



SET
V

ASK A GENIUS

SCOTT DOUGLAS JACOBSEN
&
RICK ROSNER

IN-SIGHT PUBLISHING

Published by In-Sight Publishing
In-Sight Publishing
Langley, British Columbia, Canada

in-sightjournal.com

First published in parts by In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal,
a member of In-Sight Publishing, 2016-2018
This edition published in 2018

© 2012-2018 by Scott Douglas Jacobsen.

All rights reserved.

No parts of this collection may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized, in any form, or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented or created, which includes photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher.

Published in Canada by In-Sight Publishing, British Columbia, Canada, 2018
Distributed by In-Sight Publishing, Langley, British Columbia, Canada

In-Sight Publishing was established in 2014 as a not-for-profit alternative to the large, commercial publishing houses currently dominating the publishing industry.

In-Sight Publishing operates in independent and public interests rather than for private gains, and is committed to publishing, in innovative ways, ways of community, cultural, educational, moral, personal, and social value that are often deemed insufficiently profitable. Thank you for the download of this e-book, your effort, interest, and time support independent publishing purposed for the encouragement of academic freedom, creativity, diverse voices, and independent thought.

Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

No official catalogue record for this book.

Jacobsen, Scott Douglas, Author

Ask A Genius: Set V/Scott Douglas Jacobsen

pages cm

Includes bibliographic references, footnotes, and reference style listing.

In-Sight Publishing, Langley, British Columbia, Canada

Published electronically from In-Sight Publishing in Langley, British Columbia, Canada

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Designed by Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Contents

I	Dedications	6
II	Ask A Genius 175 – Political Movements (Part 1).....	7
III	Ask A Genius 176 – Political Movements (Part 2).....	8
IV	Ask A Genius 177 – Political Movements (Part 3).....	9
V	Ask A Genius 178 – Political Movements (Part 4).....	10
VI	Ask A Genius 179 – Political Movements (Part 5).....	11
VII	Ask A Genius 180 – Political Movements (Part 6).....	12
VIII	Ask A Genius 181 – Gender Equity and Similarity (Part 1)	13
IX	Ask A Genius 182 – Gender Equity and Similarity (Part 2).....	14
X	Ask A Genius 183 – Academic Political Views (Part 1).....	15
XI	Ask A Genius 184 – Academic Political Views (Part 2).....	16
XII	Ask A Genius 185 – Academic Political Views (Part 3).....	17
XIII	Ask A Genius 186 – Academic Political Views (Part 4).....	18
XIV	Ask A Genius 187 – Academic Political Views (Part 5).....	19
XV	Ask A Genius 188 – Academic Political Views (Part 6).....	20
XVI	Ask A Genius 189 – Academic Political Views (Part 7).....	21
XVII	Ask A Genius 190 – United States, Current (Part 1)	22
XVIII	
	Ask A Genius 191 – Masturbation Culture.....	23
XIX	Ask A Genius 192 – New Relationships.....	24
XX	Ask A Genius 193 – Successful Alternate Lifestyles	25
XXI	Ask A Genius 194 – Behavioural Chauvinism.....	27
XXII	Ask A Genius 195 – Belief and Population Sizes (Part 1).....	28
XXIII	
	Ask A Genius 196 – Belief and Population Sizes (Part 2).....	29
XXIV	
	Ask A Genius 197 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 1)	30
XXV	Ask A Genius 198 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 2)	31
XXVI	
	Ask A Genius 199 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 3)	32
XXVII	
	Ask A Genius 200 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 4)	33
XXVIII	
	Ask A Genius 201 – White Supremacy and Feminism.....	34
XXIX	
	Ask A Genius 202 – Legitimacy to Minorities	35
XXX	Ask A Genius 203 – All Equal in Creation, Men.....	36
XXXI	
	Ask A Genius 204 – The Future, Inconsiderate Considerations.....	37
XXXII	
	Ask A Genius 205 – Gould, S.J.	38
XXXIII	
	Ask A Genius 206 – Not for My Kid.....	39

XXXIV.....	Ask A Genius 207 – Science Fiction and S Curve	40
XXXV.....	Ask A Genius 208 – Dominance Behaviour	41
XXXVI.....	Ask A Genius 209 – Hope for the Unpopular.....	43
XXXVII.....	Ask A Genius 210 – Time Perspective.....	44
XXXVIII.....	Ask A Genius 211 – Paradise of Porn	46
XXXIX.....	Ask A Genius 212 – Arousal Addictions	48
XL.....	Ask A Genius 213 – Partnership Options, or Not.....	50
XLI.....	Ask A Genius 214 – Words in Circulation	51
XLII.....	Ask A Genius 215 – New Catch Phrases and Words.....	52
XLIII.....	Ask A Genius 216 – Morality and Escape Velocity.....	53
XLIV.....	Ask A Genius 217 – The Blob Makes a Comeback.....	54
XLV.....	Ask A Genius 218 – The Blob, Blobs, and National and Religious Firewalls.....	55
XLVI.....	Ask A Genius 219 – The Temptation of Now	56
XLVII.....	Ask A Genius 220 – Genetic Terrorism.....	57
XLVIII.....	Ask A Genius 221 – Underclasses of the Future	58
XLIX.....	Ask A Genius 222 – Underclasses and Socialism.....	59
L.....	Ask A Genius 223 – Underclass, Kids, and Resource Dilution.....	60
LI.....	Ask A Genius 224 – Evolution of Philosophical View.....	61
LII.....	Ask A Genius 225 – Evolution of Social Maturity.....	62
LIII.....	Ask A Genius 226 – Evolution of Social Maturity into Philosophical Insight	63
LIV.....	Ask A Genius 227 – Longevity Escape Velocity, Almost.....	64
LV.....	Ask A Genius 228 – Making War, Making Babies	65
LVI.....	Ask A Genius 229 – The Boomers and Xers	66
LVII.....	Ask A Genius 230 – The Layered Old	67
LVIII.....	Ask A Genius 231 – The Lives of the Future Old (and Famous).....	68
LIX.....	Ask A Genius 232 – 2080s Old.....	69
LX.....	Ask A Genius 233 – Dead and Money Heirs.....	70
LXI.....	Ask A Genius 234 – Socialist Bouncing Pillow	71
LXII.....	Ask A Genius 235 – Metformin (1).....	72
LXIII.....	Ask A Genius 236 – Metformin (2).....	73
LXIV.....	Ask A Genius 237 – Metformin (3).....	74

LXV Ask A Genius 238 – Metformin (4).....	75
LXVI.....	
Ask A Genius 239 – Paul Ryan Thang.....	76
LXVII.....	
Ask A Genius 240 – The Problem with Personal Heroes	77
LXVIII	
Ask A Genius 241 – Heroes? I’m Not Sure Either.....	78
LXIX.....	
Ask A Genius 242 – Smarter Than Who?.....	79
LXX Ask A Genius 243 – Goofy Ideas.....	80
LXXI.....	
Ask A Genius 244 – Highest IQ?.....	81
LXXII.....	
Ask A Genius 245 – Ultra-High IQ.....	82
LXXIII	
Ask A Genius 246 – 205 and 199, and Renorming	83
LXXIV	
Ask A Genius 247 – Test for Genius	84
LXXV	
Ask A Genius 248 – Magnus	85
LXXVI.....	
Ask A Genius 249 – Strongest Man Competition.....	86
LXXVII.....	
Ask A Genius 250 – Termanites.....	87
LXXVIII.....	
Ask A Genius 251 – Chance and Sport.....	88
LXXIX	
Ask A Genius 253 – Hacking Wars.....	89
LXXX	
Ask A Genius 254 – Hacking Wars and the 2016 Election.....	90
LXXXI	
Ask A Genius 255 – Blobs of Information Processing	91
LXXXII.....	
Ask A Genius 256 – The Breakdown of Self.....	92
LXXXIII.....	
Ask A Genius 257 – Communists and Hollywood.....	93
LXXXIV.....	
Ask A Genius 258 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking.....	94
LXXXV.....	
Ask A Genius 259 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking (2).....	95
LXXXVI.....	
Ask A Genius 260 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking (3).....	96
LXXXVII	
Ask A Genius 261 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking (4).....	97
LXXXVIII	
Ask A Genius 262 – Endless Forms Most Beautiful (1)	98

LXXXIX.....
Ask A Genius 263 – Endless Forms Most Beautiful (2) 99
xc License and Copyright 100

Dedications

To three generations of women who support and tolerate me - my mom, Ruth, my wife, Carole,
my daughter, Isabella.

Rick

To the love in my life.

Scott

Ask A Genius 175 – Political Movements (Part 1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Active political movements have shifted the conversation. Where it is of utility to look at things in terms of groups, but, at the same time, it is percentages and averages.

It is as if the slave master is talking. It has the tinge of the oppressor talking about the oppressed class. It is a pretty simple trick. I do see this as a way to berate people who do have a party line.

You define a system or look at a society. You define an oppressed class. You define an oppressor class. You look for some form of justice. You self-define as the defender of the oppressed class.

So you are the good person. You are helping the little guy. You are not seeing it as an individual. You are seeing it as a representative of the group. So, you have the backing of the whole group.

Rick Rosner: What you're saying is regardless of what I say, it will be taken a certain way because I belong to the 'oppressor class'.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 176 – Political Movements (Part 2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 23, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: This is the game that is played. It seems like a very conscious setup.

Rosner: You call it a game. I would say it is partly a game. But I would also say that most of the feminist anger I see on Twitter is legitimate and justified. It comes out of a recent history of guys continuing or beginning to be dicks.

The fourchan guys, GamerGate guys, those are baby dicks. Those are guys who found their dickishness. Young guys who found their dickishness in creepy reactions to women wanting a place in the video gaming world or just online.

So a lot of pissed off feminism is a legit thing.

Jacobsen: That's minor. At the same time, there are areas of the world where 200 million women have had a female genital mutilation done. That's a real concern.

Rosner: That argument is the white person problem argument.

Jacobsen: I don't mean to dismiss the concerns. I see the concerns and agree with them, in terms of trying to integrate into another aspect of society – the video gaming world, but it is a little bit self-indulgent in a Western country.

Rosner: I don't know. My wife and I have been going to couples' counselling for most of our marriage. Not because we're always battling with each other. We only go once every three or four weeks, but it's nice to work through things. It is nice to learn how to work through things and to address things before they become super big things.

And a lot of concerns that I see on social media from feminists are social justice concerns and legitimate ones. I see them on Twitter. It is not the comedy Twitter that I follow. I follow 1,400 people. And most of those people are funny.

When people bring up concerns, they are usually brought up in a way that has some humor attached to the scorn or the anger. So it is not just a world of complainy misery. It is like pointing out—a lot of the concerns are reflective of issues that are less sad making than female genital mutilation.

Or women being burned to death or stoned to death, by their own family, for trying to attempt some form of independence. At the same time, letting go of those less horrific concerns is kind of the same as excusing them.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 177 – Political Movements (Part 3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 24, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: I don't agree with that at all. I think they're real problems, but I do think they're in proportion to other real problems people are facing. I think they are problems, but ones that need to be faced in proportion to their hardness.

Rick Rosner: Twitter was designed to tell people what they're up to. I could put this on Twitter, but I haven't, "Last night, I sharted my pants at the gym."

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: I thought it was a fart, and it wasn't.

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

Rosner: Twitter is the ideal place to disclose something like that. Or if you don't want to be that intimate with people, say what you had for lunch, or that you'd like some particular movie; so, most people or nobody on the Twitter I follow has not experienced genital mutilation, but a lot of the people I follow have experienced guys being dickheads to them.

