

Dear Dr. Peterson,

I've spent some years in the attempt to philosophically justify social justice, to provide an axiomatic foundation that creates total logical consistency and subsequently an explanation for the beliefs, actions, and justifications of social justice warriors themselves. I say some years as I've completely fallen out of time, taking on a reclusive lifestyle in this pursuit. But the result is, I think, justified. I have determined the axioms that create social justice, or rather the *singular* axiom which produces it. While a simple premise, as simple as it can get really, it becomes incredibly complex such that in order to demonstrate its eventual culmination in social justice isn't something I can present in this form. Nor can I compel you to read my treatise on this matter. Instead, I believe it best to attempt to provide you a subsequent, elementary discovery during my investigation. That being the nature of God and His myth as the genesis of consciousness. Well, that and an appetizer: the cornerstone of Leftist 'morality'.

Equality: is merely synonymy (think words and language) engendered through creating, maintaining, and so enforcing a lack of perceptual distinction between categories.

Thus everyone is 'equal' only when everyone's categories become non-criterial i.e. nebulized.

Thus it is sinful to attribute any criteria to these categories as it disrupts their synonymy.

Thus it is sinful to attribute responsibility to any individuals within such categories as such is to attribute to them effects, themselves necessarily created through cause, and cause itself is what crafts their categorical distinctions through (philosophical) individuation. The origin of their 'victimhood'.

What causes something to be is HOW it is. HOW describes a criterial existence (namely cause and effect) which must be denied in order to maintain synonymy between categories which themselves are essentially meaningless, given their lack of discernable and attributable criteria. See 'gender'.

Thus success and failure or 'standards' are oppressive as they allow for distinctions between categories that are crafted not necessarily subjectively, but through the acknowledgment of and operation according to criteria i.e. objective reality i.e. cause and effect. Discrimination is thus the greatest evil.

I apologize in advance for how mundane God will become through this explanation, but your reverence for the human spirit alone should see you through it. I, for one, remain in awe of it.

# Individuation

Individuation, as I suppose you best understand it, also applies to my use and understanding of the term. I would label such use of the term, your use, as Jungian individuation i.e. individuation with reference to the self or psyche. However, individuation as a *philosophical* term isn't particular to consciousness (ironically) but rather the manifestation, necessarily in our minds, of 'a thing that is not something else'. Essentially, it is the creation, discernment, and finally recognition of an individual. It doesn't matter whether this individual is a rock, tree, or atom. Perhaps best analogized for you as 'the abstraction from the set'. Though in this case the 'set' is the universe and the 'abstraction' is simply a subset of it.

The issue with individuation is that it is fundamentally flawed. Flawed because everything we create through it is not and never has been 'a thing that is not something else'. Through reason alone and eventually and powerfully through particle theory, we've devastated the concept of the individual and as such demonstrated that the effects of individuation, that of the creation of individuals, is false. Or rather falsely perceived. As while every *attempt* at individuation has failed, there may yet still exist an individual or many. We've just not perceived it.

An atom is a collection of smaller particles and of those even smaller particles, etc. Everything appears to exist as a matter of assembly of a single, base unit that while we've yet to determine, is ever-demonstrated through the necessity of establishing a cause for every effect. For this reason, every individual we create, every WORD we create, is actually descriptive of a system of cause and effect.

Ex: What an apple is necessarily HOW an apple is.

This is true of everything or rather every word, every individual we've been able to produce. Yet that we produce such individuals and continue to manifest the process of individuation remains irrespective of our knowledge otherwise. Thus many people, post-modernists as you've termed them, make sweeping claims of our failure to harness truth, understand reality, and to truly define what anything is.

This in no small part accounts for much of the nihilism and determinism we're faced with today. Yet in examining individuation as a mechanism we can reconcile this matter.

As we've come to understand, and is a necessary perspective for this justification, the universe must be understood as a system of cause and effect. A system wherein a single, primal cause effected the rest of universe and will for all time. Moreover, that every effect must be caused and every cause must be effected. Yet, this is all that is required for this reconciliation. I told you it was simple.

With the universe representing a system of cause and effect, the ability to individuate is necessarily the ability to distinguish some part of the universe from this system. To take a 'chunk' of the universe and describe it as yes, a *part* of the universe, but distinct from the whole. An apple, for example. To take a deterministic viewpoint, and for the time being what I will phrase as an objective viewpoint, would render this distinction entirely irrationally based and so entirely unsubstantiated. In essence, you cannot isolate a 'chunk' of the universe from itself. Such distinction is made entirely arbitrarily and as such doesn't actually exist. This is objectively true as, for example, nothing distinguishes the atoms in the air from the atoms in your arm. Nor does anything distinguish the atoms from themselves. It is akin to isolating a few lines of computer code from the rest and presenting it as its own entity. Not only can the isolated lines not run as a program, the rest of the program is rendered illogical and so can't run either. This is objectively true. Such determinism, in this context, is valid.

