

The Public Political Discourse of Jordan Peterson Deconstructed (the Monk Debate 2018)

© Daurius Figueira (September 2020)

The Public Discourse of Jordan Peterson Deconstructed (The Monk Debate: Political Correctness Gone Mad ? Toronto, Ontario, Canada May 18, 2018)

This deconstruction is based on the discourse of Jordan Peterson contained in the book “Political Correctness Gone Mad” which is an archive of Peterson’s statements in (a) a pre-debate interview, (b) the actual debate and (c) post-debate interview which comprised the format of the Monk debate of May 2018. This deconstruction will then flow with Peterson’s discourse as presented in the book.

The Pre-debate Interview

Peterson interviewed by Rudyard Griffith defines his work as follows: “What I’ve been concentrating on mostly is psychological work at the level of the individual, which is the very appropriate level for me given that I’m a clinical psychologist.” (Pg. 29). Peterson is then focused on the psychology of the individual and speaks to and from this work terrain. What then is his expertise to speak of the social order, politics and political correctness which are instruments of and constituted by power in a social context? Griffith speaks of Peterson being a YouTube sensation and the author of the bestselling book “12 Rules for Life: An Antidote to Chaos” which establishes Peterson as a guru of wellness and self-help. In this context Peterson’s discourse of the social order, politics, power, power relations and discourse revealed in this Monk debate is revealing as it strips bare and reveals Peterson’s deep rooted discourse of white male, North Atlantic supremacy/white supremacy. In response to a question from Griffith on his vocal position on political correctness Peterson responds as follows: “Well, I’m no fan of the radical Left,” “Just because you’re no fan of the radical Left doesn’t mean you support the radical Right. That’s absolutely a preposterous position. But the universities, especially the humanities and social sciences, are absolutely dominated by left-wing thinking.” “And I find the doctrine that unites them to be unconscionably pernicious. It’s basically a collectivist doctrine.” “There’s every reason to have a left-wing, you need a left-wing partly because being left-wing is in part temperamental; it’s not going away. And also because, when our society produces hierarchies, which it will inevitably do, people tend to stack up at the bottom. It’s in the nature of hierarchies to produce that as an outcome. And what that means is that the people who are dispossessed in the hierarchical arrangements need a voice, and that’s the Left, obviously, and fair enough. But it’s also obvious that just as the Right can go too far, the Left can go too far as well. But when the Left goes too far, it’s something that’s ill-defined, and to me that’s not acceptable.” (Pgs. 30-31). In Peterson’s discourse there is the concept of the Manichean duality of the radical Left and the radical Right and both are constituted by persons noted for their extremism both in thought, worldview and action, especially social action. But Peterson expresses only an assault on the extreme Left that is rooted in the discourse of the 20th Century Cold War renovated for the 21st century. This radical, extremist Left wing discourse is in the 21st century exerting hegemony over the universities of the North Atlantic thereby posing a grave threat to the stability of the social order of the North Atlantic. Why? Because this radical Left wing discourse is

rooted in collectivism, as Communism was, which poses a clear and present danger to the power and hegemony of the North Atlantic over the non-white world. This hegemony is the product of a hierarchical social order that embraces and enjoys individuality, thereby constituting the Manichean duality individual/collective, individualism/collectivism, democracy/socialism, communism. Peterson is then a Cold War dinosaur stranded in the 21st Century. Just as the organic Right, the organic Left is constituted by the hierarchical social order of the North Atlantic as the Whole that is the Society, the Organism, creates a hierarchy in its daily functioning, which means that hierarchy is natural, functional, necessary and organic to the North Atlantic social order. Since the vast majority of the members of the social order end up in the base of the pyramidal structure of the social order, an organic Left is constituted by the social order to give voice to those in the bottom of the hierarchy, not to challenge the order by propagating a collectivist alternative. By extension the organic Right represents the apex of the pyramid and their duty is to preserve the hierarchy, as the organic Left is also charged with, by ensuring that in spite of the hierarchy individuality/individualism flourishes. In Peterson's discourse there is no inherent contradiction between social hierarchy and individuality/individualism as he insists that North Atlantic hierarchy is the foundation and terrain of North Atlantic individuality/individualism. Peterson can relentlessly make this discursive sleight of the hand trick, as his discourse is devoid of a concept of power and power relations. Peterson speaks of a social hierarchy that is devoid of power and power relations which makes it everything to everybody, sublimely malleable, molded in every discursive agents image and likeness as it has no specificity being the product of the imagination to serve their political agenda. This is why in this social hierarchy of Peterson there is no human agency, for there can only be the social hierarchy that constitutes individuality/individualism which must be devoid of human agency in order to ensure the hegemony of the social hierarchy. Peterson is then the consummate collectivist constituted by a social order under the hegemony of Biopower and Biopolitics, hence his paranoia over the discourse of Michel Foucault. Peterson reveals his worldview when he insists that the organic left-wing is constituted by the hierarchical nature of the social order which comprises the Whole, the sentient Organism. The organic left-wing is tasked with channeling the voices of the base of the social pyramid, by giving voice to the dispossessed articulated by a discourse that is organic to the Whole, that integrates the dispossessed into the Whole. But there is a built in threat as the left-wing and the dispossessed it gives voice to are temperamental which means that they are prone to unreasonable mood changes which are the result of their position in the social hierarchy. Their temperament demands an organic Left to ensure the preservation of the social order but the organic Left has the same temperament which in the absence of controls will give birth to the grave threat posed by a radical, extremist Left. Peterson does not posit the same threat emanating from the organic Right as the apex of the pyramid is not temperamental, hence he is silent on the nature of the threat posed by the extreme Right. Peterson is then insisting that the lower level of the social order and its voice, the Left, for the good of the social order has to be integrated into an order that minimizes the potency of the temperament of the lower

levels constituted by the Whole, the sentient Organism. This order is premised on the hegemony of the apex, the oligarchy of the social order and the Right for this is an organic, natural order that ensures the stability and sustainability of the Whole and control of the temperament of the lower level utilizing instruments of Biopower and a discourse of Biopower summed up with the discursive concept of individuality/individualism and expressed as the Manichean duality of individuality/individualism: collectivity/collectivism in Peterson's discourse. Peterson is then defending in the second decade of the 21st Century the social order constituted in the North Atlantic by neo-liberal, financial markets capitalism centered on the world hegemony of the USA where he rails against the threat posed to this order premised on the hegemony of oligarchs in constitutionally democratic states against the radical, extremist Left. The Cold War is now being waged internally in the North Atlantic as communism, the external threat, has been defeated by the inherently superior Whole. In this discursive concept Peterson is then unashamedly an elitist who believes that the apex of the pyramid is constituted by the Whole, the sentient Organism to exert hegemony over the bottom level as it is best suited, outfitted and chosen to ensure the sustainability of the organic Whole across time. What if these chosen ones exhibit specific race, gender and class characteristics is this then acceptable in a democracy for Peterson?