I think it is fine to point out incidents of dickishness and to share that with people and to make people aware of it. Now, I suspect—I have something going on with my bowels. I have too much of a bad kind of bacteria. So there could be some social value in sharing my—I think there's an epidemic of people have bowel problems that is just below the surface.

That within the next year or so. What is going to become a major thing that people are aware of, people are aware of certain aspects of it, like people like to make fun of people who happen to be gluten free, or who are lactose intolerant.

But I suspect there's a huge segment of the population, probably over 5%. Maybe over 10% of people, there's this kind of—people's digestive systems are fucked up, I suspect. If I went on Twitter and shared my 'I sharted myself story' to help people become aware that this is a thing, and that this is something that might need to be addressed; on the other hand, I pooped myself

[Laughing].

Jacobsen: [Laughing].

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 178 – Political Movements (Part 4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 25, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: That’s an indication of a problem, on another side – not the pooping one, but on the other one. It is a signalling with little risk and feeling good, and morally upright and righteous with almost no effort and no impact.

Rick Rosner: No! I don’t see that. The angry-ish women I follow. What they point out is how hard it is for guys to not be dicks...

Jacobsen: If you spend all of your time on Twitter looking for a “dick,” then you’ll find them.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 179 – Political Movements (Part 5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 26, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rosner: The people I follow who are doing this have specifically said, “Don’t – trolls aside – be this way when you’re communicating with me. Don’t mansplain at me. Here’s what mansplaining is. If you’re my friend, you won’t mansplain at me. Here’s what mansplaining is.”

Even though, they say, “Come on, this is what it is, stop doing it. Guys cannot stop themselves from doing it.”

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Because they’re people and people explain things to one another.

Rosner: Yea, but mansplaining is, I think, when you explain something that either doesn’t need to be explained or should be obvious to the person who is being explained at. It’s like my mother-in-law explains at me and anyone around her.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 180 – Political Movements (Part 6)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 27, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Those women, who are giving relatively obvious discretionary notes, except those not obvious to a few people.

Rick Rosner: My favourite mother-in-law-splaining story is where we are at a coffee shop with the family. Coffee shop has one of those menus. It has a lot of stuff. There are a lot of items and a lot of pages.

Looking at the menu, she is looking at the menu and says this is something I wouldn't know or wouldn't have noticed, "They have sandwiches." I mean come on.

Jacobsen: [Laughing] I wouldn't be bent out of shape about it. [Laughing] I could start up a Twitter account, be uptight, and make a joke about it as a discretionary note.

Rosner: Imagine if you were married to somebody who explained at you, stuff that you knew all of the time.

Jacobsen: I would try to work on my own issues first, rather than theirs.

Rosner: I don't know.

Jacobsen: What's the old wisdom? You can't change people.

Rosner: That's true, but you can at least note it and tweet about it because it is interesting, maybe, or funny if you can take the right angle on it.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 181 – Gender Equity and Similarity (Part 1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
May 28, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: I found a quote by Steven Pinker. It is something to talk about:

Feminism as a movement for political and social equity is important, but feminism as an academic clique committed to eccentric doctrine about human nature is not.

Eliminating discrimination against women is important, but believing that women and men are born with indistinguishable minds is not.

Freedom of choice is important, but ensuring that women make up exactly 50 percent of all professions is not. And eliminating sexual assaults is important, but advancing the theory that rapists are doing their part in a vast make conspiracy is not.

Rick Rosner: That is an interesting quote to me. In that, he brings up some valid points, but the points that I think most people – and I think would include most feminists, and I shouldn't speak for feminists – would concede is not a part of their agenda.

I'd say the early part of Second Wave Feminism, if that's what 70s feminism and on is, might be Third Wave Feminism. Yea, there were some people who promoted the idea that kids are genderless, except as conditioned by society.

With the largest argument being that if you give boys dolls, they will be as happy with those things instead of giving them things that are stereotypically gender appropriate, and that kind of stuff is kind of obsolete to a great extent.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 182 – Gender Equity and Similarity (Part 2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
May 29, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Nobody – I don't think – or most feminisms are not wedded to the idea of ungendered upbringings or some natural state of ungenderedness, which is only formed via exposure to a sexist culture.

That is an old debunked thing that nobody is arguing about now. That gets brought up by anti-feminists to show that feminism is pursuing some creepy ass agenda. And nah! I don't think so. People tried it a little bit.

Some people, they found out that people are gendered. That working to treat people as if they're ungendered or to make them ungendered is not the agenda of feminism, but anti-feminists treat it as it is – as if everyone would walk around in the same jump suit.

Heaven forbid if you wear high heels and lipstick. That's not feminism. That's an unfair characterization of it, I think.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 183 – Academic Political Views (Part 1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 30, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: There was a survey of academicians' political views with about 5% as Conservative and 23/24% as Neo-Marxist with the rest as other. I would see these in many gender studies and other departments, in terms of those departments being more likely Neo-Marxist. I forget the precise details.

Rick Rosner: You're saying conservatives are wildly underrepresented in academia.

Jacobsen: Yes, they are wildly overrepresented in government at the same time, in America.

Rosner: Also, you're saying people who are radically Liberal are overrepresented in academia.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 184 – Academic Political Views (Part 2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

May 31, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: That influences the research questions. So if someone wants a research question or if someone wants to pitch a research question to a Bachelor's Honor's or thesis advisor, and if you were an instructor or tenured professor, who would you more likely want someone under you with regards to research: someone with a topic in line with your expertise or not in line with your expertise, knowing your topics will lean more Left-Liberal, even Marxist?

Rosner: Yes, the political landscape means the people who are conservative on campus as opposed to quietly conservative. There is a certain Ann Coulterishness among active conservatives that is an obnoxious torchbearer attitude among a lot of conservatives.

An anger at their underrepresentation and an eagerness to piss people off via taking aggressive stances.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 185 – Academic Political Views (Part 3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: There's another thing. In all 70 or so developed nations, more women are going to college than men. They are getting more awards. They are getting better grades. Women tend to vote more Liberal or Left. Men, I guess, tend to vote more Right.

I suspect some of that skew has to do with reproductive health rights and things like that, but that can also be an influence on the political perspectives in campus, on campus.

Rosner: Yes. But if more women are attending campus, then more of their concerns should be considered majoritarian views. We were talking about food yesterday.

Jacobsen: Yes.

Rosner: 1/3 of American adults are obese.

Jacobsen: Which is a staggering number.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 186 – Academic Political Views (Part 4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 2, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Yes. But that suggests the problem probably doesn't lie with people, that somehow 1/3 of all Americans are lacking in discipline. But rather, that there is a problem with how food is presented to us.

If food is being marketed at us, prepared for us, available to us, in such a way that 1/3 of adults can't avoid being overweight, then it is not just the fault of American adults. It is also the failure of our approach to food.

It isn't then something that can be necessarily addressed by telling people to eat less, exercise more, and make some tougher dietary choices. Also, say 55% or 65% of all college students are women, and that women on average have certain social concerns, it becomes less reasonable to talk about the concerns as being just Liberal or feminist, or as being majoritarian.

Right now, we have a president and a Congress, and probably a Supreme Court that doesn't abide by or represent the attitudes of a majority of Americans across most issues. Some form of strong support for majoritarianism like, "Hey, fuckers in government pay attention to what most people want."

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 187 – Academic Political Views (Part 5)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 3, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rosner: It is a legitimate point of view. It is characterized by people being tender snowflakes. Then when you talk about Marxism, I guess Marx was or is 140 years after he wrote his stuff still—he is certainly the most recognized writer on the idea of a sharing economy.

It is Marxism. So he is the guy. Maybe, there are some obscure ones. There is Socialism, but he is the only one with his name attached to a sharing philosophy. So he is the guy. Marxism and Socialism have been associated with a bunch of governments that brutally fucked over their own people and the world.

And to some extent, they continue to do so. The Soviet Union was a failed Socialist experiment that led to the current failed Russian state, which is some weird Plutocracy/Kleptocracy...

Jacobsen: ...[Laughing] Oligarchy.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 188 – Academic Political Views (Part 6)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 4, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rosner: Yea. China is becoming capitalistic, but it is still dictatorial in a gazillion ways. So even if it is a weaker form of dictatorship killing 60 million people with the Cultural Revolution, it still has the power to screw over people.

It is unfortunate that there is no untainted or politically untainted way to talk about the ideas about sharing economies because as we enter an increasing automated world the nature of work may change and there may not be enough work to go around.

I can imagine – to not any great extent – a hyper-social media connected world, in which people just get stipends for contributing to social media discourse because so much other work is being done by AIs.

That would be a weird dystopia or may semi-utopia. It is as likely as *Idiocracy*, which is just one among a few trends in society – like most science fiction that grabs a few things to extrapolate. But the idea of a sharing economy is not going away mostly because of AI making work more scarce and making the products cheaper.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 189 – Academic Political Views (Part 7)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 5, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Eventually, America may have to confront dumb attitudes that are reflexively opposed to any kind of sharing because that going against their idea of us as being rugged individualists, self-sufficient – and which is contradicted by actual conditions.

Which is that the Red States, the states most likely to hate the idea of a Nanny State or a Welfare State are the ones that take the most money from the government per capita. This is the thing that everybody or people have known for decades now.

If they haven't known, they should know that the states that bitch and moan – the Southern states like Montana and Idaho or states that consistently vote red – more consistently get more money back from the government than they contribute, in social programs than they give in taxes.

Whereas the Blue States like California and New York give more in taxes than they give back, so we have a sharing economy whether we like to admit it or not.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 190 – United States, Current (Part 1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 6, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Under the current political conditions of the United States, Liberalism is majoritarianism, having attitudes more Liberal than the government, people who are running the government right now, is a majority attitude.

The people who run the government would call people who disagree with them liberals, but no we're the majority.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: I have heard Noam Chomsky say that based on studies about – repeatedly I've heard him say this, which seems true to me – 70% of the American population are disenfranchised from the political process.

Where any choice or decision they make has no impact on the way the policy is set for the country, I think a good metric could be considered between the average data points you have about American society, from Pew, from Gallup, etc., and then contrasting that with the way policy is set, and then you could see how democratic the society is.

Because if you look at surveys with big samples and good questions, reliable and valid data sets, and if you state x, y, and z in surveys as a citizen, but the policy is against those to a reasonable significant degree, then you could go per topic how non-democratic the state is in some ways.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 191 – Masturbation Culture

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 7, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: As someone who grew up in the 60s and 70s, I will see sex as more of a motivating factor than other ones. I see this as less of a motivating factor than in the 80s. I see the attitudes of the 70s with sex as a big thing.

It was exaggerated, but I see it as a huge thing because this is how evolution worked, to make everyone horny.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What do you say to someone who says this isn't true?

Rosner: I think that's true. I think sex is less important now. Even now, in a less overtly sexual time than the 70s, sex still doesn't color almost everybody's behaviour in some way. If you dug into why people behave the way they do on an individual basis, you could find a sexual component in almost every behaviour.

However, if the 70s put sex at a 10, maybe now, sex is an 8 or a 7 in terms of motivating factors. The dial has been turned down a little bit. And it will probably continue to be turned down.

Right now, we're right in the middle of masturbation culture. It is that sexual gratification is more removed from personal motivation in other areas of life than it ever has before, at least in our culture.