Though continuing on in spite of this, as we do as conscious beings, we must recognize how it is that such isolation, such distinction can be made. Well, the only way to extract a subsystem of cause and effect from the greater system of cause and effect that is the universe, is to *arbitrarily attribute cause* to that subsystem. It is to treat it as 'self-caused', not unlike we've come to treat the universe as a 'self-caused' individual. As a subsystem of cause and effect by definition, this self-caused chunk *still* describes a system of cause and effect, just a smaller one. This subsystem can be simple or complicated depending on where you arbitrarily attribute the cause for it. So an apple can merely be a 'red fruit with a particular flavor' or it can be a collection of specific atoms arranged in a particular manner that culminates in what we understand as an 'apple'. The larger this subsystem, the more of the greater system of the universe it contains. The more of the universe it contains, the greater your understanding of what an 'apple' is and with that, the more representative of the actual universe from which you've distinguished it i.e. the 'more true' your understanding of the apple. Truth simply being an understanding of the universe, in this context.

Now, this arbitrary attribution of cause is what we understand as Free Will. Consider how you see others as individuals, as those whom you've attributed the ability to self-cause and thus 'choose' or 'determine' the effects of their existence i.e. their actions. Best understood as their responsibility. The process

through which we create an individual as a rock or even as a person is no different fundamentally. The special distinction we create for such individuals, for 'conscious beings', is the observation of the effects of their existence. So anything we can perceive as creating effects of their own becomes a 'conscious being', an individual in the common understanding. So an ocean can be an individual, so too a volcano or a bird or whatever. The reason such things have had this particular form of individuality evoked is due to our greater understanding of their respective system of cause and effect. In other words, we recognize such things as being wholly caused by another and thus strip them of any perception of their individuality as conscious beings. This goes for humans too. Should we discover Sam Harris to be a robot controlled by Richard Dawkins, we immediately relinquish the consciousness we attributed to Harris and view him as merely an extension of Dawkin's will; as being *caused* by Dawkins.

But what do we make of the universe then? It too is an individual via individuation and with the special distinction of, by definition, being both self-caused and having no means of determining or even suspecting some prior effect to have caused it. In this same primal fashion, the universe is a conscious being. The universe is God.

## God is the Universe

When the universe is presented as God it manifests as Deism. When applied to the earth alone or centered on the earth, Gaia theory. However, such notions of God could not exist until both the concept of the universe was born and with that an understanding of everything in it as a part of that universe. Until then, gods could exist in everything that could be presented as self-caused, as willful, as conscious beings, and only insofar as we couldn't apply a prior effect to their cause.

The Christian God, before he was even Christian, resulted from a necessary logical reconciliation of the concept of being 'self-caused'. That is, the notion itself is irrational and in our unconscious quest to manifest God as the highest ideal, he couldn't be so constituted. So what was done to parse this? God became distinguished from the universe in such a way that the universe could remain an effect of Him, but also that God wouldn't be a part of it and thus part of an individual. With individuality a subsystem

by definition, it is illogical for God to exist both as the entire system and as a subsystem within it. Hence God was moved into another realm, another dimension whose defining property is its ability to cause without being a part of the system in which it causes. This is Heaven, where God is. This conceptualization of God is known as the 'Other Dimension' and 'Stepped-back' theories of God.

Now, what is the significance of God as the arbitrary attribution of cause? As arbitrary cause itself? The significance lies in the ability of this attribution to craft the entirety of perceptual (subjective) existence, develop incomplete models of reality, and through that discern truth. In essence, individuation allows for the first manifestation of consciousness. Subsequent to that thought, and subsequent to that knowledge and truth. To transform the unknown into the known. To transform the objective (how I've termed it) into the subjective.

## The Axioms of Existence

First Aspect of Our Existence: I

Individuation is the impetus to human consciousness, or at least consciousness develops as a consequence of it. The first axiom, the first thought that is able to develop a distinction between 'you' and 'other' is: "I exist." Though the nature of this phrasing is debated and so too its true nature as the very first axiom, consider my definition of objectivity. Understood this way, "I exist," is a claim of objective existence, of existing within a deterministic, indiscriminate universe. It's the first intimation of existence and for this reason comprises the first aspect of our existence: objectivity.

Second Aspect of Our Existence: I!

The second axiom follows as a necessary corollary of the first, though I've yet to see it properly identified as such. The second axiom is, "I am right". "I am right" is only a reiteration of the axiom "I exist" using one's self as a reference point. It is the first demonstration of a comparative understanding,

of establishing something 'true' with reference to something else. Yet in this case, the comparison is between the self and another form of self, developing a duality in the understanding of 'I'. The 'I' in both "I exist" and "I am right" is the same thing, but manifested in the objective realm AND the subjective realm. This duality is a circular reasoning of sorts, which is frankly fine given that 'I exist' was foremost an irrational position to begin with. With 'I' possessed of no legitimate distinction between itself and the universe, its only means of substantiation was through itself. Hence the development of subjectivity, the second aspect of our existence.