Peterson now identifies this radical, extremist Left that he is railing against as: "And the post-modern, neo-Marxist pastiche that makes up the radical Left philosophy that's at the bottom of social sciences and humanities now has nothing about it that's useful, as far as I am concerned. It has nothing to do with compassion; it has nothing to do with my lack of what you would say? Rudyard Griffiths: Empathy? Jordan Peterson: Precisely. They're completely separate issues. And that's another thing that really bother's me about political correctness. It's like: 'Well we have hammerlock on empathy.' First of all, empathy is not enough. It's not even close to enough, and an excess of empathy can do terrible things. And secondly, you don't have a hammerlock on empathy, and to ally that with a philosophy that essentially assigns people to their identity via their group membership, and then to read not only the current state of affairs but history itself as a battleground between competing groups is, I think, dangerous. I think it's obvious that it's dangerous if you know anything about history." (Pgs. 31-32). Peterson unleashes sweeping generalizations on strands of social theorizing devoid of rigor, which betrays his ignorance of what he attacks. His prime and only theory that constitutes the radical, extremist Left is Marxism/historical materialism/scientific socialism, but what he vehemently rejects and rails against as the cornerstone of historical materialism predates Marx, Engels and scientific socialism. The voice of the dispossessed in Europe before Marx and Engels and their "Communist Manifesto" insisted on the rejection of the inequality that was forced on them by the dictatorship of the oligarchs and the solution to their poverty and arrested development was the bond of solidarity premised on all that they experienced in common in their power relations with the oligarchy and the State the oligarchy exerted hegemony over. For the dispossessed, solidarity was premised on what made them unique as an oppressed group in the social

order and the basis for social and political action to emancipate themselves. This was especially so from the English Revolution illustrated by the Levelers, the American Revolution, the French Revolution and the Jacobin insurgency, the Haitian Revolution, the Irish revolts and the insurgency of the 1780s to the 1790s in Britain. In this flow of North Atlantic history there was no Marxism/scientific socialism driving this process, for Marx never made a revolution, others did it in his name in countries he insisted were incapable of generating the 'great proletarian revolution'. Peterson's discourse is therefore ahistorical, revisionist in intent to deny the historical fact that the dispossessed of Europe conceive and visualize of their social condition in terms of power relations between groups in the social order insisting that their liberation from their position of arrested development can only be attained by leveling the social order, by breaking the social hegemony that the oligarchs exercise over the State and their group. Peterson is then deliberately selling his snake oil which denies the dispossessed social and political action that addresses their life reality and condition. For Peterson, the dispossessed is incapable of joint and individual action towards securing the success of an agenda to their benefit. Any such action they undertake Peterson insists, is not the outcome of human agency, of their human agency, but the fabrication of the post-modern, neo-Marxists forever condemned to repeat the mantra of their guru Marx across time as they are devoid of all creativity, simply parrots. It is these parrots of Marx who have clouded the minds and burdened the dispossessed with the discourse of political correctness, insisting on group identity and identity politics which challenges the order of power in the social order and the hegemony of the oligarchs, the apex of the pyramid. Peterson is attacking the post-modern, neo-Marxists in defense of the order of power, his is a discourse of power seeking to convince the dispossessed that their interests are best served by immersing themselves in individuality/individualism and foregoing the historical tool of solidarity of the dispossessed, thereby embracing divide and conquer. The issue is not then compassion for the dispossessed and showing empathy with the dispossessed, it is preserving the social order of power in favor of the hegemonic oligarchy as they are the apex of the pyramid of the perfect, absolute Whole. This is why too much empathy is dangerous as you can be seduced by the worldview of the dispossessed thereby failing to recognize your duty to the perfect, Organic, Whole, which is the basis of the grave danger posed by the neo-Marxists to the 21st Century North Atlantic social order. Peterson is not only a warrior for the preservation of the integrity of the Whole, but also a discursive agent that formulates and applies instruments of power to police the dispossessed through his discourse of wellness and self-help rooted in individuality/individualism. He is a discursive agent, policeman and snake oil salesman in the service of the hegemonic oligarchy of the North Atlantic. You apply his snake oil to your mind to soothe the maladies of your arrested development. The interviewer, Rudyard Griffiths now pushes the hot topic button of Peterson: the white race and white privilege and Peterson's reply is a lesson in a clumsy, half-baked white male supremacist attempt to deny the existence of racism and white privilege in the social order of the North Atlantic of 2018. Peterson states: "That's a good example of the conflation of empathy with ideology, first of all, the majority in any society has

privilege. That's the whole point of a society: to set up a system so that the bulk of the people in the system can do well, and then you build in protection for minorities. So, to conflate that with race is not acceptable. It's a kind of toxic sleight of hand and it's extraordinarily dangerous. Apart from that it's an empty claim. Some people have advantages that others don't. Well, obviously. And if you take anyone apart into the multitudes of categories that they can be taken apart into, what you will find is that on some of those dimensions they're doing better than other people, sometimes for rather arbitrary reasons, and on other dimensions they are doing worse." (Pgs. 32-33). Peterson insists that with the radical left empathy for the dispossessed combines with ideology which constitutes this drive to assault the social order on the grounds of white privilege and non-white exclusion on the basis of racism. It is impossible for a white radical leftist to exhibit empathy with the experience of a non-white of white racist supremacy, especially a white radical leftist whose worldview is rooted in the discourse of white supremacy as those of Marx and Lenin. The insistence on the continued existence of white privilege, in spite of constitutional guarantees of equality before the law in the North Atlantic, that continues to echo and reverberate in the social discourse of the North Atlantic is the product of the social and political action of non-whites in the North Atlantic, not that of the radical left. Peterson's radical left remains the captive of white supremacist discourse regardless of the race of its membership. The push from below in the North Atlantic continues in the 21st Century and is heightened by the intensification of racist oppression arising from the collapse of neo-liberal financial market capitalism in 2008. From 2008 onwards non-white race minorities in the North Atlantic have experienced a worsening of their living conditions, a heightening of homelessness and poverty, whilst targeted by militarized policing intent on criminalizing and eliminating a perceived black threat to a white dominated social order through assassination and imprisonment. This is an existential reality for non-white minorities in the North Atlantic, the reality of which is articulated by members of these non-white minorities and for Peterson to insist that this articulation of lived reality is the product of the conflation of empathy and ideology by the radical left is white male supremacist arrogance at its most dangerously potent state. Dangerously potent to deny lynchings and strangulation by white police officers until the non-white victim is dead. At least the KKK in your face makes it clear that you are dead meat. Peterson moves to justify the white supremacist power structure by insisting that in a social order there is always a privileged majority and you have a minority that is lagging behind which demands protection from the social order, but there is no order of race privilege and race exclusion in the North Atlantic. The privileged majority is multiracial and the underprivileged minority is multiracial which proves for Peterson that the central issue is not racial discrimination and white supremacy. Another Peterson illusion from his grab bag of tricks as a snake oil salesman. When race minorities are over-represented per capita amongst the underclass, the working poor, the prison population, the homeless and underrepresented per capita amongst the oligarchs, the managerial class in the private and public sectors, the military command; whilst over-represented in the lower echelons and the managers of academia, science and medicine then you have the proof