It gives people more flexibility to be trolls on the one hand, to not have to constantly manifest reproductive fitness on another hand. That is, you don't have to lift weights. You don't have to be trim and sexy. If you can jack yourself off, it doesn't matter necessarily what you look like.

You are free because your gratification is directly dependent on the sexual attractiveness of the people you're with. So relationships can be more inclusive both in terms of who can hook up, even 1-on-1 relationships, but even among people who hook up in these newfangled multiple person relationships.

Where two guys and one girl, two girls and one guy, these triads or whatever you want to call them.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 192 – New Relationships

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 8, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: With all of these new relationship forms, those might work better now because people can always beat off.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: This makes sense evolutionarily too. Apparently, statistically, almost all female humans, women, have had 1 child; whereas, men will have 0 or 2. So a larger proportion of men will be completely out of the future gene pool compared to women.

Rosner: I see.

Jacobsen: Also, there are so many taboos crystallized in comprehension worldviews, like religions, that were not really acceptable, but were more or less imposed by government.

For instance, gay marriage was a huge issue and probably not widely accepted unless enforced by provisions of equality. So it is a larger thought, where a lot of these other ones will have a hard time.

Rosner: So what you're saying for gay marriage to work, the government needs to step in on those that would stop it on religious or other grounds.

Jacobsen: Secular or religious grounds, I could see similar or the same pushback, whether religious or various secular-minded individuals who have personal disagreements with it and so don't want to see it in society in any way – in all its combinations.

Whether quadruplets or triplets, or whatever the title may be, or in various sexual minority orientations...

Rosner: I feel that I am a self-righteous person, not a righteous person. I am judgy. I get pissed. I think a theme or semi-universal theme among people is to be a fan of one's orientation or lifestyle or choices, and to be resentful when alternate choices are successful in the world.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 193 – Successful Alternate Lifestyles

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 9, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: To the extent that I have been successful, it has been being clever at making jokes or being smart rather than being attractive. I try to be attractive, but I am not smoking hot.

When I see people who are vapid as shit living in LA, you see people who are successful based on hotness. I am like, “Fuck you, hot person.” That is bullshit. I don’t like that because it is an avenue of success that is not open to me.

Similarly, some frickin’ rube might be like, “Fuck you, smart person, with your words and all. You’re not American. You don’t work with your hands. You don’t know how to clean a carburetor.” Fuck, I could clean one.

There’s resentment or tends to be resentment of alternative life strategies. It is just that people are just or don’t like – every like strategy involves foregoing other strategies. And you want to believe in the choices you made.

When you see people having made other choices, even when they are other choices, you resent it, “Hey weirdos with the two guy and one relationship.” I have spent 10s of thousands of hours of my life going to the gym.

On some visceral basis, I don’t want to see three chubby people happily in a relationship with each other. It is like, “What the fuck? Why did I waste my time exercising and being monogamous? I am even struggle with contact lenses. These people that are chubby with glasses ar able to satisfy each other. It is annoying.”

To some extent, the institutions that you’re talking about can include religion, probably codify that fear and resentment. Does that make sense?

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Yes, it seems like a smaller phenomenon of the even more sincere and deeply held feelings then turned beliefs and then turned behavior of individuals opening up making-you-not-gay (and so straight) places and not hosting gay weddings or not giving cakes to gay couples.

You have a mild resentment, but this other category or series of categories feel so deeply about it. That they feel the need to impose their idealized world onto the society in which they live through legislation, and otherwise.

You don’t do that. You have feeling and keep it there, which is mild judgment. Everyone is entitled to their feelings and judgments and attitudes, especially feelings because they’re feelings. it is like anger not lying.

They want to impose on society, though. Especially in America, I see this with the Evangelicals quite strongly.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 194 – Behavioural Chauvinism

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 10, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: If everybody is kind of wired – regarding behavioural chauvinism – and I am not speaking clearly or sharply, if everybody feels they have a stake in their behaviour, that, maybe, is a manifestation of one more way evolution gets in the mix.

If everybody feels compelled to be or someone doesn't act the way you do and you punish them, then that keeps that behaviour. Perhaps, competition in behaviour is another semi-evolved way to arrive at some optimal forms of behaviour.

Evolution doesn't want anything because it is not teleological.

Jacobsen: Evolution's natural directionality implies what...

Rosner: This might be another area where evolutionary force is taking place. The force to find the optimal way of being, even though that sounds ridiculous. If you look at the 1950s of the Make America Great Again people, it is everybody living in a 2-parent household in a suburb.

One provider and a house, and a car, you're spitting out 2.3 kids or more, actually more if you look back at the 50s. Families were bigger. That idea is a recipe for reproductive success.

If everybody is in this nuclear family and spitting out kids, that's one view of society's model of success. That success includes a growing population.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 195 – Belief and Population Sizes (Part 1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
June 11, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: If you look at the size of some of them then, ignoring the timescale of centuries and millennia and even maybe decades for some, that enshrine these values; if you look at the Catholic Church, they are 1.3 or 1.4 billion people.

If you look at the Eastern Orthodox Church, they are 225 to 300 million.

Rosner: If you look at Islam, it is over 1 billion people. My conservative buddy gets really worked up at the rate at which Muslim populations increase. He says that one way that Muslims try to take over countries is by having more kids.

It is this paranoid view of things.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 196 – Belief and Population Sizes (Part 2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
June 12, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: That interlopers into Western society are trying to take it over by having more babies. That includes Muslims and Hispanic people, but while I think that is wrongheaded in a lot of ways. The US is less than 1% Muslim now.

The rate at which Muslim Americans reproduce by 2040, according to one estimate, they'll be 2.1% of the population, which is a still really a tiny fragment of the population; whereas the world AI population by at least one person I know to be about 1 trillion by 2100.

I believe there was a march against Sharia Law. That somehow enough Muslim Americans will take over enough of America to impose Sharia Law. But like I said, those people marching against Sharia should be marching against robots.

Robots are going to be made at a fantastically greater rate than compared to Muslims. In any case, these normative models; these lifestyles that people are compelled to embrace and promote, and to fight for, at the expense of alternate lifestyles are models of how to make the species more successful.

Not necessarily accurate models, but models on how to pump out more people.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 197 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
June 13, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Do these become systems of control of populations, and so individual people?

Rosner: The US doesn't really have a national population policy, but China does.

Jacobsen: America does, sure. I think of the Abrahamic religions.

Rosner: I mean the government doesn't get involved, well does say to have kids and we'll give you tax deductions with allowance of dependents allow you to take deductions from your taxes. You pay less for having kids.

We will make it economically slightly easier to have kids. It is not as overt as China policy. Policies they have had since Communist China came into existence.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 198 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 14, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: Well, if you take both examples, if you take the biggest religions in the world, they account for half of the population in the world; if you take the largest country in the world, you have a national secular policy for control of birth rates and who has kids, and how many.

Each have different forms of control of reproduction, which, for the most part, amounts to control of women generally. These are different manifestations of similar phenomenon, which might be similar phenomenon across primates of controlling female reproduction.

Rosner: Yes, this promotion of reproduction, which controls the push to make more – which governs all animals. All organisms. I am sure you can find some exceptions. It is probably as close to a universal as you'll find in evolution. I am just guessing.

For humans, that will be coming not necessarily to an end, but it will fall more and more under overt human control, where we will be more and more in charge of what we want to do with the human population.

Whether we want to keep expanding it, for more than 100 years, people have or some people have been worried about increasing human population. The drive or the sex drive—now, that is something under societal consideration.

The things that drive us to make more people will more and more come under our consideration and control.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 199 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 3)

**Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
June 15, 2017**

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What about—Can I make a distinction of reproductive control?

Rick Rosner: Yes.

Jacobsen: I like Margaret Atwood, and I am Canadian. So, this is partly where this is coming from. If you control women's reproduction, then you control legacy. The primary means of control of reproduction are women, who are lower status globally and through time.

Secondary is men who get sex with a woman and generally lower-class males who get some status and the reward is the sex with the woman and probably enshrined in things like head of the household, head of the family, and so on.

Whereas for the primary control, that class doesn't get that. I feel as though this era that we're seeing now, and that you're strongly directing attention to is a – not a dissolution, but a slow erosion of that.

People have more freedom in their lives and so control over their own reproduction, which hasn't been the historical case whether from the state or a religion.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 200 – Overpopulation, Religion, Government (Part 4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
June 16, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: One is the freedom. One part of that is the control over our drives. It is to a huge extent getting control over how our sexual behaviour. So, we're talking about coercive control. I wasn't even talking about that. I wasn't talking about it as we suss out become or learn more about how consciousness works and how to determine the types of consciousness we want to have.

That may me control over sex because sex is one of the great drivers of our conscious and unconscious existences.

We'll be, in the future, able to decide if we really want to be driven by butts and tits. For an increasing percentage of the population over the next few centuries, that will come to be seen an antiquated and ridiculous.

There are some science fiction visions of the future that present a race of humans who are kind of desexualized and coldly clinically intellectual.

Sometimes, you see the humans of the future as being little spindly bodies with big throbbing brains

Their heads are three times the size of our own now and their bodies are shrunken by half. That is ridiculous.

But I can see a gradual deemphasizing of sex, but not a deemphasizing of foolishness.

That we all become coldly and clinically rational and smarter, but our entertainments. Our fun will become more developed, complicated, and ridiculous along with our abilities.

Sex will be just one of many the ways that we entertain ourselves.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: That does tie back in. That broadening of the landscape of entertaining ourselves does tie back into this differentiation, into the splinterings of sexual pairings or non-pairings and the variety o stimulation that come from that, or arise out of that.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 201 – White Supremacy and Feminism

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 17, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: I have been supportive of feminism for about 40 years. But to talk about his as a cis white male talking about feminism now...

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: ...you're Rick Rosner talking about feminism. Your own individual identity.

Rosner: Yea, but it is like a cis white guy talking about Black Lives Matter, it is a ticket to getting in trouble, to misstep.

Jacobsen: It is only a ticket to trouble if you're thinking in terms of groups, but you live in America where the emphasis is on the individual. So, I am thinking of you as Rick Rosner.

Rosner: I am going to get caught with my pants down, I think. I live in LA. I have a wife and daughter and even if I didn't. First, we can talk about majority movements. That is, movements that endorse a majority versus movements that promote minorities.

Specifically, white supremacy, most white people are not active white supremacists, and recently, somebody pointed out, it is not that white supremacists are necessarily claiming to be better than the non-whites.

What they want is the privilege, that they are supporting their right to privilege in the society. White supremacy isn't a statement of superiority necessarily. It is saying that we want power as white people, which a) is gross and b) kind of reflects the reality that most supremacists are trashy people.

A lot of white supremacists are people who, even though they have the privilege that often goes with being in the majority, haven't been able to make a good go of it with that privilege. They are trying to claim even more privilege, say.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 202 – Legitimacy to Minorities

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 18, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: People who don't want to grant legitimacy to minority movements try to represent those movements extreme versions of those movements, as unpleasant and unfair – more than citizens deserve. People are making trouble where there is no real trouble.

Like Rush Limbaugh and the Nazis, they describe feminism in this way. Feminism has been overtly fucked over, over the decades, with the waves of feminism. I don't know what this wave is called now. This current wave started as an outgrowth of the discontent of the sexism and chauvinism of the Hippy movements in the 60s.

But a lot of the socially progressive and anti-war movements of the 60s, which were male dominated, treated women just as shittily as the rest of society did. The women who supported these social progress movements and these anti-war movements.

They got into the movements because they felt strongly against the war and some other stuff that was going on, but noticed that they were being treated as shittily in the wider outside world and began taking up the reins of protest themselves regarding issues of sexism.