Now, "I am right" is as self-righteous as it sounds. In this case, it is a *literal* SELF-righteousness. The 'self' is right given the existence of the 'self' through "I exist." Though more integrally, the 'self' is 'right' given the inability to believe otherwise. To follow "I exist," with "I am *wrong*," terminates the prior axiom. Thus the self is right and, as our very first reference point for what is known, what is 'true', the self MUST be right – always. It is our single reference point, our single foundation, from which we perceive the universe.

This characteristic of self-righteousness manifests in simple language tricks such as the fact that what you believe, you believe you are 'right' about. That you are 'right about everything you believe' by definition, otherwise you wouldn't believe it. The closest one can get to being 'wrong' is their recognition of operation according to some irrationality that they cannot as of yet justify, which itself is a claim of truth or rather righteousness i.e. the truth of *that* being false. This is contrasted with our ability to separate what any other person believes from what is 'true'. This is the self-referential nature of the subjective 'I'.

#### The Origin of the Dual 'I' in Myth:

Call this duality of 'I' Yin and Yang. Should Yin take over, the self is destroyed. Should Yang take over, the 'other'/universe is destroyed. Should objectivity take over, subjectivity is destroyed. Should subjectivity take over, objectivity is destroyed. This is the nature of the subjective 'I', the self, as both sacrificial (to the universe) and ultimately destructive (of the universe). This is why we must maintain a 'balance'. In order to possess the dualistic existence of consciousness, to be both conscious and to be conscious of, to live and live within, objectivity and subjectivity must both persist without one overtaking the other.

### Third Aspect of Our Existence: I?

After “I am right” we are struck with what I hesitate to call an axiom, given it breaks the mold. However, it is unique in that rather than a claim it is a universal query without answer. This is simply, “As?” Putting it together: “I exist. I am right. As?” (or I, I!, I?) This question of “As?” is essentially the development of inquiry but more importantly reason and perhaps thought itself. It is the drive to constitute, to justify the self *as something*. But why is this necessary? Why can't the duality of 'I' exist without such justification? Well, because of individuation, of course. Though more importantly, it's because the universe is a cause and effect system and as such the self, the individual 'I', must be representative of some system of cause and effect. It must be a *subsystem*, a 'chunk' of the greater system – within the greater system.

Aside: Naturally we've hardly the conceptualization of cause and effect at that point so I ask you take it for granted. While individuation is fundamentally based on cause and effect and as such I *could* use that as explanation, cause and effect is fundamentally based on the conceptualization of the 'self' and the 'other' or more simply 1 and 0. Cause and effect is a product of binary which is a fundamental part both of “I exist” (apart from the 'other' i.e. universe) and “I am right” (apart from the 'other' i.e. falsehood that is, not self).

Were “As?” to be answered with, “Nothing,” it would invalidate the prior axiom, “I exist” and, depending on your understanding of 'rightness', “I am right” as well. As such, “As?” CANNOT be nothing. Moreover, it can *never* be nothing. We can't believe the self to be right for 10 years and then suddenly believe it false. At no point can one manifest 'nothing' as the self. This creates another necessary irrationality. That is, no matter what one justifies themselves as, it will be perceived as as immutable and unchallengeable as the self. It is, in effect, what one understands 'I' to be. With 'I' both 'existing' and representing 'that which is right' *axiomatically*, whatever 'I' is justified AS gains the same axiomatic characteristics. This is the necessary nature of self-righteousness. The reason 'everything you believe' becomes 'right', is because 'everything you believe' comes subsequent to “I am right” and necessarily as a means of justifying what 'I' is i.e. your understanding of 'I'. Hence the inability to sever belief from rightness in your own mind.

With “I exist” existing in the objective realm and “I am right” existing in the subjective realm, “As?” is a bit of an outlier once again. Though as thought, as a means of discerning truth, it represents the *attempt*

to transform the subjective into the objective. It is thus transformative and cyclical. "Predictive" is the best term I can muster for it. Thus the triad of our existence is objective, subjective, and predictive.

Now, the means through which we justify this "As?" is the same fashion in which we were made conscious: individuation. We isolate subsystems of cause and effect from the universe through the arbitrary attribution of cause, then present these systems, these causal relationships, as individuals. We understand this process as the creation of a WORD. So we too harness the power that had created us and use it in the same fashion to create things for ourselves. To speak things into existence.

## God is Individuation

So God is actually individuation as we understand it. He is the process through which we are granted consciousness, how we are made distinct from the universe, no different than how we individuate things from the universe. He presents us as a subsystem of cause and effect, distinguishing us from the universe through the arbitrary attribution of cause. As God IS this process Himself, He is thus not created in the same fashion, but rather embodies the very essence of creation itself.

### The Soul

Now, His arbitrary attribution of cause to us is what you call a Soul. It is the singular, immutable *self* that exists in perpetuity. As such it is a *part of God* gifted to us. It is our characteristic of being 'self-caused' just like God is. It is also how He sees us, no differently than you would perceive any individual you create through individuation. As such, this 'self-cause' cannot otherwise and is not otherwise effected by anything prior nor anything subsequent. It is our single vestige of 'holiness', of insurmountable and unchanging truth.

