on time. And basically, if you claim your co Ed team, and you only have men on the, on the, on the field at the time, you're not effectively playing co Ed. But what I was gonna say is an all an all male game, which is fun to watch, you know, there's just this raw physicality. But there tend to be long hawks, and fast runs into the end zone, you know, layouts, spectacular, all of this, but the points are short, most people don't touch the desk, a lot of people don't get play, and many

**Bret** 1:23:45

beers are held.

**Heather** 1:23:47

No, but you know, in women's games, it tends to be almost the opposite. Like a lot of short passes a lot of focus on making sure you know, not not competitive stuff, there's not as much focus on like, make sure everyone touches the desk, but you know, shorter passes, fewer long hawks longer points, gets a little tedious. And you know, I never liked playing the women's the women's game as much as I liked playing the CO Ed games, because it has both because there is more strategy and focus on how are you going to do this, if you've got some, you got some six foot six guy who's going to show up and shut you down. Anytime you get the desk, you got it, you've got to think strategically and realize that your strength isn't necessarily in raw power and size and speed. Right. So anyway, in in that case, and it won't be the case in a lot of team sports. But in that case, there is actually a way to play co Ed That is wonderful. And I would say you know, that's what that's what life offers as well. Let me just read one paragraph from the introduction of Helen Joyce's new book. She begins by saying, No, just just one paragraph here. This is a book about trans activism is a story about policy and institutional capital. Have charitable foundations controlled by billionaires joining forces with activist groups to pump money into lobbying behind the scenes for legal change. They have won over big political parties, notably America's democrats and big businesses, including tech giants. They are backed to by academics in gender studies, queer theory and allied fields, and by the pharmaceutical and healthcare industries, which have woken up to the fortunes to be made from gender affirming medicine. So it's the same everywhere, right? We got the same kind of story everywhere we got capture, and activism that may or may not be coordinated, but its effect is as if it was.

**Bret** 1:25:37

Yeah, and I, you know, I hate that this is now manifesting in new realms. But really, the point is, this was what we were trying to warn people about when we were talking about the danger that capture and corruption poses to our ability to function coherently. And you know, the fact that you're seeing it across the social media platforms, the fact that you're seeing it in science, medicine, health policy, you know, our military, everything, the fact that everything is susceptible to being pushed into insane contortions is just evidence that we have a very serious problem right? And you know, evergreen many people took it to be almost funny in how over the top it was, but it was a warning right? This is what corruption does to a system it renders that incoherent and an incoherent system doesn't collapse immediately but at the point you recognize that these you know, falsehoods have taken over the steering mechanism. It's an emergency whether or not there's an iceberg visible, right? There's gonna be one at some point.

**Heather** 1:26:46

Yep. All right. Last week, you had us use a thumbnail with a B and A flower and obviously that should have been a thumbnail for this week on sex and gender Oh, right. twice over you were arguing that he was sleeping somehow

**Bret** 1:27:06

I argued it was going to slow some point yeah, it wasn't sleeping all the time.

**Heather** 1:27:10

Right no matter. So do we have a thumbnail for this week. We are going to end here. We are going to for those listening be back in a week. And for those watching if you want to partake partake in our live q&a, we'll take a 15 minute break or the minimum amount it takes to get the new the new Odyssey link up. Ask us questions at Dark Horse submissions.com recognize that we appreciate the money that you give us for those questions but we make no promises that we will get to to all of them. And we are increasingly prioritizing those that seem apropos of what we were talking about or you know otherwise interesting or relevant to us there is now an option to to vote on questions as well and we look at those votes over they don't really affect whether or not you're sorry if some question gets a ton of ton of votes, we may we may pay particular attention to it. consider joining our Patreon consider coming over to natural selections my new substack newsletter all of the writing is going to be free I'm going to be doing for paid subscribers audio reads of my of my Tuesday essays but all the writing is free so if you subscribe that just means you get an email from me whenever I post something new which will be Tuesdays occasionally more frequently. Considered going to store dot Darkhorse podcast.org to check out those Goliath t shirts and please if you want to buy a T shirt go there. Don't buy it from some other party because they have stolen that from us. email any questions that you have with regard to logistics not with regard to questions that you would like us to answer in the q&a to Darkhorse moderator@gmail.com and consider subscribing to all four of our channels. We've got two on YouTube, too on Odyssey Brett Weinstein's main channel, which is where you're seeing this on both and Dark Horse podcast clips, which of course has clips, and like this video, share it. Anything else?

**Bret** 1:29:19

achieve greatness, stand up for what's right, and we will see you soon.

**Heather** 1:29:27

And be good to the ones you love and eat good food and get out.

**Bret** 1:29:31

Be well everyone