There were stereotypic anti-feminist reactions to this in the 70s. People were called “bra-burners.” People didn't burn their bras, really. It was a symbol of cultural oppressions. Studies pointed out that women's attire, more than men's, hobbled women and constrained women more than men's attire constrains men.

It is present as making it harder for women to run away as being chased by a guy, which was semi-facetious but not entirely facetious. There was the kneejerk reaction to feminism in the 70s, but reactions against Liberals have gotten more sophisticated beginning with Reagan.

Where how to take down Liberals has been focused on by conservatives, *Fox News* is a daily workshop in dissing Liberal causes. So, if you kind of look at what has happened to feminism, they have been persuaded that it is not for them, where it is like what has happened with Hillary Clinton.

Which is hanging a lot of lying bullshit on women, but it is a steady mischaracterization, the basic idea of feminism is that women should be treated equally to men; whether you believe women are equal to men in every single aspect, it doesn't effect that idea that people should be treated equally.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 203 – All Equal in Creation, Men

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 19, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: That the Constitution says, “All men are created equal...” and should include women too, not just men. The basic idea is that this is the basic idea for the fabric of American liberty. So, to make feminism unpalatable to a lot of people, you must hang a bunch of other stuff on it to make it seem not right.

That it is whiny. That women are already in a privileged position in society. That if women just knew their place, then they would be better taken care of than even men who must be the risk-takers. Then even more modern counter-arguments, that feminism is anti-beauty.

That they see it as part of a movement to being pro-abortion or is tied to pro-abortion arguments and movements; or the idea that – you see this with minority movements too, that all the important battles have been won and that we should be cool because we live in a post-sexist and post-racist society.

A lot of people have dumb ideas about what feminism is. It makes them decide that it is not for them anymore and doesn't need to be respected when people espouse feminist ideas. So, as I said, I have a wife and daughter, I like them to live in a world.

Even if I didn't have a wife and a daughter, I would like women to live in a society, where there is basic fairness among genders – and I look forward to the science fiction future in which gender becomes less important as we gain more control over our identities and our biology.

And our choices about who to be and how to be. So, I have been active on twitter for a little more than 3 years. Social media and particularly Twitter is a good place, I think, to learn about feminism because some of the angriest and funniest voices on Twitter are feminist voices.

Jen Kirkman is a stand-up comedian who might be one of the most vehement pointer-outers of guy assholes on Twitter. As a guy, one thing I have learned is that there is such a thing as mansplaining. I don't know if it came out of social media.

But the idea of it has been fleshed out of social media. Twitter is a good place to become cognizant of my own mansplaining tendencies, and to learn where sometimes I should just shut up. This is where I shut up. Is that enough of a thing?

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 204 – The Future, Inconsiderate Considerations

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
June 20, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: It is easier for people to call bullshit on the future on Twitter. People go along and hear predictions with these weird things and things being overturned, then you look at your life and think, “Where is the future? We had cars 100 years ago and cars now.

We have phones and movies now. Some are 3D. Some have special effects, but still they’re movies. So where is the fantastic future?”

That kind of misses—when the future arrives, it arrives all the sudden and then ka-boom within a couple of years things are different. “You got airbags. Fine. You got auto-park. Fine. It doesn’t change that we’re still driving cars.”

So, you have a bunch or a couple of ways for people to call bullshit on the future. That doesn’t disqualify the future. That those ways of calling bullshit don’t disprove that the future is going to kick everyone’s ass.

On the one hand, we have shown stability is characteristic the way things are; it doesn’t preclude rapid changes in the ways things are. You have gradual changes that by their nature of being gradual do not seem like a big deal. It is like, “So what? The auto-parking car. How does this change my life?”

So that by the time you get to the self-driving car, you find the radical change that is the frog in the water that is being brought to a boil. You get used to a thing with changing technology, so you’re not blown away as easily.

The future finally gets here. It is like a principle of reality versus science fiction, which is, in science fiction you get to see the future and it is, awesome. You get to see it all at once. But, even with S curves, stuff takes a while.

When it gets here, then you see how it got here, and when it shows up, it is a culmination of old stuff and new stuff and it is grubby and sleazy and cheap. The sense of wonder has been sucked out of it by the process that it took to get here and how grubby it is by the time it gets here.

The principle is that you never get as much enjoyment out of the real future as kind of would anticipate seeing science fiction portrayals of the future.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 205 – Gould, S.J.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 21, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: As we've said a gazillion times, we have tried to pin down when it gets weird like a thousand times. We can try to pin down when the phase changes will occur. We can look at evolution, which is a gradualist theory.

Speciation takes place over huge stretches of time. Species are stable for huge stretches of time. It is the accumulation of change. 100 years after Darwin. Stephen Jay Gould and his research partner came up with a modification to evolutionary gradualism with punctuated equilibrium.

The evolutionary changes still take a long time, but they don't all take place at the same rate. If you look at the fossil record, you can find endless instances of extended periods of species stability and short periods of species change and adaptation.

The change will happen at shorter time scales than periods of species stability, but there seems to be more time for species to be stable, except for certain hallmarks of a well-adapted species. A lot of species that are good fits in their environment.

They are successful across centuries, which is the domination of jocks in a niche, basically. The well-adapted species tend to be the dominant species over time. The members of the species that are bigger and dominant drive things to be bigger and more dominant, but other things are stable.

When new species bud off, that happens relatively quickly. It is across hundreds of thousands of years, typically, but not like the hundreds of thousands and even millions of years in which species can be stable.

You can kind of look at changes in our culture from that same perspective. That things tend to be stable for a long time and then they have a stable period of technology. The era of writing and literacy extended for a long time.

Depending on what your criteria are, whether you need 20% literacy for the population to say their literate or 50%, whatever your criteria; however, you define the era of the written word. You're going to get something that has been not too unstable for centuries.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 206 – Not for My Kid

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: You've got more and better technology at 1472. Before that, the written word was a pain in the ass to circulate, and then across the next 550 years. It has become easier and easier to reproduce and disseminate words on paper or on screens.

But that whole deal of the printed word(s) has been a kind of stable point. Cars have been stable for 90 or 100 years, even though you have demographic changes. You have cars getting better with more features, but we use cars in a lot and even most of the same ways and for the same purposes.

So, you have stability, you have S curves. S curves show some things are being used by 0% of the population to almost every member of a population. The S curve measures the percent of the population doing or using something.

So, the S curve for the telephone is flat until the 1870s, 1880s. Then it starts to gradually go up. The curve of adaptation gets steep around 1910 and 1935. By the end of WWII, it is weird if a household doesn't have a telephone.

That is an S curve for telephone, where it goes from a flat 0% of this curve to a flat 100%, and we can guess that future changes and the S curve implies punctuation. The S in the phone curve occupies 50 years. You've got thousands of phonelessness before the S.

You've got some 80 years and counting after the telephone. So, graduality, the people who live in times of change experience that gradual narrative. Things change. I experienced the changes of the computer chips invading the home. My kid didn't.

By the time she was ready to really use computers, as close to the time that people got started; by the time she was old enough to make effective use of computers, the search was in place and the Internet was in place too.

The Internet sucked in 1995. Information search has been a super bad point of almost not being a thing. So, I experienced the S curve. My kid didn't. So, science fiction tends to focus on S curve stuff. The going away of some old way of being and the coming of some new way of being.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 207 – Science Fiction and S Curve

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 23, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: People gradually adapt to these changes. Maybe, a better model of the future will be things look like now, and then an S curve pops in and then you have a new S curve. Instead of a gradual thing like the coming smart phones, you can have the things like that.

They took over in less than 10 years. Now, we have a stable relationship with smart phones. We're constantly buying new crappy ones. You can buy crappy computers. You can buy new crap, but that buying new crap is kind of a stable thing now.

So, you can talk about the conditions under which you get an S curve. Technology must work well enough. People who want to use it—you get the very beginnings of these things. Where only a few are wanting to take the trouble, or are intrepid enough to deal with the technology; then it becomes useful technology, and people embrace them, it becomes hard not to embrace them.

I cannot think of any technological improvement to human life that hasn't been embraced for some reason. If the technology is clearly convenient and helpful, and doesn't have major problems, then people will ubiquitously use it.

Science fiction, if not impossible, eventually comes to pass. A story written in 1976 or 1980s science fiction might have a pervasive use of computers that we might not see until 2006. I have to say no to science fiction as a correction.

We will probably never have a society of flying cars because flying cars don't make sense for a lot of people.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 208 – Dominance Behaviour

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 24, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: In earlier sessions, we were talking about dominance behaviour in species. It started when I saw a finch or a sparrow in a park in New York. I decided that that animals' consciousness was less worried about the individual birds' position in bird society as much as humans are about their position in human society.

I did a little reading. I found out that that is not as true to the degree that I thought it was. There are dominance hierarchies and pecking orders in many, many species. There is always the potential for those dominance hierarchies to form.

They provide efficiencies that prevent spending too much energy fighting amongst themselves, by giving them social structure. Some fighting takes place initially, and then everyone else decides they're cool with where they are.

Then you don't have members of the species battling with each other. This saves energy for other aspects of survival.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: You don't need much extra to put more towards cognitive and behavioural flexibility. Also, estrus is year-round for our species.

Rosner: Things get weird when you get a hyper-fit species, as we are. The natural world is not as much of a threat to individual species member survival, for humans as it is for almost every other species.

Most humans survive to reproductive age, and most of our displays of dominance aren't directly related to reproductive fitness. Things are more complicated, more baroque, and so displays of fitness and dominance hierarchies in humans are just a lot weirder than they are—less straightforward than they are for other species.

Within my lifetime, I have seen displays of fitness and dominance change from what can be seen as a more basic demonstration of physical vitality to more of a demonstration of hipness. When I was growing up, things felt more straightforwardly like jocks vs, nerds with jocks being cool and nerds being uncool.

That became more explicit in 1976, when *Pumping Iron* came out and made Arnie a star and weight training not a niche activity, but a widely accepted activity in America and people strived for that trim and muscular V-shaped torso, men did, and clothes and shirts were tight with shirts being tucked in.

That was 40 years ago. Now, physical fitness is overall de-emphasized compared to that era. People have the bodies they have. Clothes are not tight. Demonstrations of dominance, I think

more in terms of Brooklyn hipsters; it has become—the stereotype when I was growing up or the thing that people were told was that “you’re nerdy in high school and junior high, but when you grow up you’ll be in charge. Everyone who is cool and a jock will be working in a gas station.”

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 209 – Hope for the Unpopular

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 25, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: That sounds fantastically optimistic.

Rick Rosner: It is among the things you tell the unpopular kid who plays the tuba in the band. You say, “They are jealous and don’t like you.” It is a thing to make the unpopular kid feel better. In fact, that tuba thing came from something called *The Hollywood Nights*. It was about nerds trying to get laid.

But the entire culture has gone nerdy, where bros try to get laid. You’ve got guido culture, which can involve hair mousse and lifting and hitting club at night, and getting with women.

Jacobsen: There’s two aspects to that. One is traditional masculine with men as the head of the household. The other is bro culture which is drinking, smoking, don’t wear sunscreen, ride dirt bikes and motorcycles, and this is your life trying to hit on and pick up women aggressively.

It is attempts to appear dominant in ways that appear more awkward and less functional and less cool than before.

Rosner: There is fragmentation. I think there are—I never read John Nash book, but I saw the movie called *A Beautiful Mind*. He says that if you’re trying to hook up or mate successfully, then one strategy is to eliminate the most desirable females from consideration and then choose from among the best remaining females.