When you die you 'become one with God' by relinquishing your characteristic of self-cause, to exercise Free Will, to Him. In other interpretations you go to be with God, maintaining your distinction from Him

whilst still being together. This interpretation is taking the 'cause' that is yourself into Heaven in order to be logically distinguished from the universe; such that you can maintain your distinction of being self-caused.

## God as the Trinity

The characteristics of God as the Trinity explain his nature as He who individuated everything, though better understood as the individuation of the universe and the attribution of individuality to it. Fundamentally however, God is truly the individuation of the self as He is, after all, an effect of consciousness.

### Omnipotent:

As the single cause that created the cause and effect chain of the universe, and taking entropy into account, God is therefore omnipotent. He is able to effect the creation of everything, of all. He is all-powerful.

### Omnipresent:

With God as an individuated universe, as a universe made individual, He is thus everywhere. It's really that simple. Of course, we are gifted a soul, but remain distinguished from God and thus maintain our Free Will since He has made us self-caused too, just like Him. Though more to the point, anything you individuate becomes necessarily distinguished from the self. An apple isn't you and neither are you an apple. Thus in your creation of the apple, you both coexist. Such is the soul's relationship to God.

### Omniscient:

Your understanding of a WORD, of an individual, is 'perfect' insofar as that word represents your particular scope of understanding. That is, your understanding *of your understanding* of an 'apple' is perfect. An apple is only what you say it is and in that way when you evoke an apple, an apple as you

understand it is perfect. As such, any description of an apple that differs from yours is fundamentally not an apple anymore but something different. For that reason, and because there is nothing outside the universe, nothing that could be 'known more' about the entire cause and effect system, God is thus omniscient in His understanding. His understanding of the universe, akin to your understanding of an apple, is perfect. God's WORD is perfect. So as He individuates, He *speaks into existence*. I suppose I should let you know that John explained this in his very first verse:

John 1:1

In the beginning was the Word,

And the Word was with God,

And the Word was God.

Translated:

In the beginning was the Cause,

And the Cause was with Effect,

And the Effect was Cause.

The existence of cause, effect, and their co-existence within a single system as a single system. The original self-cause, the original attribution of cause and attributor of cause. Whether or not John understood 'Word' in this context, as individuation, I do not know. Though something amusing that comes from this is the significance, and the fact, that the notion of God 'just existing' is absolutely true and legitimate. He is self-caused. Thus in modern parlance He, well, just...exists.

That is hilarious. That is what KEK was made for.

Anyway, the prior characteristics outlined the power of God *as* the Trinity. Omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent describe individuation as a whole, as a completed triad of all three aspects: objective,

subjective, and predictive. But that said, those aspects, and the axioms they represent, have been personified, in a sense, with characteristics of their own.

I Exist: God the Father

The 'Father' that birthed us is the deterministic universe. It is reality devoid of perception, observation, of any subjective manifestation. He is objective and hence He is what is real. In essence, He *is* objectivity. Simultaneously, He is also the unknown and that which we strive to know. He is all truth but in that way equally mysterious, unknown. To know Him, to learn of Him, is to know truth and learn rightly. He is thus objective truth. Now, truth as a concept hardly manifests what we could understand as will, as that which effects. As such, a different means of effecting God's will needs to be determined and one that operates within objective reality, within the entire system of cause and effect. Well, the greatest, most powerful, most immutable, most unchallengeable force man has discerned is Time itself. Predictably, a core component of causal relationship. That which is true in objective reality is an effect and thus is caused, using the medium of time to ultimately determine. So we take your list of God the Father's characteristics and interpret Him as Time:

Characteristics of God the Father i.e. Time

- 1) You can make a deal with it i.e. investment for greater gain.
- 2) It responds to sacrifice i.e. exchange one thing for another. Work hard for greater yield.
- 3) It answers prayers i.e. can manifest your hopes.
- 4) It transcends time and space. That's a given.
- 5) It punishes and rewards i.e. brings about success and failure states according to personal predictions (standards). Ex: poor farming methods vs better farming methods.
- 6) It judges and forgives i.e. brings about what is interpreted as adequate karmic punishment or doesn't.
- 7) It is not Nature i.e. is not the world as it interacts with you but rather the means through which all things may manifest, good or ill, natural or unnatural. It is the medium of interaction, not interaction itself.

- 8) It built Eden but banished us for our disobedience. (Addressed regarding Original Sin)
- 9) It is too powerful to be touched i.e. time is utterly incorporeal and cannot be wielded, only submitted to.
  
- 10) It granted free will i.e. whence from objective reality (not quite time) was birthed consciousness.
- 11) Distance from it is Hell. (Addressed regarding Sin).
- 12) Distance from it is Death i.e. illogic, operation without regard to time. Stagnation and otherwise risky behavior.
- 13) It is the Law i.e. our ultimate submission, that through which we determine all truth.