that Peterson's concept of the multiracial majority/multiracial minority is simply a discursive concept in his discourse of power as he fuels the white supremacist onslaught in the second decade of the 21st Century in the North Atlantic and on the world. Peterson at the end of this statement reveals the strategic and tactical instruments of his discourse, its instruments of power expressed by his insistence on the focus on the individual rather than the group. For this discourse and its instrument of power recognizes only individual trees denying the probity of focusing on forests for concepts of the group, group identity and group social and political action are dangerous tools in the hands of the radical, extremist left in their quest to destroy the Organic Whole replacing it with a collectivist nightmare that destroys individuality/individualism. To preserve the Organic Whole from attack and destruction Peterson must then deny the quantum field/terrain that is constituted by human agency at the level of individual/group consciousness distinct yet joined at the hips, inseparable yet not reducible to each other, each exhibiting specificity but lacking the ability for independent action. The discourse of Self is then a discourse of power. Individual/group consciousness operates in a quantum field/terrain because of the reality that it has no specificity, no capacity for social action without an incessant interaction with power/power relations between human individuals and groups. Individuality is only coherent in the context of power relations. Hence Robinson Crusoe's quest for Man Friday, where with the discovery of Man Friday the power relation between Crusoe and Man Friday was defined by the discourse of white supremacy, as Crusoe was white, Massa and Man Friday was non-white, Nigger, inferior. Discourse then defined the individuality of Crusoe and Man Friday not the personal traits of both, the personality of both nor the fitness to dominate of both. Upon discovery discourse immediately placed a soul over the body of Man Friday and declared him inferior to white boy Crusoe. Now we have arrived at the crux of the issue which exposes Peterson's white supremacist agenda. Power through discourse with its instruments of power impacts, constitutes and assails individuality and group consciousness, there is then no Absolute that is individuality/individualism. This is a discursive concept manufactured by discourse to impact humans in the social order to enable the hegemony of a specific group over the social order. Peterson is then defending the hegemony of the oligarchs of the North Atlantic choosing to ground himself in the discourse of white supremacy setting out to deny power, power relations and its strategic importance to the quantum terrain of individual/group consciousness. He attempts to do this by manufacturing the Absolute of individuality/individualism that is the product of the Organic Whole designated as the sole basis of human agency. This Absolute generates individuals who reflect the Uncertainty of life which requires Peterson to instruct individuals on the means necessary to overcome the Uncertainty of life. This is Peterson's idyllic world devoid of power relations which has the instrument of power of his discourse, the Absolute/ individuality/individualism, to destroy the threats posed to the existing social order of this idyllic world. A snake oil salesman rooted in white supremacist discourse driven by a desire for power, a wannabe cult leader.

Peterson continues to rail against the concept of race privilege in the interview, but he now reveals his political strategy to attack an enemy concept by using his definition of it in order to assail it with his “facts” that in no way are relevant to the concept as used by its progenitors. Peterson is then fashioning a political discourse aimed at seducing a specific white audience to constitute this audience as the base of a counter movement, a counter social movement that will resist the social movements that present the threat to Peterson’s beloved Organic Whole with its instrument of the Absolute. Peterson is then targeting specific social movements of the second decade of the 21st Century seeking to constitute white resistance to these dangerous social movements within the context of the discourse of white supremacy. In my non-white persona Peterson is not speaking to me, he is in fact attacking me. Peterson states: “My grandmother was a cleaning woman for farms in central Saskatchewan in the 1930s. She cooked for threshing crews. She chopped woodpiles that were as big as the damned cabin to get through the winter. So, where’s the privilege? I see it accrues to me as a consequence of my race. On, I see. So now we’re going to have a discussion about race, are we? And that’s the thing about the toxic Left everything is about group identity. And so, let’s take the argument even further and say, okay, well, because of my skin color I am differentially privileged from a historical privilege. So what? You’re going to make everybody now pay for some historical inequity on the basis of their race?” (Pg. 33). For Peterson white race privilege is debunked by the fact that there are poor whites, whites in the underclass which is a political device to motivate a white backlash against the social movements that speak to racist social orders of the North Atlantic whilst refusing to engage with the discursive concepts of these social movements in the context of their usage. Utter white racist contempt. Peterson now steps further into the event horizon of the Apocalypse insisting that it is a racist, anti-white assault by these social movements that utilize these discursive concepts. All it is anti-white race chatter which demands the white race now defend itself by any means necessary. Peterson attacks the concept of reparations by separating the liability of those in the 21st century who enjoy the benefits of (material and otherwise) differential privilege to those in the 21st century who are the descendants of those who were enslaved. Peterson insists that there is a statute of limitation on white liability in the 21st Century for being differentially privileged to the progeny of the enslaved. Peterson accepts white differential privilege as fact and it is only those who actually enslaved the Africans are liable for the payment of reparations. White persons who benefit from differential privilege today did not actually own slaves, are then exempt from liability across time, making differential privilege a white right and entitlement in keeping with Manifest Destiny. Peterson is a David Duke 2.0. This is another instance of Peterson’s political discourse cobbled together to constitute political action from the white race in its defense in the face of a relentless assault from its enemies intent on destroying a social order that is rooted in white supremacy. Peterson’s Turner Diaries wrapped in academic snake oil.

Peterson now deals with the discourse of the oppression of women by male patriarchy of the radical left using the same formula applied to the discourse of race and racism by insisting that this is not an issue of gendered power relations, for power is a faulty

concept. For Peterson power always connotes oppression which renders it invalid as a concept. Peterson states: “And you’re going to view the history of the relationship between men and women as one fundamentally of oppression? That’s the way we’re going to play this, that it wasn’t that men and women cooperated throughout history to bring themselves out of the fundamental catastrophe that history has always been?” “We’re going to revisit that and we’re going to say, ‘No, really, the fundamental reality of the world is that men oppressed women.’” (Pgs. 33-34). To cobble together his political discourse targeting the women’s movement he has to reinvent History as an Absolute going back to the prescientific discourse of the North Atlantic’s Enlightenment, where History the Absolute is immune from human agency as it has nothing to do with the existential condition of man, but of top down power with man as the recipient. Peterson frames this mythic bullshit as the basis of a discourse to deny power/power relations in an attempt to create this white idyllic, where there is no oppression but partnership because History the Absolute presents man with a resolute challenge for daily survival which can only be overcome through partnership of the genders not the oppression by man of woman. History the Absolute then necessitates the multiple discourses of Peterson for he has the key to guide the individual on the strategic path to victory in this trying environment. The desire to be a cult leader is manifestly palpable. The interviewer then poses a question on the power of women in the social order of the 21st Century and the need for them now to exert this power as seen in the #MeToo movement. In his reply Peterson presents his problematic of power by revealing his discourse of white social hierarchies having the capacity to be operationally devoid of tyranny. The social order of the North Atlantic is hierarchical but not tyrannical, which potently illustrates the inadequacy of power as a heuristic tool in the North Atlantic. Peterson makes this declaration on his equation of power with oppression which is a fumbling device manufactured by a journeyman or a political hitman. This discursive construct of Peterson is rooted in the discourse of white supremacy and the manifest destiny of the white man. Peterson states: “First of all, when the discussion is about power, it immediately sends a shudder up my spine, partly because part of the post modern doctrine, in its alliance with neo-Marxism-which is the world’s strangest alliance, by my estimate-states that everything is about power. And I don’t believe that. I think hierarchies are only about power when they’ve transitioned themselves into tyrannies, and I don’t think the fundamental hierarchies that characterize the West are tyrannies, comparatively speaking.” “compared to everywhere else in the world right now and every other hierarchy throughout history, we’re doing pretty damned well.” (Pg. 34). Peterson’s discourse of power is revealed where power only exists in hierarchical social orders where tyranny abounds as Russia, China and the Third World unlike the North Atlantic where there is no tyranny, no oppression, hence no power relations in the human interactions that drive the social order. What there is then is an Organic Whole uniquely white, North Atlantic which constitutes a social order where there no need for tyranny and oppression and power for this is an Organic order that nurtures all individuals enabling them to attain self realization. Those who find themselves disadvantaged, less privileged are to blame for their own condition as they