That you look for the best deal with reduced competition. You find the females that have the most competition for them, and then you ignore them and you look for the best deals based on what standards you have among the relatively ignored females.

There is a scene in the bar with the blonde being ignored. Then there is a brunette, the stereotypically less attractive female becomes more attractive because there is less competition for her.

So, I would guess that it comes to trying to hook up, in a species where you’re not competing directly against nature, but that in a super successful species that there is going to be the potential for niche forming.

Where people will aggregate themselves to maximize reproductive potential by forming groups where their attributes can be manifest to the best advantage; so, people will form bro culture, which gives an advantage to people who are best at being bros and broettes.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 210 – Time Perspective

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 26, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Do you think there is an aspect of time perspective in this culture or cultures? Where if you look at the perspective of time that someone emphasizes – past, present, and future, do you think they're focusing on the present?

Rick Rosner: I am not understanding entirely.

Jacobsen: If you look at rave culture, these are people focusing on the present in a hedonistic frame. There is a whole psychology of time perspective. If you look at the guidos, the bros, the guys...

Rosner: ...I see what you're saying. One of things we have to burn as a successful species is time. There is an aspect of time consciousness. Like, nobody plans on being a raver or a guido forever, but, right now, it is fine.

The cost of time is fairly low. Colleges, to some extent, are folding pens of parties, depending on which college and what people's goals are – to some extent, you can see college as a way to reduce excess productivity that doesn't—

For hundreds of years, we have seen increasing productivity, industrialization. To the point where millions of graduating, people graduating high school, do not join the workforce, to personally survive or to help the nation survive.

Instead, they can go and spend 4 years either learning further skills or partying in college, which is a sign that we have excess productivity and that colleges can be seen in some lights as productivity sponges.

It gives people a place to waste time. There are plenty of other activities in society that are time sucks that we get to engage in because we have time to spare, so you have entire lifestyles that are kind of among the things that they hinge on as time to spare.

You can go and be a guido, and go sow wild oats. Get your shit together in your late 20s, it is the same with rave culture. Rave culture is outwardly about everybody being loose and free and not having the constraints of everyday life.

But behind that, it is still demonstration of dominance and of fitness. People try to wear not much clothes. People who are in—

Rave culture is still a competition to see Coachella, which is southern California's rave-type event. It is hot. It is in the desert. People put on outfits that are super skimpy. It is still a demonstration of sexual fitness and sexual availability.

Although, if you probably ask most people attending a rave, there number one objective of going to Coachella. It is not to hook up, but hooking up is a huge underlying theme of that whole deal.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 211 – Paradise of Porn

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 27, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: You see these play out in preferences of verbal expression.

[Laughing] That is a really abstract way of putting it. Men and their titles; women and their makeup. Typically, women will advantage their looks; men will advantage their status to some way.

Also, there is denigration of competitors. Then there is denigration by men against other men's status, or women denigrating other women's beauty.

Rick Rosner: That is pretty straightforward, then you get into ironic hipster culture. Where the criterion is authenticity, it is about living authentically. People riding antique bicycles, having ironic hair, using old non-technological techniques.

In hipness culture, you try to arrive at a state of hipness authentically, through having honest interests in these things as opposed to being a poser who is only interested in it because everyone else is interested.

Jacobsen: What about people on the fence who just want to fit in and so adapt to the culture, or sub-culture?

Rosner: You can choose a culture. Or you can turn out to not be well-adapted to any niche. You can choose to opt out, and just be adversarial. The 2016 election had all sorts of adversarial groups, like the 4Chan groups, or Pepe the Frog people.

People sharing intolerant messages, and a lot of the pro-Trump people – or the more visibly offensive pro-Trump people, or the alt-Right people. A lot of those people belong to cultures of opting out.

Guys who have given up on being popular and getting laid. Lonely basement guys, trolls basically, troll culture is an opting out cultures.

Jacobsen: The trolls, the MGTOWs, much of the men's movement...

Rosner: ...there are a lot of guys in those cultures who have decided it is not worth it for them to find a niche to compete to hook up with girls, and so they are going to stay on the sidelines and amuse themselves by trolling.

That points at masturbation culture.

Jacobsen: That overlaps with porn culture.

Rosner: They are part of exactly the same thing, I think. Everybody is still horny. But it is easier than ever to relieve one's horniness without social contact. Yea, it is easier to get off without social contact.

So, you have people opting out and giving up on social contact, and giving up on productive, positive social contact altogether, and live lives that are pretty solitary except for online interactions, but they can be hostile because they don't have to meet any societal standards to get laid.

A paradise of porn.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 212 – Arousal Addictions

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 28, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: There is a psychology of failure to adapt to these rapid changes with older men followed by younger men. It is the psychologizing it, or providing new diagnoses of it, with things like “Arousal Addictions.” Have you heard of this?

Rick Rosner: No, but go ahead.

Jacobsen: It is not more of the same, as with cocaine, for example, but it more of different things, and so arousal addictions. It would be something like “Pornography: Variations on a Theme, of Addiction.”

What happens is you get a shot of dopamine in the reward system in the brain, in particular the nucleus accumbens, it feels good.

Typically, what happens as you grow up is the prefrontal cortex, which is the house of executive function, allows you to plan, be conscientious, be moral, delay gratification, and so on, from which then once you accomplish these plans and delay this gratification, and succeed for the thing that was a later gratification, and so on, you get that shot of dopamine from the nucleus accumbens.

So, you have a system: planning ahead, delay of gratification from the prefrontal cortex for executive function, get a reward, nucleus accumbens activates and you feel good, so you get real world context. You get the context. But with pornography and video games, you get reward and no context.

Rosner: All of this stuff spreads across all these other parts of life. So, trolls feel as though they won't get laid, but also a lot of them also feel like there's no path to good employment. They feel as if there is no achievement path for sex, for work, and so that increases the alienation and the hostility.

Also, there are more paths to pretty high levels of easy gratification than there were 40 years ago. Entertainment is more entertaining, food tastes better now, I have said this before. In the 70s, things sucked and sex was definitely one of the best things to aspire to.

There were so many other awesome things. Now, there is a lot more entertaining stuff in the world. So, sex doesn't have to be the main thing you aspire to – so that is even more reason for trolls not to aspire.

Video game culture is about achieving gratification via entertainment rather than building a path to the future. I don't know whether gamers, if you survey them, view what they do as temporary and then they'll grudgingly attempt to fit into the traditional adult world.

The way, you know—I mean, if you survey guidos, and I assume there are, they will say it is a temporary thing they are doing while they can and will settle down and get married. The people on *Jersey Shore* settle down and have kids.

Snooki has written 3 books so far, maybe more, including one on parenting. Fucking Snooki! Who passes out by dumpsters while pissing, has written a bunch of books. J-Wow, also a dumpster pisser.

Jacobsen: I do not have experience with dumpster pissing.

Rosner: For work, I had to watch a lot of *Jersey Shore*. There was a lot pissing by a dumpster because you were drunk and couldn't be bothered to go inside. You're drunk already. I don't know whether trolls, or what percent of them, consider this a temporary phase and then they'll take on some kind of adult role.

Eventually, that they'll try to grow up.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 213 – Partnership Options, or Not

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 29, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: In the past, we talked about the differentiation between different partnership options, or not, in developing countries as technology causes massive change in social and cultural life, and in political orientation.

What we're talking about now is sub-cultures that come somewhat out of 70s and 80s, and some new ones with regards to technology, that amounts to fringy outcroppings of what might come in different forms.

I mean, an alteration in the way people partner or don't, so I mean a greater variety in partnership expression.

So, guy culture, anti-social culture, or, the one that you were describing, the not quite anti-social but non-social bro culture – which is no contact with women or society and do not get any education and completely drop out, in addition to the variations on that theme of those that become hooked to some form of electronic stimulation rather than moderate use.

What does this mean with regards to some of our older conversations about the broadening of the landscape? For example, we see much more acceptance of LGBTQ+, which opens the landscape for people to feel more comfortable in their own skin, and to partner up in the ways that they would have otherwise if not for oppression or repression from society: covert and direct.

Rick Rosner: There are several things going on. Maybe, we can find the main themes. For me, the main theme is that I grew up in the 1970s, which was a particularly sexual time. It was also a time that thought—the sexual attitudes of the 60s and 70s, during that time, were thought of being more essential and more natural than the attitudes of any other time that came before.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 214 – Words in Circulation

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

June 30, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: We are sending more letter type things to each other than people have ever done before in history by some crazy wide margin. So, you'd expect words to get into circulation and then get used up at a faster rate than previous eras.

The 50s and 60s had their words. SNAFU, it was a big WWII word. There is situation normal all fucked up. I don't know if people in the army went around saying it all of the time. In the 60s, they had their cliches that were or things that were allegedly said.

In the 50s, there was a big focus on advertising, and it was allegedly said. it was, for the same reasons that *Mad Men* was popular, it epitomized the time. For the first time, America was a thoroughly prosperous consumer culture.

One of the cliches that you could put in the mouth of an ad guy is "running up the flag pole to salute." There was the man in the grey flannel suit, or the organization guy. The guy, for the first time, who had – you had a greater number of people working for organizations, business organizations, than at any other time.

The man in the grey flannel suit is just a cognitive business machine. A guy who wears a suit to work and is one of a zillion drones who is doing mid-management stuff. It was the same culture to show a 100 by 100 room.

It would show many different secretaries each at their own desk.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 215 – New Catch Phrases and Words

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: We can continue to absorb catch phrases and words. So, there is probably more flaking than ever before, or failing to live up to assumed tasks. The will-do lunch is now widely recognized to mean we'll never do lunch.

There has been a falling off of thank you notes. it is not an unpardonable breach to not respond – somebody has to be the one to stop the text chain. It is not an unpardonable breach without giving an explanation why.

People forgive that and assume the conversation is over, or that there is some reason the person had to step away from the text chain. All of those things are examples of flaking at some level, which means that volume of the tasks implied by standard communication and etiquette has reached the point where those conventions are now routinely violated.

It would be tough to keep up with all of them. It would be weird to be somebody to not be the one to end the chain of texts. They would be thought of as a kind of pain in the ass and OCD-ish.

There are limits being created by our ways of communicating right now, but they don't appear to be putting limits on the new garbage words we can learn and quickly use up.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 216 – Morality and Escape Velocity

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 2, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Okay, so we're just at the beginning of kind of a cultural adjustment to the possibility of extended life.

Rick Rosner: We've gone from—mortality lifespan statistics are a little tricky because at the beginning of the 20th century the average lifespan was 40, that's not a fair deal because the average was brought down by huge levels of infant-child mortality. If you could make it, you know, past ten you'd likely live into your 60s.

But over the past century we've added 20 years or so to the average adult life span, but people don't treat that as if it's like a signal to change how we live our lives. It hasn't impacted us psychologically and only now are we beginning to adjust our expectations to the idea of extended further extensions in lifespan.

Our risk avoidance behavior has changed consistently with increased adult life spans. It's not like the 1930s where we drive around in deathtrap, unpadded automobiles with no seatbelts, you know, people drive worse than ever but auto fatalities keep dropping because cars are packed with safety features and that aspect of life.

So we have two waves; we've got the wave of extended healthy lifespan, we've got the wave that is sort of trailing that which is preserving mental function independent of the body.