I am Right: God the Son(like)

He who is borne of the Father but still like Him. This is the subjective aspect of the self, the subjective incarnate, and thus what is 'true' as opposed to what is *real*. What is 'righteous' as opposed to what merely '*is*'. Both the Father and Son are types of truth, naturally. Thus the Son, the Christ figure is actually the self as created through individuation. It is the *second* claim of existence, the *reiteration* or REINCARNATION of 'I', of God.

Moreover, as representative of the self, it is little wonder Christ's message, the message of the New Testament, was to hold the individual up as sacred. To hold the individual as divine rather than the state. To make perfect the subjective and so relinquish any need for the perfection of objective reality.

The Old Testament, the realm of God the Father as objective reality, was thus concerned with the constitution of reality itself. Concerned with the constitution of everything external to the self and to create a paradise therein. To produce a 'perfect state' for the self; a perfect objective reality for the subject, the self, to inhabit.

"Change the world, change the self. Change the self, change the world," as the saying goes.

Furthermore, the self comes with it the unique characteristic of self-righteousness: the necessary characteristic of justifying "As?" as perfection, as what is absolutely and always true, regardless how

it may change. However, you understand that your self-perception certainly *does* change. Yet while it changes, you still remain Jordan Peterson. So while the constitution of Jordan Peterson varies over *time*, according to the 'will of God the Father' i.e. *Time*, that you are always and forever Jordan Peterson never wavers.

The Son (subjective) is therefore subservient to the Father (objective), doing as He commands and becoming what He demands. Yet the Son nevertheless remains righteous at all times regardless such alteration. This is, again, the necessity of self-righteousness.

So consider this evolution of the self, whilst ever-righteous, as a phoenix. It dies only to be reborn once again in a never-ending cycle. A cycle which produces a phoenix and only a phoenix, every time. This is, of course, the sacrificial and redemptive nature of the Son. It's also His position as a scapegoat. When this cycle of rebirth replaces the 'prior self' or 'past self' with the 'new self', the 'old self' becomes a lie, a folly, as that which isn't right and *that which isn't Him*. In essence, as the self changes (but not our righteousness), the prior self is scapegoated and thus continuously. Like replacing yourself with a mannequin before being punched in the face, you replace yourself with each and every instance objective reality demonstrates that you are, in fact, wrong. Every instance that *time* proves you wrong. When God demands a sacrifice of yourself. One that He asked of the Son who, subservient to Him, obeyed.

#### Characteristics of the Son(like) i.e. Self

- 1) It speaks chaos into order i.e. individuates, creates subsystems, categories, words.
- 2) It slays dragons and feeds people the remains i.e. essentially the passing down of knowledge as developed through experience. Teaching others (or yourself as a plurality of identities) rather than having to undergo it themselves. It's the ability to *learn* and to justify *your subsequent selves* (or plurality) with knowledge. It is 'nourishing' i.e. justifies the self, fulfills "As?" Also, it is a *teacher*.
- 3) It finds gold i.e. determines what is precious or 'good' through the creation of standards themselves demonstrated through time.
- 4) It rescues virgins i.e. rescues us from the unspoilt nature of a purely objective existence. A life of no desire, no standards, no preference, no purpose. Unspoilt by 'Original Sin' as well.

- 5) It is the Body and Blood of Christ i.e. both the constitution and the sacrifice of that constitution. Might allude to the duality of 'I'. Not certain.
- 6) It is a tragic victim and a scapegoat and eternally triumphant redeemer simultaneously i.e. the tragic victim is naturally reflective of His subservience to time, to God, which can bring with it nothing that we would consider warranted nor deserved. Hence His victimization.
- 7) It cares for the outcast i.e. that which doesn't fit the categorization inherent to individuation. He cares for the outcast because He cannot maintain consistency i.e. rightness, in the presence of an exception to the rule, to the category, to the word, to that which justifies Himself.
- 8) It dies and is reborn. (See prior section)
- 9) Is the King of kings and Hero of Heroes i.e. such that He represents that which is absolutely righteous, absolutely right, He is thus the ultimate in wisdom and deed. We are, after all, the *hero of our own stories* by necessity. Though more integrally, the subjective self is sovereign above all others. Another nod to the divinity of the individual.
- 10) It is not the state, but is both the fulfillment and critic of the state i.e. is not objective reality but is able to critique or otherwise standardize it through individuation and furthermore to predict it and craft it through the same process.
- 11) It dwells in the perfect house i.e. whatever is used to justify the subjective 'I' becomes perfect (right). As such, the void left in the justification of 'I', the empty space, is itself perfection: the house in which the Son dwells. Whatever fills it becomes perfect, hence the space itself is perfection. It is: "Right = \_\_\_\_\_"
- 12) It is aiming at paradise or Heaven i.e. subjective striving for that which is 'better' or 'best'. To create the perfect objective existence (paradise) or subjective existence (Heaven). Ultimately it is the ability to apply individuation in an effort to discern either truth.
- 13) It is the foundation stone and the stone that was rejected i.e. the foundation of the self and the consistent means through which it is re-evaluated. I'm not certain.
- 14) It is the spirit of the Law i.e. the constitution/nature of our submission to objective reality.