have failed to strategise in the manner necessary to ground with the Organic Whole to attain self realization. But don't despair Peterson is here to guide you to self actualization, all you need to do is join his cult. Peterson constructs a white supremacist idyllic, where the white hegemonic race has no moral imperative to accept its action in using various devices/instruments of power to render minorities in all forms Children of a Lesser God, on a sustainable basis across time in the North Atlantic. Peterson is in fact absolving the white hegemonic race of the North Atlantic of all guilt for its actions from 1492 to 2018 as it is a race that stands unique in the history of mankind, it is the only exceptional race in human history endowed with Manifest Destiny, which exonerates it from all guilt and liability. Peterson denies that in the North Atlantic there is any basis to the discourses of all the social movements that are challenging the hegemonic order, that he vehemently defends by any means necessary, including rationalizing genocide. Any discourse of a social movement that assaults the hegemonic order Peterson dismisses as the product of the radical left hence irrelevant, which in a region without tyranny is thought control. What is noted with Peterson's discourse is how he formulated it by the process of reverse engineering, by first identifying the discourses that must be attacked, then creating discursive concepts to define them, which constitutes Peterson's Reality of what he says they say as a Soul that he then drapes over them in an attempt to silence them. Any debate with Peterson is then futile as his discourse is deaf, simply not interested in what you are saying, it is dogma, simply discursive tyranny, for he is only interested in motivating his white target audience of a specific demographic. When Peterson debates he is only interested in speaking to his target audience and will do everything and anything to motivate his audience, including lies. Peterson speaks publicly as a demagogue, a cult leader, one who desires the unbroken attention of his target audience, a narcissist. The very accuracy and rigor of his discursive concept of the radical Left, of neo-Marxism, of post-modernism, power etc. reveals the glaring lack of depth in his knowledge of these discourses and his refusal to present the nuances and diversity of thought he lumps together as a cogent, coherent whole. But these omissions are necessary to build his discursive concept to demonize the radical Left which he created out of nothing as the plausible, potent threat to white hegemony of the North Atlantic in the second decade of the 21st Century. Peterson is no right wing ideologue, for all he believes in is Peterson and his discourse is built on chimeras his mind creates to attain the power and the glory he desires. Persons as Peterson in the history of the North Atlantic when endowed with power have always left a mark on history that is a trail of human blood and suffering.

Peterson now addresses the issue of women in the North Atlantic by furiously articulating a neo-Malthusian discourse of population and population control which states that the womb of the woman and the power of pro-creation that only women wield in the species is what denied the social mobility of women in the North Atlantic. Peterson states: "And the fact is once we had reliable birth control, which really only happened in the 1960s, women were welcomed most fundamentally-although also opposed, but most fundamentally welcomed-into every position of authority and competence that could possibly be laid open to them,..." "So how fast do you expect a

transformation to take place? The argument is: well, it would never have taken place without political pressure. No...sorry. What triggered it was reliable birth control. And that made it possible. It was reliable birth control, reliable menstrual sanitation, and all of those things that no one ever takes into account that made the playing field open. And it's transformed utterly in, what, fifty years? How fast do you think these things can happen?" (Pg. 35). The hierarchy of the social order of the North Atlantic is not tyrannical, oppressive, hence power is absent in the relations between members of this social order. Gender bias and discrimination is not organic to this exceptional social order, it cannot be, for the Organic Whole drives the human relations of this social order on the utility of the individual to the greater Whole which is greater than the sum of the individual parts of the social order. Procreation, child rearing and socialization located in the family is the organic locus of the woman where her womb is her destiny for the sustainability across time of the Organic Whole, consensually embraced by the individuals of the social order for there is an absence of tyranny. The Organic Whole also determines consensually that a woman menstruating presents a problem to the social order and should be confined to private space as the space devoted to procreation and child rearing. In his neo-Malthusian discourse the woman has to be emancipated from the role assigned to her by her womb and its cyclic process that drives procreation only with a technological intervention that places the womb in stasis and creates the means to have a menstruating woman declared clean and acceptable for mainstream inclusion. Peterson problematizes the female body which justifies exclusion, then emancipates the woman through technological innovation which illustrates the exceptionalism of the white male North Atlantic. In this history of woman concocted by Peterson women never worked, produced and generated wealth external of the tasks demanded by procreation and child rearing, remaining forever cloistered under a vow of silence in the home. For Peterson woman is womb and a woman who fails to procreate and raise children is not a woman, and this is the trap he spins for women, hence his assault on the women's movement. For Peterson the womb of a woman is not her property as it belongs to the Organic Whole which consensually determines that its use for procreation is paramount. Liberation by birth control is not then liberation of women, only an attack on the sustainability of the Organic Whole across time. There was then in the hierarchy of the social order of the North Atlantic no gender discrimination for this hierarchy is devoid of tyranny, oppression and power. Women were uniquely gifted for a role that only they could execute in the manner demanded by the Organic Whole. The Women's Movement politicized this role ably assisted by the technological interventions of birth control and female sanitary products for without this technological innovation the political movement was incapable of dismantling the order of the Organic Whole. These technological innovations are then contrary to the needs of the Organic Whole and one must expect further technological innovations to recreate the balance demanded by the Organic Whole, as cloning. But one must not fail to grasp that this is a white Organic Whole rooted in the discourse of white supremacy which necessitates a neo-Malthusian discourse of 21st century eugenics, as the white race is faced with ever declining birth rates in the North Atlantic whilst the birth rates of non-white minorities rise threatening

to render white folks gifted with manifest destiny a minority in its ancestral homeland, especially in the USA. The horde of Muslims descending on the EU seeking entry as migrants and Germany's unilateral decision to accept some one million of them heightens the anxiety of those as Peterson. The white womb under assault by the discourse of the Women's Movement has turned its back on its ancestral duty to the race and its Organic Whole, demanding Peterson's assault on all these movements of the radical Left. Limiting the output of the non-white womb is strategically necessary and must be attained by a menu of instruments of power from planned parenthood to forcible sterilization, but the white womb must be exempt and its output heightened in the 21st Century.

In ending the train of thought on women, emancipation and birth control in the North Atlantic, Peterson presents the capstone of his discourse by indicating his embrace of the concept of equality of opportunity and his rejection of the concept of equality of outcome. Peterson states: "And I am certainly not against equality of opportunity." "anybody with any sense would go for equality of opportunity at least because it gives you the possibility of exploiting the maximum number of qualified and talented people. And equality of outcome well..." (Pg. 35) Peterson embraces equality of opportunity because it ensures the hegemony of the oligarchy at the apex for it can never challenge the inequality generated by a hierarchical social order over which the oligarchy exerts hegemony. For Peterson the hierarchy is sacrosanct for it's the order of the Organic Whole, which means that the hegemonic oligarchy is by extension sacrosanct and growing levels of inequality that arise from this order where the hegemonic oligarchy has captured the State is acceptable. This social order remains free of tyranny, oppression and power, hence inherently superior for Peterson because the oligarchy is dominated by white males and the non-white minorities over-represented in the ranks of the underclass. One can never expect Peterson to embrace equality of outcome for it is a potent threat to this hierarchy, but its potent ability to destroy the white oligarchy in the North Atlantic and to end non-white apartheid in the North Atlantic must be questioned. Peterson's rejection of the concept of equality of outcome lies in its instruments of power which will address the system of non-white apartheid by establishing quotas for the entry of minorities and women into social institutions, by entering into labour markets by setting a base living wage, by investing in State provided housing and medical care for those dispossessed under Peterson's social order etc. Peterson's individuality is then premised on the discourse of the free market and free enterprise rooted in free individuals having the freedom of choice, where you are poor because of your failures and the oligarch is an oligarch because of his inherent qualities, which you don't have. Simply a discourse of power that blames you for your lot in life. Peterson is simply then an ideologue for the oligarchic order of the second decade of the 21st Century, devoid of intellectual rigor and insight into what is actually taking place on the ground. An oligarchic order he serves gratuitously.