With the healthy lifespan thing playing out across the next fifty years and the separating the mental function from the body thing playing out across the next 150 years and then beyond that is...

well, first we got to talk about what we want from cognition which goes back to the question every semi smart at least little kid asks her or himself at some point which is, "Why am I me and not somebody else?" with the answer being because all your sensory information, all your memories, all your information processing pertain to you in your body; everything is... all the information you have and use comes from your body with the added senses and its brain and pertains to you and your body. And for many aspects of extended life that will be able to preserve that feeling of the self.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 217 – The Blob Makes a Comeback

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 3, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: The one making the willed decisions or perhaps you've got an agglomeration of joined selves that in combination make the willed decisions.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: And what is this entity?

Rick Rosner: We've been talking about a thing called, that we call "the Blob," but it has aspects of the cloud, it's got aspects of social media, it'll be big patches of the planet-wide computing structure. I don't know.

I doubt that the entire planet will be covered by a unitary computing or information processing entity. That seems like a bad idea and also seems like it won't happen. But there will be entities that act in more or less unitary ways as if there is a single entity consisting of many different information processing parts.

I don't want to say nodes but the thing that can unify itself across a bunch of information processing machinery whether organic or mechanical or both and act as an entity to preserve, protect, preserve and protect itself and its components and then do for itself in the world and you might have several of these, you might have billions of these; interacting with each other, merging with each other.

There will probably be a judge if not a single worldwide information processing infrastructure. I mean you might have that but on the other hand you might have one of the world's biggest ones that covers most of the planet then you'll have smaller ones in places that have willfully isolated themselves.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 218 – The Blob, Blobs, and National and Religious Firewalls

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 4, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Islam is still a force, powerful force, in the world that's kept people afraid. I am skeptical of what has become of the western world 250 years from now and so that there may be like an Islam bloc. One that's kind of firewalled off from the rest of the planets' infrastructure, or there could be nationalistic blocs with each fire walled off philosophically.

Then you'll have this planet-wide infrastructure with a lot of fluid communication possible among the different parts of the infrastructure. It'll be the most complicated machine entity in history. But you may have for a variety of reasons philosophical, political, divisions or firewalls or whatever, though the year 2261 equivalent of a firewall may have protections in place.

I mean this thing or these things will function as willed entities, which will not be free from conflict. You could have easily imagine that a couple of these blocs could be squaring off.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 219 – The Temptation of Now

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 5, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: It's only through the veneer of civilization that we'd even manage to set up structures that remind us to think about other than the now. In the future in case we gain control over our thought processes, you know, we could probably tweak ourselves.

I assume that as we gain control over our thoughts and drives, that we will tweak ourselves to be better adapted to the demands of the current world. You know, we like salty stuff, we like sweet stuff because those things were rare in the world we evolved in and precious because they helped us not die.

But now, you know, since we control the world we can make endless salty and sweet things and now we like those things too much for our current circumstances and salty and sweet things can kill us fast more than if we didn't eat all those things.

So we can tweak our foods that taste delicious but doesn't kill us as much as delicious food tends to, but we can also tweak ourselves so we like delicious but deadly stuff a little less.

And we could also tweak ourselves so we could put constraints on aggression if we decide that's a good thing or we can tweak ourselves for specific mindedness though I don't know how that would be beneficial to groups.

But it wouldn't be beneficial to individuals, if it would remain beneficial to individuals, they'd continue to be motherfuckers. So to get an entire civilization to agree that none of us should be fuckers...

that would be a tricky thing to pull off and also would be subject to all sorts of cheating. So maybe... I don't know, some gorillas of the future, some genetic engineered... what do you want to call them? Terrorist...

I guess gorillas is the word because maybe release a virus that will make people more public spirited and create an epidemic pandemic of a public spirited wimpiness where all of a sudden we all become special snowflakes who are concerned about the future that we're leaving our kids.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 220 – Genetic Terrorism

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 6, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Genetic terrorism; I don't know if it'll happen in the real world, I think it's a great thought point for science fiction. The genetic engineers go rogue and they start infecting humanity with genes that are intended to improve the world.

Now that thought point could be used in a whole variety of contexts. The rogue engineers start infecting people with viruses that are supposed to get people super powers and then the gene tweaks go override and you get maybe some super heroes but you also get some super mutants that.

Maybe that's basically X-Men anyway. But the thought point would be those genetic terrorists... Those conservative politicians who rile against genetic engineers saying that we're playing God, they don't want to get old and die as God intended and then terrorist hit these old curmudgeons with age reversal genes and then the curmudgeons have to either fake continuing to be old or renounce their positions.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 221 – Underclasses of the Future

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 7, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: The problems of the underclass in the future; those are the bottom of the socioeconomic hierarchy.

Rick Rosner: Let's talk about the underclass in the future.

Right now in America we have a confrontation between two philosophies; the democratic and the Republican philosophies. The democrats think that we all get better by all helping each other, it takes a village philosophy.

The Republicans say that if you free America from rules and taxes then everybody will get out there and be entrepreneurial and succeed that way. That we'll create so much in the way of riches that we'll be able to, independent of government, share our riches with the less fortunate.

But really it's a matter of... the Republican philosophy is a bunch of horse shit, it's really people with the resources want to get resources and money trying to get them and hold on to them and saying 'fuck you' to people they consider as freeloaders. And it kind of trickle down and most of that stuff does not prove in itself through recent history.

The economy works better under Democrats. Republicans say that free America... not free America; America free of rules, regulations, and taxes will be great for everyone. But that has not proven to be so and Republicans also to say that any kind of sharing of resources a government, anything that involves taxation and then spelling the taxes on people is a form of socialism, that Obamacare is socialism and you even get people...

The Republicans are the most extreme they've been ever. And pretty much all the America's dumb people... the Republicans are partially-intentionally partially-accidentally crowd a big... if they're made being stupid into a demographic and it's their demographic.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 222 – Underclasses and Socialism

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 8, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: And so you get all sorts of stupid arguments from Republicans including arguments on even things such as highways and other forms of infrastructure that they may need to be privatized and lately bringing up to the government that advocating for these things is socialistic: garbage arguments.

And the deal is when you look at 100 years from now where human structures are still largely in place but things are rapidly changing, you're going to see a small group of economic leads competing for and owning most of the planet's economic resources unless something radical happens.

I doubt it will and then you'll have a vast underclass who exist who live lives that would be considered by contemporary Republicans somewhat socialist.

The elites will control all the resources and the underclass will be short of work, perhaps short of skills and maybe not. There may be the democratization of skills but even with skills, you may not be able to find adequate work.

The underclass won't be able to find enough work to pay their ways, so there's going to be some kind of guaranteed minimum something to allow the underclass to live; food, shelter, clothing, all of which will continue to grow cheaper over the next 100 years to the point where it won't seem as socialistic.

It won't be that socialistic because giving the underclass what they need to live won't cost that much and plus the economic elites will be supplying this stuff and sucking lots of profits out of it anyhow.

So it will be a weird exploitative capitalistic socialism with lucky rich people still competing to maintain the upper hand and a large underclass; some content, some trying to struggle out of the underclass having the resources to live because the cost is negligible.

I mean 100 years from now the population may be stabilizing because there will be so many technologies coming into play, they will distract or dissuade people from spitting out kids; people who have kids later if at all because of lifespans for most people will be increasing vastly.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 223 – Underclass, Kids, and Resource Dilution

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
July 9, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Technology will prompt people to have kids later or to hold on to their own resources. The economic elites holding on to their own resources because they can anticipate living indefinitely and not be diluting those resources through having kids.

The underclass; I don't know how it's going to work with them and kids, but I anticipate that the population will begin to level out around 12-13 billion, 14-15 billion. I don't know, but around a century from now.

And it doesn't have to be Idiocracy having a large number of people whose needs are taken care of and it might not even be fair to call them the underclass, you might call them the economically non-elite.

Those people with having their needs taken care of may be free to create all sorts of great things for the world. The risk is that will be economic stratification, but perhaps the more critical issue is whether access to tech will be stratified.

It is having all the tech and the have-nots not having as much access. I have a feeling that access to tech will be more democratized than wealth will.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 224 – Evolution of Philosophical View

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 10, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: So, how has your philosophical view evolved? Because we've talked about growing up as Jewish and not really questioning things, but also thinking of some of the stuff as not necessarily true.

Rick Rosner: The Jewish have much to do with my philosophy about the nature of the universe. I mean I had various earlier philosophical views but they weren't very sophisticated. They were little kid views.

Like one thing was, I was nerdy and bad on the play-ground and bad at sports and I understood that this was fitting but I didn't like it because the Declaration of Independence says that all men are created equal.

I mean I was seven years old, but I took that to mean that I was good in school but there had to be a countervailing bad thing so everybody pretty much equalled out. So like, my being good in the classroom was countervailed by being terrible socially.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 225 – Evolution of Social Maturity

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 11, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: And you were the top kid at your school?

Rick Rosner: I mean when you are seven years old, nobody knows whether you were the top kid, nor should know from top kid, every kid is different, but this was the IQ era and eventually, yeah, I found out I had the top IQ scores at my junior high, but that's a ridiculous criteria.

But I took it to heart when other stuff went wrong; in gym class or whatever, though that was probably a crutch, I should have kick out from under myself earlier and I realize that regardless of how...

I needed to make some social compromises or at least develop a more sophisticated understanding of how to get what I wanted socially at a, perhaps, earlier age, instead of defiantly being nerdy.

I wasn't trying to be nerdy, but I wasn't trying to change myself drastically until high school, the last year of junior high. But then it was...that was ninth grade and by then it was pretty much too late.

Or at least the way that how clueless I was, it was too late, because not only was my social taste naïve, I wanted all the things that dumb guy wanted, which was to have a really cute girlfriend from amongst the group of universally acknowledged popular cute girls.

Because I didn't know better. That's when you are young and socially dumb. That's who you get crushes on. Anyway, at a young age, I don't know, say six or eight, I remember asking myself the standard physiological question of, "Why am I not seeing as somebody else?"

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 226 – Evolution of Social Maturity into Philosophical Insight

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 12, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: And there is an answer to that, but I couldn't answer it. I can probably think of that, but the answer to why you are you and not anybody else is because all the information in your brain pertains to you, all your sensory information, all your thoughts.

You are you because you live within your own consciousness and the everyone lives within his or her own consciousness and for you to be somebody else, we would have to be that person. There is no escaping.

And everything you are comes from your perception of your own thinking and free to be, to get glimmers of somebody else, then you'll have to be some supernatural movie phenomenon where you start getting information piping in first from somebody else. That doesn't happen.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 227 – Longevity Escape Velocity, Almost

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
July 13, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: There are certainly people alive today who will live to 120. And, probably alive today who will live to 106, but that won't be happening for another hundred years at least because it just takes time for people to live that long.

So, we can look a little bit at what extended life-spans will look like, because it will take time for them to roll out.

My wife and I have just been helping my mother-in-law move into a senior living community. She was born 1933 as was my mom.

And, they've certainly enjoyed the benefits of you know better health care and better knowing what to eat and to exercise, stuff that their parents didn't have. So, they're pushing their mid-80's and likely will live into their 90's.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 228 – Making War, Making Babies

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 14, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: So, you have a generation, the main old people now, were born, well they're depression babies, they were born in the late 20's are really old now, and you have the people born in the 1930's just before the boomers.

And those people will get to live on average into their, probably early 90's. Which means a lot of them will leave into the 2020's and some of them may make it to 2030.

And then you have the boomers. The boomers have been changing the face of aging just by demographic force. Boomers were born from '45 through '64. Of course, they're a bigger presence in the U.S.