As?: God the Spirit(like)

It is the necessity of effecting our own process of individuation upon the universe. It is the 'spirit', rather the *means* or *method*, through which we attempt to 'know God': the nature of objective reality. It is also the 'spirit *OF* God' as He *is* individuation (as the Trinity), and it is also His nature since in creating us, His nature is to individuate too. As such, the Spirit takes on the characteristics of a *conscious application of individuation* to another, rather than to ourselves.

Furthermore, it appears to maintain a distinction between the Father and the Son as a pair, whilst still being a part of them. This is likely due to the duality of the self, the objective and subjective 'I', forming a binary that excludes the conscious application of individuation, the Spirit, in that singular respect. Also for other reasons I mentioned.

Characteristics of the Spirit(like):

- 1) It is akin to the human soul i.e. the arbitrary attribution of purpose, as discussed.
- 2) It is the prophetic voice i.e. through categorization and learning, we can predict the future i.e. time i.e. God and His will.
- 3) Is the still small voice i.e. possibly a reference to its nature as an unconscious process. It doesn't need to be actively engaged (still) and isn't consciously recognized (small).
- 4) It is the spoken truth i.e. that which is individuated culminates in its declaration as a word.
- 5) It is called forth by music. (Your guess)
- 6) It is the enemy of deceit, arrogance, and resentment i.e. as the attempt to create and understand reality, it acts in opposition to what is false, to whom insists they know the truth without knowing, and those who would claim an unfairness in reality itself i.e. God Himself.
- 7) It is the water of life i.e. that which nourishes the self, as mentioned prior.
- 8) It burns without consuming i.e. it is a REFORMATIVE process wherein what is individuated will be *replaced* with a 'truer' version, not unlike the cycle of rebirth of the righteous self. What is 'burned' is never consumed yet the consumption that is the 'fire' remains.
- 9) It's a blind light i.e. takes the unknown, all of objective reality, and makes it into something by virtue of categorization via individuation. It thus 'illuminates' the dark and is the most brilliant light, the most brilliant means of discerning truth, in existence.

So God as a Trinity is the triad of individuation, as represented by their corresponding axioms:

I. "I exist." – Objective

II "I am Right." – Subjective

I? "As?" – Predictive

Aside:

I don't know a better term for 'Spirit' than repeating individuation once again. Predictive suffices but I'm uncertain of it. Perhaps the trinity could be a triad of Creation, Reflection, and Application?

The Trinity thus becomes cyclical. God produces the Son which produces the Spirit which, we don't say produces the Father necessarily, but guides us toward Him. Given individuation allows us not to discern truth, rather to discern what is 'more true' or 'more real' regarding objective reality, it thus brings us closer to God. While it may not produce THE TRUTH, it yet produces A TRUTH as we understand it.

These are telling distinctions as 'THE' represents the system and 'A' represents the subsystem.

In this fashion, the Spirit does produce the Father because it produces that which it 'more true', that which is more like the Father, that which is more universal. From there the cycle continues. This 'new truth' produces a new self which, armed with this new knowledge, engages the process of individuation once again in the attempt to gain greater understanding. It is the attempt of man to reconcile himself with God. Essentially to 'coexist' in their duality as objectively and subjectively substantiated. If you think this mirrors the scientific method you're right, it does. Truth is the goal in both, with systems of cause and effect the concern of both, and time as the ultimate arbiter of both.

# Genesis

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.

A claim of the existence of cause and effect basically. Also the notion of Heaven existing separate from 'the earth' i.e. universe.

Now the earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep,

Nothing was individuated. A dark ether of the unknown.

...and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.

The 'spirit' of individuation was cognizant of this void i.e. waiting to be applied. In other words, the unknown was recognized *as a target* for individuation.

And God said, "Let there be light," and there was light.

Individuation was applied and thus 'light' i.e. knowledge, being, was made manifest. It was 'spoken' into existence as it had become *named*. Also, given the necessarily universal concept of truth, that a single *perfect* truth encompasses the entirety of the universe through relation i.e. cause and effect, that light was the first thing to be produced is no coincidence. It was the first truth and thus spanned the entirety of the universe without any other truth to establish a consistency with; no other truth to create a boundary with and so establish some sort of limitation i.e. to become subsystem as opposed to the entire system. Light 'just was' and hence was 'just everything'. It was truth, everywhere.

## Eden

Though your interpretation may vary, the ultimate virtue is honesty (subsequent to humility) and the ultimate vice is lying (subsequent to pride). With God as objective reality, to lie is to misrepresent God, to speak heresy. To be humble is to be subservient to God, to truth and time, and so understand your place within it and thus what is 'true'. So as unbelievable as it may seem, the nature of the subjective self as necessarily self-righteous, is the cause of *both* humility and pride.