The interviewer now asks Peterson for his analysis of what is an outcome of the debates in the North Atlantic in 2018. Peterson gives no concrete answer as he states that there could be an improvement or a return in the 21st Century to the tribalism of the 20th

Century. This explains Peterson's discursive concept of the radical Left of the 21st Century being a pastiche of the Marxist tribe of the 20th Century which illustrates the plausible, potent threat they pose to the 21st Century social order. Peterson's discourse is then driven by the creation of a self-fulfilling prophecy with social traction. He is simply faking it, a snake oil salesman. Following this statement Peterson now states what is heartening and disheartening to him in the present scenario which reveals Peterson's central role as savior he has anointed himself in his discourse. Peterson states: "I'm heartened by the fact that so much people have been taking the psychological material that I've been providing online to heart, and doing what they can to put themselves together." (Pg. 36). Peterson is now the healer to the masses in this battle for the soul of North Atlantic civilization, the stark opposite of the radical left who can only destroy. Peterson liberates from and heals those damaged by the discourse of the radical left which is the proof of his credentials as the cult leader in the war against the radical left. This is then Peterson's crusade and it is all about Peterson and his self-importance. Peterson presents his Manichean opposite as follows: "I'm disheartened by the fact that virtually everything now is transformed into a polarized political argument, and there seems to be no understanding of the fact that not everything is political. I actually don't think the discussion about political correctness is political. I think it's both theological and philosophical, but it's always presented, or often presented, in political terms, not least because, if you're influenced by the radical leftist collectivist ideology, that is the *only* playing field. It's all hierarchical at each other's throats playing power games." (Pg. 36). In Peterson's discursive concept of the hierarchical social order devoid of tyranny, oppression and power, politics and what is political is strictly defined by the consensual social order and by extension the Organic Whole. The debate on political correctness is not then according to his discourse a political debate, but rather one of theology and philosophy. The radical left must present it as a political debate for politics trumps all other realities of the North Atlantic social order for them. Which in effect means that the description of the social order of the North Atlantic of the radical left is fundamentally flawed, wrong, as it does not approximate reality on the ground as Peterson's description does. Which means that all prescriptions written by the discourse of the radical left for the ills of the North Atlantic social order are fatal as they address ills that do not exist. The discourse of the radical left then presents a clear and present danger to the sustainability of the social order of the North Atlantic and the individuals that comprise the Organic Whole. The temperament of the radical left is one that sets them apart from the consensus of the social order, their existential reality is one of a group hierarchically structured to the detriment of individuality/individualism consuming each other in a perpetual war for power, dominance. The radical left groups are then deviants, in rebellion against the hegemonic order of the Organic Whole, which is expressed in their organizational structure which is anathema to the order of the Organic Whole. Bonding into groups driven by the desire, immersed in power games making then the Other of the binary duality framed as a Manichean duality by Peterson. This group is then a cancer in the body politic intent on destroying the Organic Whole and replacing it with tyranny, power, oppression, the group, the collective and equality of outcome. Peterson continues

his demonisation of the radical left, which exists in his mind only, as follows: “The free speech thing is really interesting because on the radical Left, there is no debate about free speech. You can’t have a debate about free speech from that ideological position because there isn’t any such thing. All there is is those who are maneuvering for power within their respective groups, making claims that benefit them. That’s the basis axiom of the interpretative system. So, the reason free speech has become politicized is that if you adopt the collectivist viewpoint, it’s a shibboleth, it’s a fantasy. You might think you are speaking freely but you’re not; you’re just expressing your privilege.” (Pgs. 36-37). The discourse of the radical left denies the very existence of unique traits of the North Atlantic hierarchical social order devoid of tyranny, one of which according to Peterson is their denial of the ability of individuals in this social order to exercise free speech. But Peterson is not speaking about the political, constitutional definition of free speech, he is in fact using a political concept to describe speech free of personal, subjective bias or speech free from personal interest, strategy and agenda which is aptly described from Judeo-Christian discourse and North Atlantic philosophy by Peterson. “Free speech for Peterson is the speech of the confessional. Peterson’s use of “free speech” is deliberate deception in his discursive quest to demonize the radical left justifying his call for its criminalisation. The threat posed by the radical left to the Organic Whole in the second decade of the 21st Century demands its criminalisation. Peterson’s discourse is not then right wing, but Fascist, even Neo-Nazi with his version of the “Turner Diaries.” Peterson ends the interview by delivering what he believes is the knockout punch against the radical left wing paradigm which arises from the theory and method of feminist intersectionality which according to Peterson results in “infinitely differentiated” instances of identity as gender and “endless numbers of ethnic variants” as formulated by the paradigm of the radical left. (Pg. 37). Peterson insists that this is potent proof of the paradigm of the radical left falsified and his discourse of the paramountcy of individuality in the social order of the North Atlantic affirmed. Peterson states: “But the fact of the matter is that the reason the West decided on a radical individualist perspective to begin with is that we figured out 2,000 years ago, at least at the origin of this type of thinking, that everyone is unique, to the point where you can fractionate their group identity right down to the level of the individual.” (Pgs. 37-38). For Peterson the individual is the building block, the root, core and foundation of the North Atlantic social order. There is no North Atlantic individual without Peterson’s Organic Whole which is exceptional in order to constitute an exceptional individual. The individual can then only arise from the social order which constitutes the nature of the individual. Exceptional white social order begets exceptional white individuals! So how can the individual be unique when the central question that the existence of any social order begs is: Why do men and women obey? Peterson is then denying the centrality of the issue of power, control, obedience, servility and discipline to the North Atlantic social order. There can be no social order without obedience, compliance and a hierarchy exists with an operational concept of order. A hierarchical social order cannot countenance the exertion of sustainable control over individuals who are defined as being unique, for the individual must be sustainably racialized, problematised,

criminalized and seduced in order to exert control over. Identity, groups and discourses of the uniqueness of the white individual, white supremacy are simply then instruments of power by which to fractionate/atomize the individual into identities and groups of races superior and inferior, gender, those criminalized and not, of those problematised and not, of the normal and abnormal which are the groupings organic to sustainable hierarchy. The most potent mix unleashed to-date is the continuum of: race/gender/desire/abnormality/criminality. These are the “Souls” derived by the drive for order that are draped over the bodies of individuals, by which sustainable order to the benefit of an oligarchy is relentlessly pursued across time. Peterson’s white supremacist idyllic of the unique white individual of the North Atlantic was simply a soul devised to drape bodies racially categorized as white in a Manichean duality with bodies designated black to render them docile, obedient in a hierarchical social order. In the second decade of the 21st Century Peterson’s wears his white soul faithfully, proudly, passionately insisting that it is in fact real, the basis of his white supremacist idyllic.