Because the term largely applies to the U.S., but applies to the rest of the world too because the rest of world, World War II ended in '45, and so people stopped killing each other and started making babies.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 229 – The Boomers and Xers

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 15, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: And then what comes after boomers, gen-x or I guess. Well, anyway people born from 1965 to 1980. And, those people will really, really benefit on a wide scale from extreme life extension.

Where people born between '65 and '80 may be looking at 40 or 50 years or more of extended life beyond the average like 75, you are going to get a bunch of people in the 1965 to 1980 cohort living to at least 120 and possibly 140/150.

But that takes us to into the 2080's and beyond. By the 2080's we are well passed, if you believe in the singularity, which I think you shouldn't entirely. The strong singularity believers believe that by 2040 that all questions will be answered thanks to AI.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 230 – The Layered Old

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 16, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: I kind of believe in a slow singularity. Where you get all of your questions answered thanks to humans working with AI, but it takes – it doesn't all happen in the 2040's it takes 60/80/100 years after that for everything to roll out.

The singularity is when everything happens at once. So, I guess I don't believe in the singularity. Because I think the singularity is going to take most of a century to play out.

So, by the 2080's you have a lot of – it may be possible for people to live indefinitely and then you are going to have the layered old.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 231 – The Lives of the Future Old (and Famous)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
July 17, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Or you will have people say born in 1970, still living healthily in 2080, but baring the marks of having lived 110 years.

The people who live 110 years 50 years after them won't have the same damage. Somebody who is born in 1970 and gets to live to 2080 and beyond is going to have a lot of damage from still living in normal times.

Somebody born in 1970 is 47 now. And, that person over the next 30 years may be able to be rejuvenated but still at the end of 30 years, that person is 77 and with money and good technology that person may look like somebody in their 50's or late 40's but weird, because that person has had all sorts of rejuvenation treatment.

That person may be able to keep going for another 40 years after that, but they are going to be, they may be healthy in their 110's but there will still be all sorts of signs that they didn't have the benefit of super advanced medical care for most of their life.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 232 – 2080s Old

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 18, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: So, I don't know, I guess I am guessing that in the 2080's you are going to have a lot of people who are very old by our standards still running around and living healthfully maybe with replacement and rejuvenated in all sorts of ways. But still kind of Frankenstein-ish from all of the different treatments they've had.

And, there's certainly going to be a lot of prejudice among different groups of the old versus different groups of the young.

Because if you were born in the second half of the 20th century and you are still around in the second half 21st century you will probably accumulated a bunch financial resources that younger people may be jealous of – because in the past death has been one of the greatest ways to transfer wealth.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 233 – Dead and Money Heirs

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 19, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Just people die and their money goes to their heirs. But as people live longer and longer that money is locked up. And, it will have effects on society.

Though, it's hard to predict exactly how pissed off people will be and how big the effects will be, because there is going to be a gazillion other economic things going on.

But it may be a world of resentment, of cross-generation resentment. Because at the same time you have people getting older and older and keeping their money by not dying, you are going to have a worsened job market due to AI, probably.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 234 – Socialist Bouncing Pillow

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 20, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: So, you may have kind of a socialist floor, a bouncing pillow that keeps the poor from being too poor thanks to a guaranteed minimum wage.

But, those people won't be living in luxury though certain aspects of that life may look semi-luxurious from our point of view. When you have, when even the poorest people can afford TV's that cover an entire wall.

Which is straight Ray Bradbury in the 1950's but is slowly coming true. And you know, decent food, clothing, semi-crappy shelter but not enough work and perhaps resentment against the have's. And the have's may be more and more obvious, based on them looking old and weird.

Anyway, that's enough of that. I am going to start veering into pure twaddle.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 235 – Metformin (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 21, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Alright, one more thing. Eventually, say once you get out of the 21st century medicine and technology becomes so good that at least for the have's – age is pretty much irradiated.

That everybody grows up with treatments that allow them to hold onto youth indefinitely if that's what they want.

There will be some obstinate jerks who insist on aging naturally, but after 2100, you won't necessarily be able to tell the difference between somebody born in, I don't know, 2040 from somebody born in 2080.

Somebody born in 2100, if you are born in 2040 you may benefit, there may be, you may start engaging in youth preservation as early as your teens.

For instance, metformin is this diabetes drug that gets prescribed to about 80 million prescriptions for metformin are written every year just in America. Metformin is a drug that regulates blood sugar and helps you use insulin more efficiently.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 236 – Metformin (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 22, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: It basically helps slow down your body clock. People who are on metformin seem to age more slowly. But it's not usually a drug, it's not a drug that is usually prescribed before age 40. And only then if you're looking like you are verging on type 2 diabetes.

But people who become obsessive, and all of society may become obsessive about youth preservation, people may start getting metformin pumps and pumps for other drugs installed as early as in their teens.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 237 – Metformin (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 23, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: If you have a wrist apparatus or a stomach apparatus they just rode a belt on your stomach and prevented your blood sugar from ever spiking, that would probably add 20 percent to your life span. So, people may start doing that stuff early in life.

So, somebody who is born in 2040 and goes on a pump for youth preservation in the 2060's may reach the year 2100 at chronological age 60 but looking as if he or she is in his or her 30's.

And may be able by the year 2100, may be able thanks to the technology of that time continue to look as if they are in their 30's indefinitely.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 238 – Metformin (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 24, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: And then there will be a zillion psychological implications of the end of aging.

But those will all get messed-in with other social factors that are going on, because most people who may be 80 and look like they are in their 30's will also have a lot of other technology to be plugged into other people.

You know there will be people, they will be infested with AI, so you can't just talk about a world in which nobody looks old, because it won't be like the Star Trek World that you see when, sometimes in the Star Trek movies they return to Earth and it is just people walking around and everybody looks young and pretty and they wearing a-symmetric clothes, and there's big plazas with big architecture.

And that's going to be a full picture of the year 2300, because people won't be the highest form of life. It will be augmented people and other manifestations of AI. So, it becomes pretty hard to predict what the world will look at by 2100 or 2130.

Alright, that's enough of that.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 239 – Paul Ryan Thang

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 25, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: We see the outcome of this Paul Ryan thing because of the short term follow-up. I don't know which is sort of all dress code.

That was a few days ago and. It will come in. And. Done will are so many more serious issues. In trying to get women to wear sleeves. Or I guess he has a protocol right under some kind of protocol that was so.

Trump gets his tax which he probably won't. He hasn't been able to get anything yes. That people making twenty five thousand dollars a year will all say forty dollars a year in taxes while people making three point four million dollars a year will save nine hundred thirty-seven thousand seven hundred dollars.

So with that much policy they're trying to get through.

Health care is tax cuts for the very wealthy. That's insane. Oh, Ryan's not the one to push that particular tax. But the justification for cutting taxes primarily on the rich has always been trickle down.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 240 – The Problem with Personal Heroes

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
July 26, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Just to take a step back, who are personal heroes for you although you have qualms with those terms?

Rick Rosner: Alright. Well, I don't know about heroes, but people I am interested in finding more about or reading more of their stuff.

Jacobsen: Like who?

Rosner: Like George Saunders I would say is a hero. He is a guy who is trained as an engineer and then became a writer who addresses a lot of issues of modern life that other people don't quite get.

The world is discovered. And so, he has rightfully been elevated into one of our great current writers. He's also personally kind and available. He just seems like a good guy and he is a great writer.

Other writers I like, though their interests don't always overlap with mine – I mean entirely overlap with mine, so they don't always write about what I wish they would write about. Stevenson, Charles Strauss, whoever wrote, I forget his name, *The Wind-Up Girl*.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 241 – Heroes? I’m Not Sure Either

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 27, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What about Cory Doctorow?

Rick Rosner: I like Kelly Oxford and Doctorow.

Jacobsen: Who is the segway from there?

Rosner: Just writers that I like.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Who was next?

Rick Rosner: People I like finding more about include like Elvis, I like reading about F. Scott Fitzgerald, although he was a huge mess. A provocative mess.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 242 – Smarter Than Who?

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 28, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: What about formally? You are on the World Genius Directory of Jason Betts.

Rosner: Hold on, hold on. I also like there's a whole little cluster of women at Harvard at the beginning of the 20th century who are responsible for much of our understanding of the structure of the universe. Who didn't get the credit they deserved.

Like *Henrietta Swan Leavitt* and her crew. What's that lady, the one that discovered the elemental composition of stars.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Cecelia Helena Payne?

Rick Rosner: Yeah. She's interesting, in that she came up with this huge discovery and is almost entirely absent from our collective scientific memory.

Compared to people whose names are pretty much household names, like Hubble — who builds his work upon the work of these women. I like reading about [indecipherable], but there's not too much more to read about him. So, anyway. Oh, you asked who is smarter than me, and...

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 243 – Goofy Ideas

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 29, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: Oh yeah. On the Betts listing, you would be number two, because he is number one.

Rosner: Well, everything has to start with how goofy the idea is that you can write about that way.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Okay. So, what is your preface to the question on competing for smarts?

Rick Rosner: I benefited from the ranking, but you have similar problems as to as when you ask, and worse problems are when you ask who is the world's strongest man. There are lots of different indices of strength.

And, any kind of measuring tool is sort of the arbitrary in whatever tasks picks or emphasizes. I can tell you that at the highest measured IQ of anybody who has ever written jokes for TV...

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 244 – Highest IQ?

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 30, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: In one interview you said you had the highest IQ in the world.

Rosner: have worked with plenty of people who are wildly smart, who are geniuses accordingly fairly, not the loosest definition of genius but not the strictest definition of genius.

You have to put things in context where I might be the funniest person currently alive within an IQ in the 190's. Or, I might be the IQiest person alive writing these written jokes for – like beyond the specific contexts it's hard to judge.

Anyway, you were saying. That I am the smartest person...I have got a good argument that I have the highest IQ in the world.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 245 – Ultra-High IQ

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

July 31, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Why? How?

Rick Rosner: I've taken more than thirty tests to measure ultra-high IQ, and have gotten the highest score ever earned on more than twenty of them. Nobody has that huge record of maxing out all of these high-end IQ tests.

The most that anybody else has done is two or three or five. Where they get the highest score ever. I don't know if anybody would even doubt it's high. I would think that other's people's claim to their IQ's generally rest on one or two really good performances on an IQ test.

Mine rests on my performance across dozens of tests. And decades of messing around with these tests.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 246 – 205 and 199, and Renorming

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 1, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: And if you take the Betts listing and the one test that they do take into account to decide your score in ranking from it, Evangelos scored 205 on SD16 on a test by the Cerebrals Society, which was a nonverbal, and therefore a culture fair test.

You scored 199 on SD16, so... but his is nonverbal. Your 199 was verbal. Was it not?

Rick Rosner: I don't know. I would have to look up the whole deal. And some of these scores are based on, these high-end tests get re-normed a lot.

So, as the people who make the test to get more results and do more statistical work, which itself maybe – I mean most of these people aren't psycho-metricians or statisticians.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 247 – Test for Genius

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 2, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: Okay. So, I just pulled it up. So, why don't I point to a Test for Genius for [undecipherable] from 2010.

Rosner: Okay.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: So, we can take this, and you also scored four 198.1's all by Betts from 2012. So, maybe, we can take a step back and that way you can speak more confidently.

Rick Rosner: I mean the whole thing is just arbitrary. I have practiced a lot, because I have taken so many tests, I know what it takes to do those tests, and I have to put in the work to do them.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 248 – Magnus

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 3, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Jacobsen: Okay.