The humility is an effect of our lack of knowledge. Regardless the necessary justification of the self as righteous, one is intimately aware of the utter irrationality of the position. In this way, they still hold to themselves as themselves but manifest self-doubt, searching, and ultimately individuation that through which they can attempt to discern truth and hold themselves to it. To hold themselves subservient to God.

The pride is obvious. Given your self-righteous nature, that which you justify as yourself becomes true regardless its actual validity. Thus you become prideful in your claim of it and your immutable adherence to it as 'truth'. In order to maintain this self as true in spite of reality, in spite of truth, in spite of God Himself, you have to deny Him, by definition. You must deny what is true. You must reject time as the ultimate arbiter of truth i.e. reject God's will.

Such denial is an active process. In fact, it is the opposing process to individuation. For with each thing you individuate which challenges your perception of self, you must destroy that thing. So you invert the process of individuation. You nebulize rather than individuate. You destroy the concept of that individual 'other' by relinquishing your arbitrary attribution of cause to it. You eliminate it as a subsystem of cause and effect and so let it recede back into the unknown.

## Original Sin

Problem is, everyone must do this in some regard. Regardless that the self remains in a state of flux, it remains, in some fashion, grounded through a *rejection* of reality. It is, after all, founded on an irrationality: an illogical 'self-cause', an inconsistency and one that couldn't be recognized. Yet, it is an

irrationality that cannot be recognized *until* one engages in the process of individuation. Until one applies the process of individuation – though not to objective reality, but to the self as God had done.

This is Original Sin. It is a product of our consciousness as created through individuation. It is responsible for the soul yes, but also the Original Sin with it.

So in the Garden of Eden existed Adam, Eve, and God and God gave Adam the *task of naming things* i.e. individuation (of course He did!) Yet in the Garden was the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. This tree didn't represent individuation itself as Adam could already do that. Rather, it represented standardization. Standardization is best understood here not as the arbitrary attribution of cause, but the attribution of cause to that which doesn't actually exist; essentially producing claims of untruth – unreality, though nevertheless presented as truth. It is the process of creating unnecessary and illegitimate dichotomies. Moreover, such attribution is necessarily *to the self*. It was *self-targeted*, rather than targeting objective reality. It was to look to the self rather than to God. A narcissistic exercise if ever there was one.

For example, instead of applying individuation to reality in order to discern truth and so subsequently alter the self, individuation was applied once more to the *self*. This was something God had originally done and *only God was allowed to do: judge His creation*. This was able to manifest as, essentially, preferences. Albeit such preferences were now claimed as 'truth'. Also, given the nature of individuation, such was done in the effort to *ALTER GOD*. See, since one individuates reality in order to alter self, if one individuates self they are attempting to alter that which is above the self, that which has created the self through individuation. Hence this was an affront to God. Furthermore, by applying individuation to the self, it once again arbitrarily attributed cause to the self. Yet in this case, it was an arbitrary attribution of cause to one's *beliefs*. In the same way you apply individuation to reality in order to produce a 'self-caused' individual, you apply individuation to the self in order to produce – not a self-caused self, but rather a self-caused *belief*. A belief you 'just have', one that 'just exists' irrespective of reality. Moreover, one needs to deny reality, needs to deny the truth i.e. God Himself in order to keep such beliefs unchanged. So in essence, this was the creation of BIAS. And what, pray tell, is the greatest sin in the scientific world? Bias. Again, the parallels are uncanny.

Aside:

Dr. Peterson, consider the concept of universal human truths. That's what Adam and Eve operated on in the Garden. Once they applied individuation to themselves rather than reality, they produced preferences. Preferences which are by definition exclusionary dichotomies. Everything from a taste for peanut butter to making lampshades out of human skin. Essentially, it was desire apart from need, subjectivity *apart from* objectivity. These were not necessarily evil nor good of course, but then again it was the Tree of the Knowledge of 'Good *and* Evil'. Yet once they became entrenched as biases that, by definition, seek to supplant objective reality with subjective self-righteousness well, that's when they became evil itself.

The notion of exclusionary categorization, but also of presenting the subjective as absolute, as objective, IS the concept of the 'good' and the 'evil'. Sure, we attempt to hand-wave this away by claiming that it's merely *our own* standards, which is true of course. Yet, that such standards come to form what we label as 'good' and 'evil' shifts the burden onto the notion of morality and whether IT is an objective concept. Hence the debate there. Though more importantly, that our own standards eventually culminate in behaviors, themselves necessarily based on predictions regarding objective reality, reveals that regardless our claims of morality being subjective and, in this context, innocuous, they manifest in real-world behaviors that are designed to operate within and as an effort to predict objective reality. In other words, such personal standards operate no differently than that which we would claim as truth, as that which is objective. So the 'distinction' becomes moot in practice.