The debate

When faced with two debaters, Michelle Goldberg and Michael Eric Dyson against the motion, who are located in Peterson’s radical Left according to his definition of it and with a debate partner for the motion, Stephen Fry, who also fits Peterson’s definition of his radical Left, Peterson’s delivery of his discourse must be noted. His method of delivery reveals his strategy in dealing with the radical left in a public space and his political intent. Peterson says: “So, we should first decide what we’re talking about. We’re not talking about my views on political correctness, despite what you might have inferred from the last speaker’s comments.” (Pg. 47). Michelle Goldberg opened the debate and as far as Peterson is concerned she failed to define what she was speaking on as the central issue is not his discourse of political correctness. Peterson is attacking the intellectual power of the white woman of the radical left, as she is unable to surmount the temperament of the radical left for the occasion. Goldberg’s temperament condemns her to politically attack Peterson’s discourse on political correctness when much more rigor is demanded of her. Peterson now moves to define the context of his presentation as follows: “This is how it looks to me: we essentially need something approximating a low-resolution grand narrative to unite us. And we need a narrative to unite us otherwise we don’t have peace. What’s playing out in the universities and in broader society right now is a debate between two fundamental low resolution narratives, neither of which can be completely accurate, because they can’t encompass all the details. Obviously human beings have an individual element and a collective element—a group element let’s say. The question is, what story should be paramount? That is how it looks to me.” (Pgs. 47-48). Peterson in public has rephrased Manichean dualities and toned down his railing against the radical left of the pre-debate interview. This is a kinder, softer, Peterson for dummies, seducing the live audience for their affirmation is crucial to his self-importance, as is winning the debate. Peterson now gives the discourse of the radical left a makeover into a low-resolution narrative just as its competitor, but the strategy is in the details because what is organic to the social order cannot be supplied by one of the

two competitors, unity and peace and that is the lynch pin of his assault. The Manichean duality between the discourse of the radical left, the voice of the dispossessed and the elite of the social order is not repeated in his worldview stated in the debate, in fact the Cold War venom is absent. Peterson is now passive in his presentation inviting attacks intent on being the victim of the assaults of the panel of the radical left. Peterson continues: “In the West, we have reasonably functional, reasonably free, remarkably productive, stable hierarchies that are open to the consideration of the dispossessed that hierarchies generally create. Our societies are freer and functioning more effectively than any societies anywhere in the world, and than any societies ever have. As far as I am concerned-and I think there is good reason to assume this-it’s because the fundamental low resolution grand narrative we’ve oriented ourselves around in the West is one of the sovereignty of the individual.” (Pg. 48). The West is exceptional and hegemonic because of the hegemony of the discourse of the sovereignty of the individual in the West. The hegemony of this discourse over the social order is the reason for the uniqueness, the exceptionalism, the inherent superiority of the North Atlantic over the rest of the world, over the non-white races. To assault the hegemony of this discourse will result in the collapse of the West and its degeneration reflective of that of the non-white world. Peterson’s Manichean duality is now being unfurled. He next has to attack the pedigree of the counter discourse of his Manichean duality, thereby framing the potency of the threat it poses to North Atlantic exceptionalism and world hegemony. Peterson continues: “The reason we’re valuable as individuals, both with regard to our rights and our responsibilities, is because that’s our essential purpose, and that’s our nobility, and that’s our function.” (Pg. 48). The exceptionalism of the North Atlantic is rooted in an exceptional, inherently superior white person, a noble white person exhibiting all the characteristics of an exceptional personality, especially their temperament, which results from the embrace of their function allocated to them by the Organic Whole which defines their purpose. This obedient individual is not born exceptional but is socialized for exceptionalism, by the function allocated to each individual by the Organic Whole. For the only way the social order can be hierarchically structured devoid of tyranny, oppression and power, is for the Organic Whole to place the individual endowed with rights and dutiful to her/his responsibilities, as the foundation of the social order. The Organic Whole is compelled to constitute this exceptional individual endowed with rights and dutifully executing her/his responsibilities, for it is only on the rock of this individual that the exceptional social order can be built and the Organic Whole actualizes its destiny to constitute this white hegemon. White supremacist myth that is simply way too simplistic to do any justice to the white supremacist discourse of Max Weber and his “Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.” This is expected in the “Turner Diaries” and the myths of the Waffen-SS of Heinrich Himmler.

Peterson now articulates his discourse of the radical left and the threat it poses to the exceptional North Atlantic social order. This threat emanates from its embrace of the collective to challenge the hegemony of the discourse of individuality/individualism. Peterson states: “and its fundamental claim is that, no, you’re not essentially an

individual, you're essentially a member of a group." (Pgs. 48-49). Peterson's describes the threat posed to the exceptional social order as follows: "So, you define the groups first and then you assume that you view the individual from the group context, you view the battle between groups from the group context, and you view history itself as a consequence of nothing but the power of maneuvers between different groups. That eliminates any consequence of the individual at a very fundamental level, and also any idea of free speech." (Pg. 49). The discourse of the radical left is founded upon, rooted in the concept of the group which renders blind the adherents of this discourse to see, perceive and gaze upon the essential individual and its centrality to a sustainable white, exceptional North Atlantic social order. The nature of the threat posed by collectivist discourse lies in its assault on the essential individual to destroy its hegemony and as a result the concept and the social structure of "free speech." Peterson has unleashed the politically loaded concept of "free speech" after naming and describing the threat of the radical left to the white social order in a public debate. Peterson continues on "free speech" as follows: "Because if you're a collectivist at heart in this manner, there is no such thing as free speech." "it's that in that formulation, there's no such thing as free speech because for an individualist, free speech is how you made sense of the world and reorganizes society in a proper manner." (Pg. 49). For Peterson "free speech" is not the same as the hegemonic meaning in the social order for free speech as having your discourse restricted, censored and otherwise silenced, rendered invisible, suppressed, but nowhere does Peterson explain to the audience what he actually means by the concept. This is another instance of Peterson's approach to public engagement with his enemies. The audience has to be very vigilant to not interpret the radical left as a grave threat to themselves, their rights and freedom, influenced by Peterson's discourse and his instruments of power, which is the intent. The concept "free speech" is unleashed by Peterson in the pre-debate interview and the debate with no definition of this loaded concept presented. Peterson now presents his concept of hierarchy and the social order and the exceptionalism of North Atlantic civilization. Peterson states: "And hierarchies do tend towards tyranny, and they tend towards usurpation by people with power. But that only happens when they become corrupt. We have mechanisms in our society to stop hierarchies from becoming intolerably corrupt, and they actually work pretty well." (Pg. 50). The North Atlantic social order is then tolerably corrupt for Peterson, for the evidence of North Atlantic corruption is endemic. Another instrument of seduction utilized in the debate loaded with political meaning to impact the image of the radical left held by its audience.

In making his final statement before ending this presentation in the debate Peterson said: "and to construe the entire world as a battleground between different forms of tyranny as a consequence of that group affiliation." (Pg. 50). There is then a real world that radical leftists are incapable of seeing. That is the world of the exceptional North Atlantic where there is hierarchy without intolerable corruption, freedom and free speech. This is what constitutes the grave threat posed by the radical left to each and member of the audience which must be resisted as the radical left with destroy our exceptional social order turning us into a non-white nation. Criminalize the radical Left!