Rick Rosner: So, you could argue that there are a huge practice effect and a huge determination in the diligence.

So, I mean the whole thing is arbitrary again in the same way that when, if you have ever watched the world's strongest man, see a bunch of guys who weigh anywhere from 280 to 400 pounds doing various things that take tremendous strength.

Lifting stone balls that are two feet in diameter. Pushing 800-pound truck tires that are 10 feet in diameter, end over end. Racing while towing a semi that might go for I don't know 10,000 pounds. And there are different people win different events.

There's no world's strongest man whose won that thing eight years in a row, I don't think, maybe there is. His name is probably something Scandinavian-like, the name Magnus Carlson comes to mind.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 249 – Strongest Man Competition

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 4, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Where guys from the Viking country seem to be really into this, and do really well. But, I don't know that you can claim that any one of those guys is absolutely the world's strongest man, because the tasks are arbitrary.

Then you have Olympic power holders who do things of strength and whole other set of tightly judged measures of strength. Then you have weird effects like the world's strongest teenager, for a long time was a kid out of one of the eastern bloc countries.

This kid turns out that he has like brutal scoliosis, so that when he dead lifts, he grabs the bar spine flexes, his rib cage drops a couple of inches, so his ribs are resting directly on his ileac crest of his pelvis.

And so, he only has to get the bar like two inches off the ground, because his body flexes so he doesn't...I've heard that when he bench presses you can put a basketball under his back because his spine is so curved. So, that's weird way of not cheating but of kind of leveraging one's strength due to anatomical peculiarity. And the measurement of IQ of intelligence has always been problematic.

And also, this is similar to the world's strongest man, what the hell, it doesn't matter, what matters...the world strongest man matters just within the context of the show called The World's Strongest Man. It matters within the context of like National Pride, which you could already use an important thing when it comes to power lifting.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 250 – Termanites

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 5, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: I'm just saying that the idea that IQ doesn't have a huge context of matter, especially since IQ was designed by [*undecipherable*], I believe in France as just a tool to see what kids needed help with in school.

He had IQ, I don't know what he called it, he probably didn't call it IQ, because that was probably termed coined by California.

But he came up with the idea of intelligence testing, on a five-point scale, where the ones and twos had learning difficulties, needed help, and the fours and fives had advanced learning abilities and needed perhaps different educational resources too, and the threes are your average students who might be okay in just a regular classroom.

And then Terman gets a hold of the idea and probably comes up with an index of 100 being average. You know with differences of measured on a scale of the standard deviation of 16, and he kind of Americanized it, he kind of tech-ed it up.

Going from a one through five scale to a scale that gives you two or three-digit score, which gives the illusion of much more precision.

I can brag about my IQ and use it to try to get recognition and maybe eventually a book deal or employment, or somehow monetize it the way like Marlin Savion who was known for having the highest IQ in the genus book of records in the 80's has monetized her IQ. She has probably six or seven million dollars over her life-time.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 251 – Chance and Sport

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 6, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: So, what's the deal with the chance and sports?

Rick Rosner: So, the deal in sport is people feel that victories, defeats, mean something. And I just came across data that quantifies how chancey each sport is. And it kinda verified my suspicion that baseball is the chanciest of the sports.

Kinda on a par with hockey, anytime you have a low amount of scoring, that allows for more chance of outcomes and games.

I guess with basketball it's got the most instances. The sport of least chance has the probability that the less good team wins. I really wanted to know who the best team is, in a playoff or in a game, you'd play forever possibly, with a chance victory by the lousier team.

It's ruled out. In baseball 9 innings, and in hockey, 3 periods are not enough for that to be ruled out. Baseball you might have to play 24 innings across 2 days to really squeeze out the chance, the lousier team then wins down to a less than 10%. I'm just guessing with the super bowl, where a game was that important. You're only playing 4 quarters, so the lousier team can win.

So, if you're really interested in the fairest outcome, it really tells you which team is the best. The super bowl should probably be at least 6 quarters or probably double.

The super bowl should be twice as long as it is played across 2 days if you have to. People don't want that. The best team doesn't always win. People will tend to ignore chance and instead kind of victories and defeat in the structure.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 253 – Hacking Wars

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 8, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Hacking wars go on all the time where different entities, cyber structures, or whatever you want to call it, information processing machinery and the people who operate them are fighting other countries and other groups information processing machinery plus the people who operate them.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 254 – Hacking Wars and the 2016 Election

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
August 9, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: 2016 election, you can argue that it was the first cyber war election. It was the first of a lot of things, but it was the first election partially determined by cyber warfare, or significantly determined—determined to a significant extent by cyber warfare.

It was also the first election where the disruption caused by AI played a significant part. And for the foreseeable future, there will be conflict among information processing technologies from the people who operate them.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 255 – Blobs of Information Processing

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 10, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: So you can imagine two centuries from now, it's impossible to predict, but you can imagine large blobs, large agglomerations of information processing machinery.

Whatever comes after, you've got mega, then you have Giga, then you have Tera, then you have Peta and Femto, take that another three or four prefixes, or five prefixes, you know whatever stands for ten to the I don't know, twenty seventh? Calculations per second.

Machinery that can do that many calculations per second, but in a shared way that kind of acts like consciousness. One blob squaring off against an equally powerful blob, just to hold onto their section of the world's information processing real estate.

And you can imagine people living in those things. In cyber worlds, because it's just cheaper to live there, because there's preservation there. If the blobs are durable and you can store yourself, multiple copies of yourself in case of mishap or foul play.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 256 – The Breakdown of Self

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 11, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: People may—will certainly give themselves over to these entities. Not everyone and not all the time but people will belong to them and the people will participate into various degrees in willing the action.

People won't be people. People will be broken down, will be melded with other information processing entities, and the self, I mean, some people—or entities will, will hold their selves to be super important and will live existence—it will have existence that maintain the integrity of the self.

Other entities will sled it up and merge and split and bud and be part of a more fluid information processing structures where you know, the self doesn't, isn't at the level of you know, what we would consider the self.

The self might just be much bigger in terms of the information processing ability it has and the—where it's getting its information input, its sensory input from. And so living as a human will still be possible and there will still be probably billions.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 257 – Communists and Hollywood

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 12, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Communists had some success in infiltrating Hollywood, getting some projects made that were very pro soviet. At the same time, there were a lot of people who got up in Hollywood communism because it looked like a good way to get laid.

The women that you'd meet at commie parties in Hollywood tended to be I guess looser than other women and so a lot of people would attend these functions just to hook up or have a shot at hooking up.

In any case, that was 80 years ago. But—Russia's greatest success in infiltrating America is now.

They have fucked up our political system, or taken a situation that was already leaning towards the fucked up and you know, doubled the fucked upness.

And conservatives are—well, not exactly conservatives, but staunch Fox news viewing Republicans and Fox news pundits are falling all over themselves to explain how Russia's involvement isn't that big a deal.

But we have the worst bunch of yahoos holding national office. And well, since the gilded age, and possibly, all of American history. That's it.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 258 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 13, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Long term thinking. Long term thinking is needed. Most of us only do short term thinking. Why, and why is it a problem now?

Rick Rosner: Well you just mentioned off tape, you mentioned the marshmallow test. You can tell the difference between kids with discipline, kids who don't have discipline. You sit a kid in a room alone with a marshmallow on a plate.

This test was performed probably 30 years ago. Nowadays you'd want to give them, I don't know, something more tempting than a freaking marshmallow. I don't know, half a pop tart. I don't know what kids right now for junk.

Anyway, you tell the kid you can have the marshmallow now, or if you wait till I come back in five minutes, you can have two marshmallows. And some kids pass the marshmallow test, some kids fail. Anyway, this all kind of harkens back to my favorite quote, I guess, in the long term, we're all dead.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 259 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
August 14, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: John Maynard Keynes said that during the great depression, when somebody must've asked him what's the best long term solution. And he was saying, f- long term solutions. We need to do something about now.

And the deal is, we're perishable. We are flowers that bloom for a day and then die. We're done in, even though our life spans are longer, now by, you know, 20 years or so than they were when Maynard Keynes said in the long term we're all dead—in the long run we're all dead.

We're still all dead eventually and pretty quickly. I've been helping my mother in law move into her senior living community. You know, where the average age is, mid 80s. And I'm mid to late 50s now, but we do not have much time.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 260 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking (3)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
August 15, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Unless there are great strides made in medicine, I've got, another 20, if I'm lucky, 25 years of competent life left. That's just nothing. But anyway, we are, we are born and live and pass away fast. It's understandable that our framework is short term.

We are evolved creatures and we've been evolved to create the next—to have sex, have babies, and send the next generation off to do the same thing.

Evolutionary forces tend not to work more than—I mean, an evolutionary victory is spitting out the next generation. Now, we're—humans are in a slightly different position than a lot of animals in that human babies are born incomplete.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 261 – Necessity of Long-Term Thinking (4)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner
August 16, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: Because our evolutionary tactic, the thing that helps us occupy our niche in the world is having a big brain. But brains can only be so big before they kill the mother during childbirth by getting caught in the birth canal.

So, you know, women, when they give birth, their pelvises split apart, the baby's head gets forced out.

The baby's head at the point of birth has overlapping plates that can kind of get compacted as the baby passes through the birth canal to make the skull just a little bit smaller. But anyway, human brains are as big as they can possibly be and not kill moms.

But that's not big enough. So there's still a lot of growth and wiring that needs to go on after birth. Which means that human babies take you know, at least ten years to raise. Nobody now would let 10-year-olds out into the world on their own.

You can argue that human babies now take 18 to 20—well Donald Trump was just talking about how Don Jr. really can't be held that much responsible for meeting with Russian.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 262 – Endless Forms Most Beautiful (1)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 17, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Rick Rosner: There will be just being able to go on indefinitely in one's current form or in a number of, in a variety of alternate forms, or, you can allow yourself to be absorbed into a larger information processing entity.

Or, and that absorption can, you'll be able to choose from a range of levels of absorption, of merging with larger entities.

And by choosing, I mean, yeah, if you're lucky you'll get to choose, and if you're less lucky, the level of absorption will not be entirely up to you which in itself will be okay also in that we don't—our brains consist of a number of information processing, not conscious entities but of some parts of our brain, and we feel no loyalty to certain parts of our processing apparatus.

[End of recorded material]

Ask A Genius 263 – Endless Forms Most Beautiful (2)

Scott Douglas Jacobsen & Rick Rosner

August 18, 2017

[Beginning of recorded material]

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: Do you have like a metric for that?

Rick Rosner: Oh, I don't know. Just where I feel like there's—yeah we could have a metric, where I feel I'm more likely to say laughable nonsense than I am just saying something that happens to sound like it contains insight.

Jacobsen: Like it's proportional to your functioning level?

Rosner: Probably. I don't know, that was—part of not hitting the twaddle.

[End of recorded material]

License and Copyright

License



In-Sight Publishing and *In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal* by Scott Douglas Jacobsen is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Based on a work at www.in-sightjournal.com.

Copyright

© 2012-2018 by Scott Douglas Jacobsen and Rick Rosner, and *In-Sight Publishing* and *In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal* 2012-2018. Unauthorized use and/or duplication of this material without express and written permission from this site's author and/or owner is strictly prohibited. Excerpts and links may be used, provided that full and clear credit is given to Scott Douglas Jacobsen and Rick Rosner, and *In-Sight Publishing* and *In-Sight: Independent Interview-Based Journal* with appropriate and specific direction to the original content.