Essentially, by individuating the self we created our own dichotomy wherein we held our standards, our individuals, our beliefs (things created through individuation) as some absolute truth. We took the tool granted to us by God and used it in the attempt to make ourselves Him. To alter what He had created and so alter Him in the process – even to usurp His station as our creator.

Of course, the nature of such standards, such biases is that, like pride, they *require nebulization* to maintain. Everything that exists to contradict the standard is therefore 'evil' and must be eliminated. So when Adam and Eve ate of the Tree they gained the ability to standardize the self, to individuate self. Simply put Dr. Peterson, just consider the notion of Adam and Eve critiquing and otherwise having want for, and finding fault in, God's creation. Talk about looking a gift horse in the mouth, it's utterly blasphemous! So Adam and Eve created nakedness and standards for dress, amongst other 'discoveries'. Though there is a particular reason nakedness is the first thing to notice. It has to do with vulnerability but we'll discuss that later.

Social Justice Warriors

Now as you know, when God asked Adam if he ate of the Tree he didn't deny it but rather shifted responsibility to Eve. This is ABSOLUTELY INTEGRAL but I must discuss it with you in full later. Though consider the nature of pride here. Pride engenders nebulization. Nebulization is a rejection of, and so the attempt to invert, the process of individuation. It's the attempt to return everything that has been created through individuation to the ether, to the void. The attempt to dissolve the 'truth', to nebulize reality. It thus remains wholly and forever bound to the subjective 'I' without any means of reconstitution, without any means through which it can engage the cycle of perpetual reformation, of rebirth. It is when the self is ever-right, ever-prideful, and ALL IS SUBJECTIVE FOREVER. Where one is ever-blameless and can only *blame others*.

You call this evil, Marxism, Nazism, the worst of humankind. I call it Antithesism. Anti-thesis-ism.

## Political Binary

See Dr. Peterson, the Biblical tale of Genesis is the explanation of the creation of consciousness. You're right about that. Yet it's also the tale of the origin of the Left and Right binary as a necessary consequence of that consciousness, of individuation. The origin of 'good' and 'evil'.

In particular, it's the origin of the dual means through which one can CHOOSE to justify "As?" This is why the Spirit remains somewhat detached from the duality of the Father and Son. With the Father and Son represented axiomatically in 'I', "As?" as an axiom forces a CHOICE and with that the decision either to individuate *or* to nebulize. It's the decision to set and reform individuals or to tear down and destroy already existing individuals.

The necessity of having already-existing standards to destroy is why the Left exists in response to, and as a parasite on, the Right no matter where they manifest. The Left exists to destroy what the Right creates through individuation. Period. Hence why the Left exists apart from the Right no matter how far the Right moves Left. There is always, ALWAYS some new frontier, some product of individuation to nebulize thus crafting their distinction.

## Reformist

There does exist an 'evil' Right of course, what you would call the 'Far Right'. In this paradigm however, what you consider to be a 'good Leftist' or Liberal, nevertheless engages in the process of individuation by definition. They are thus a secondary 'Rightist' of sorts who manifests individuation such that it results in a continuous reformation *whilst maintaining the purpose* such standards were designed to achieve. It's something that isn't done anymore, hence the dissolution of meaning for 'gender' and even 'woman' without any replacement. It's also what the confused 'centrists' are supposed to be doing but can't grasp.

## The Left and Right within the Triad

The Far Left exists without, and resists the implementation of, a Success State i.e. that which demonstrates as true. Hence nothing is true to a Leftist. They stop the cycle at the subjective without searching for truth, without engaging in individuation. This is one form of self-righteousness.

The Far Right exists without, and resists the implementation of, a Failure State i.e. that which demonstrates as false. Hence nothing a Rightist does *as a Rightist* is wrong or believed false. They stop the cycle at the application of individuation without subsequently reforming the self. This is the other form of self-righteousness.

The Reformer or Reformist completes the cycle and as such cycles through it in perpetuity.

Dr. Peterson, there would exist more political wings were there more positions upon which to halt this cycle. Yet as a Triad there are only 5 states:

0 – Non existent

1 – Objective

2 – Subjective

3 – Predictive

#### 4 – Full Cycle

Granted, one could cease the cycle at the level of non-existence (0) and subsequent to it objective reality (1), but the former wouldn't exist by definition and the latter wouldn't develop consciousness by definition. Moreover, that is where we develop our understanding of cause and effect. It's the impetus to the binary of that which is and that which is not, 1 and 0, and the realm in which we *don't* recognize Free Will and so can attribute cause. The realm we can individuate within.

We exist in 1. We manifest in 2. We test in 3 to determine 1 once again. We get either a '1' or '0' out of it and begin the process again, hopefully with an alteration to what '1' is such that everything changes in response and the cycle progresses. Which is what real progress is.

#### Closing

With all this said, the nature of the Left and its origin exists within the same consciousness creation myth you already understand. You can simply reapply it to what I've said in the context of Left and Right. Or we can have a chat.

Your choice Doc.