In Peterson's second statement in the debate we find this: "And I think that we've done a pretty decent job of determining what right-wing beliefs become dangerous when they and the people who stand on the right evoke notions of racial superiority, or ethnic superiority, something like that. It's fairly easy-and necessary, I think-to draw a box around them and place them to one side." "We've done a terrible job of determining how to demarcate what's useful from the Left from what's pathological. And so, it's perfectly okay for someone to criticize my attempts to identify something like a boundary. We could say, diversity, inclusivity, and equity-especially equity which is in fact equality of outcome, which is in fact an absolutely abhorrent notion." (Pgs. 60-61). Peterson defines when the Right embraces the discourse of race supremacy but can non-whites in the North Atlantic be race supremacists according to Peterson? Are whites who embrace Fascist and Nazi discourses of white race supremacy on the Right rejected by Whites and placed in a box? Or is all forms of white supremacy operationalized as an instrument of power throughout the social order of the North Atlantic and configured as a liberal democracy rooted in the Rights of Man placed also in the box? Why is white supremacy placed in a box by the white population without the need to demonize and criminalize the radical Left? Is white supremacy organic to the Organic Whole, but has now become a beloved renegade? Peterson's boundary set for the radical left arises from the threat he insists it poses to the social order, hence he demonizes and criminalizes the left. The boundary is then a quarantine to isolate a great threat that is generated by the social order with the intent to destroy it, a malignant cancer. Peterson's filter traps all ideas and breaks up all action to apply and attain change in a group setting in a hierarchical social order: diversity, inclusivity and equity which is founded upon equality of outcome as defined by the radical left. Peterson has defined these concepts as they are operationalised in the social order in the lives of individuals on a daily basis, for that is the only criterion which is strategic in his quest to save the exceptional North Atlantic hierarchic social order.

Peterson is assaulting the discourse unleashed by the radical left in the course of the debate and he is taking it personal first, when he insists that the radical left is equating his achievements in life to white male privilege. Peterson states: "To what degree is my present level of attainment or achievement a consequence of my white privilege? And what do you propose that I do about it. How about a tax? How about a tax that's specialized for me so that I can account for my damn privilege, so that I can stop hearing about it." (Pg. 74). To defend his discourse of the exceptional individual, the foundation of the exceptional North Atlantic, Peterson has to reject all evidence to the contrary as the product of the discourse of the radical left. The assault on his white male privilege is then a clarion call to the race of the intent of the non-whites, the radical left to demean the very basis of the exceptionalism of their civilization. He is summoning the tribe to deal with the threat posed as an extraordinary political zealot, a race agitator, a white supremacist warrior. Peterson then presents the challenge to the radical left to inform him of their plan for him to dispense with his white male privilege and what constitutes for them a radical left that is now extremist. For Peterson this is the basis of the debate, the extremism of the radical left, this is the issue of political correctness under debate as

it is the product of the extremist radical left. The central issue for Peterson is when the reasonable left will reemerge and silence the extremist left, for the reasonable left is organic to the North Atlantic social order. Peterson is then a warrior in this strategic struggle to silence the deviant left, thereby allowing the organic left to blossom. Peterson states: "But if you have a better suggestion and won't side-step the question, let's figure out how I can dispense with my white privilege, and you can tell me when the Left has gone too far, since they clearly can. And that's what this debate is about-political correctness. It's about the Left going too far, and I think its gone too far in many ways, and I'd like to figure out how and when, so the reasonable Left could make its ascendance again and we could quit all this nonsense." (Pg. 74). Peterson insists that the radical left is incapable of setting boundaries to its actions and the content of its discourse to differentiate themselves from the entity Peterson defines as the extremist left. This is Peterson's discourse and he expects those he defines as members of the radical left to accept his discourse that constitutes them, to abide by its directives and parameters and be compliant and servile to Peterson. There is then no debate possible as there is no commonality of meaning of concepts used by Peterson with his partner Fry and the radical left of the debate, there is only attack, assault and conquest, a colonial power relation and Peterson must be triumphant by any means necessary.

In the rebuttal stage of the debate Peterson raises the issue of the radical left and violence and the threat posed to the social order where he insists that violence is the product, is the nature, content of the discourse of the radical left. Peterson states: "Well, what I derived from that series of rebuttals is twofold: the first is that saying that the radical Left goes too far when they engage in violence is not a sufficient response by any stretch of the imagination, because there are sets of ideas in radical leftist thinking that led to the catastrophes of the twentieth century, and that was at the level of idea, not at the level of violent action." (Pg. 79). Further evidence according to Peterson for the need to criminalize the radical left of the North Atlantic, as the discourse of the radical left is constructed to generate social violence by silencing the individual and insisting on groups that are in existential competition with each other. This deviant discourse has then to be criminalized in order to ensure the integrity of the exceptional North Atlantic social order. Failure to quarantine this threat will result in the repeat of the catastrophes of the 20th Century in the 21st Century. Peterson is Cassandra. He next deals with the issue of his white male privilege raised in the debate again as follows: "You don't know anything about my background or where I came from, but it doesn't matter to you, because fundamentally I'm a 'mean white man.' That's a hell of a thing to say in a debate." (Pgs. 78-79). The racist assault on Peterson is proof positive in the debate of the violence that is constituted by the discourse of the radical left because all that he is as an individual with all his achievements is erased, subsumed by placing him in the group of the privileged white male with its Manichean duality defined and constituted with diversity as women, non-white males, non-white women.

For the remaining portion of the debate Peterson sticks to his standard line of attack adopted for the debate: the quest for the definition of boundaries for the Left and the assault on his race. Peterson states: "The first is that any question about when the Left

goes too far *still* hasn't been answered. But I would say that the fact that race got dragged into that particular comment is a better exemplar of what I think is wrong with the politically correct Left than anything else that could have possibly happened." (Pg. 83). Peterson wants the radical left of the debate to accept the inherent correctness of his concept of organic, reasonable, responsible left/radical, extremist left by agreeing that there is a need for a boundary to be set to demarcate both. For the radical left of the debate to do this is to surrender to Peterson's discourse which he desires. Peterson is insisting with this refusal that the radical left is incapable of setting a boundary as they are in fact the extremist left which must be criminalized. Peterson is attacking Michael Eric Dyson, an African male of the radical left, for attacking him on the basis of his white race thereby spinning the web of the aggressive, upstart jigaboo intent on destroying the white male and raping their white women in the minds of the audience. Dyson replies to Peterson: "Imagine the hurt, the anxiety, the insult that you might genuinely feel, according to what I felt was an appropriate comment of description at the moment of its expression. But imagine now those hurt feelings and...Peterson: "I'm not hurt. Dyson: Okay you feel great! You feel great about it! Peterson: "That's really different. I'm not a victim. I'm appalled." (Pg. 83). Peterson has an entirely different psychological makeup to that of Dyson, what brings hurt and anxiety to Dyson Peterson is immune to, because Peterson is white, not non-white as Dyson. Dyson is the victim constituted by radical left discourse but Peterson is devoid of this as a result of white supremacy. Dyson cannot then posit that the pain he feels from an assault on his race persona/soul, Peterson will experience the same said pain from an assault on his race persona from especially a non-white person. Peterson is immune to assaults on his race and the supremacy of his race by non-whites as he has no victim complex, neither a perpetrator complex, what he has is a savior complex for his race. Peterson is insisting that non-whites and women of the radical left are burdened with victimhood constituted by their extremist discourse which makes them potent threats to the exceptional North Atlantic social order.

In his exchanges with Michael Eric Dyson, Peterson insists that he is experienced in "seeing" non-white oppression which qualifies him as being experienced with non-white oppression in the North Atlantic. But Peterson can never experience non-white oppression nor can he understand its impact on the psyche of the non-white as he is white, but as a white man he certainly can oppress non-whites. Peterson can only see non-white oppression that is visible to his white worldview, the realities that the matrices of perception of his white supremacist discourse trap and render legible to his psyche. Peterson is then articulating the liberal white supremacist shuck and jive when under assault by the non-whites. Peterson states: "Well, I've seen the sort of things that you're talking about. I happen to be an honorary member of an Indigenous family, so don't tell me about what I should go see with regard to oppression. You actually don't know anything about me." (Pg. 85). Peterson has Native, First People friends which expose him to view oppression of non-whites, which makes him knowledgeable about non-white oppression, qualified to lecture on it, to tell us what exactly it is and to produce solutions for us to enrich our individuality. Peterson is then the all knowing white man

sent to deliver us from our oppression, not from the hegemony of white supremacy. Peterson continues his assault on Michael Eric Dyson by insisting that Dyson is an anti-white racist. Dyson states: “You asked me a question, I gave you a response.” Peterson: “You gave me a generic response, a generic race based response.” (Pg. 85). Dyson continues to refuse to embrace Peterson’s discourse, its innate superiority and inherent hegemony as a result his reply to Peterson’s question is generic and race based, especially by focusing on Peterson’s race, a product of the pastiche that drive radical left discourse in the 21st Century. Dyson is an unapologetic example of the radical left, thereby the threat is exposed to the white order, but Dyson is non-white and male which explodes the potency of threat posed to the audience. Peterson is then a race baiting bird dog sniffing out and scattering the radical left from the cover of its universities to the full glare of the white public and the right to bear arms.

Peterson is once again pursuing his strategy of having the radical left on the panel define the boundary that separates the responsible left from the radical, extremist left. Michael Eric Dyson in response posed this question to Peterson: “Has the Right gone too far?” Peterson: “Of course the Right has gone too far.” Dyson: “How? Tell us how?” Peterson: “Well, how about Auschwitz.” Dyson: “What else? More recently, what has gone wrong with the Right?” Stephen Fry: “Charlottesville?” Peterson: “I’m no fan of the Right, despite the fact that the Left would like to paint me that way, because it’s more convenient for them.” Dyson: “How has the Right gone too far recently?” Peterson: “It’s threatening to go too far in identitarian Europe, that’s for sure. It’s gone too far in Charlottesville, it went too far in Norway. How long a list do you want? And why am I required to produce that? To show you that I don’t like the identitarian Right?” Peterson: “Look, the Right hasn’t occupied the humanities and the social sciences. It’s as simple as that for me. If they had I’d be objecting to them.” (Pgs 94-95). For Peterson the extremist Right is Nazi discourse, an early 20th Century disorder that is no longer potent in the flow of discourse in the North Atlantic. Neo-Nazi discourse in the 21st Century in no way poses a threat as Nazi discourse of the 20th Century, hence it was his debate partner who named Charlottesville as a 21st Century example, not Peterson. Peterson distinguishes between identitarian Right extremism which is active in Europe and gives Norway as the example of this, but Charlottesville, Virginia, USA is not in Europe, was it also an identitarian Right attack? Peterson includes Charlottesville simply because his debate partner called this incident, but he had no intention of classing Charlottesville as an attack by the extremist right for in his view the extremist left precipitated this attack by the right in Charlottesville. For Peterson the grave, plausible threat is posed by the extremist left not the extremist right, in fact the extremist right is growing in response to the radical left and its assault on the white social order. For Peterson the extremist right poses no grave, plausible threat that compares to that posed by the radical left and the radical left has the pathological profile to damage the 21st Century North Atlantic social order which the extremist right does not. The radical left exerts hegemony over the faculties of humanities and social sciences of the of the North Atlantic universities, whilst the extremist right is consigned to the lower levels of the hierarchy of the social order. Peterson sees only a single threat with the radical right being natural allies in the

fight to eliminate the radical left, hence many Charlottesville's are in order, necessary and strategic. What is the salient difference in the discourse of white supremacy, a race wielding Manifest Destiny, the KKK and the discourse of European identitarianism? That exists only in the mind of Peterson.

Peterson ends his contribution to the debate by returning to his concept that power is oppression and tyranny which means that in the exceptional social order of the North Atlantic power is absent, but he never says what is present and operationally necessary to answering the potent question posed by Max Weber: "Why do men obey?" Peterson problematizes power in order to falsify and debunk what his discourse constitutes as the radical Left. Peterson is then arguing with himself for he cannot listen to the discourse of the left, deconstruct and then assault. He puts words in their mouth, his words and then he cannot even debunk his words coming from the dummy that he created. The man has no intellectual rigor, a snake oil salesman. Peterson never presents his answer to Weber's question for he has none. How do you in a social order seduce persons without violence, enslavement, tyranny to police themselves, to abide by patterns of behavior that illustrate their compliance to a worldview and a discourse that does not address their existential condition and the fact that their reward for obedience is differentiated from that of others, they complain yet they remain compliant? When Peterson can explain this reality then he is explaining the power relations of the North Atlantic social order, for in order to have compliance, servility and discipline in spite of inequality, differential, structured reward in the absence of tyranny you must have power devoid of violence, tyranny, enslavement exerted at the level of the idea and on the body, discourse and the body. Biopolitics and Biopower constituting an inherently racist, white supremacist State of which Peterson is the sublime example of its white supremacist product.

Finally, in the course of the debate Peterson refuses to deal with the bombshell dropped by Michael Eric Dyson on his discourse of the exceptional North Atlantic social order, which reveals his white supremacist worldview. Dyson states: "When I get shot down for no other reason than I'm black, when I get categorized for no other reason than my color, I am living in a culture that refuses to see me as a great individual." (Pg. 63).

Peterson either denies that this reality is valid or as the founding fathers of the US constitution Peterson's discourse of the exceptional North Atlantic applies only to white folks, most likely both. Michelle Goldberg in winding up her contribution to the Monk debate 2018 states: "But if, say, I stood up here and said: recognize how threatened so many women feel when one of the best selling and most prominent intellectuals in the world right now says in an interview that maybe the #Me Too movement has shown that this whole experiment of men and women working together is just not working? Or that maybe if women don't want the workplace to be sexualised, they shouldn't be allowed to wear makeup?" Peterson: "I didn't say that." Goldberg: "It was in a vice interview. Google it." Peterson: "I didn't say that." (Pg. 101). Peterson in the Vice interview did say that and much more, but being a political hitman, wannabe cult leader and white supremacist warrior he lied in the debate to ensure the outcome he desired: victory over the radical Left in the Monk debate 2018, which he did attain.

Reference

Fry, Stephen, Peterson, Jordan, Dyson, Michael, Eric and Goldberg, Michelle (2018):
Political Correctness Gone Mad?" One World, Britain