



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 23, 2025

Liberal Ex-college Professor: “We’ve Been Sold a Bill of Goods ... Called Multiculturalism”

“I’ve come to the conclusion that we’ve been sold a bill of goods.”

“And the bill of goods was called multiculturalism.”

So said liberal evolutionary biologist, researcher, ex-academic, and now podcaster and commentator Brett Weinstein. He made his comments recently during a very intellectual discussion with famed clinical psychologist Jordan Peterson, part of which [was posted](#) Friday to the latter’s YouTube channel. And the two men essentially issued a warning, albeit in the most highbrow tone. To wit:



wildpixel/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Multiculturalism threatens Western civilization itself by prioritizing differences (read: diversity) over unity. If it is not “canceled,” the West very well may be.

The Multi-cult

The video clip opens with Weinstein, brother of famed mathematician and podcaster Eric Weinstein, expounding upon that “bill of goods.” He stated that the

problem with multiculturalism is that it sounds like something that those of us who like to interact with people from many different cultures should appreciate. But it’s in fact the opposite of ... the value that we actually hold. The value that we actually hold I would call Western cosmopolitanism.... Multiculturalism is the idea that people should not join our societies, but they should maintain their own traditions in an isolated pocket, and that we should effectively reject the idea of becoming one people in the West.

At this point, Peterson interjected and pointed out that this ideology ignores

the fact that if you bring people together and reduplicate the situation of the world at large with no uniting meta-narrative ... you also bring in all of the conflict.

Put simply, and as has been said, bring enough of “there” here, and here becomes there. For example, import the Third World, become the Third World.

By Bread Alone?

Peterson went on to say that this multiculturalist error is “fueled by ... an underlying materialism.” He continued:



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 23, 2025

So maybe the notion is, if you bring diverse people from all over the world regardless of their culture and you provide them with sufficient economic opportunity — given that conflict is driven fundamentally by economic need, let's say, or economic differences — that that will just vanish somehow, magically.

What's generally unsaid is that this is a *Marxist* idea. The late Pope Benedict XVI addressed this phenomenon, in fact, when critiquing Karl Marx. He pointed out that the latter's mistake was his viewing of man as a *purely economic being*. That is, human behavior is explainable, and problems remediable, the thinking goes, solely via an economic approach. (E.g., the communist notion that simply eliminating economic inequality will end human strife).

Yet man is not driven just by economics, important though that is. He also has intellectual, emotional, psychological, moral, and spiritual dimensions. Moreover, the Truth appears precisely the opposite of the Marxist thesis. Just consider, for example, that terrorist Osama bin Laden was worth approximately \$30 million.

And why does the saying "An idle mind is the Devil's workshop" exist? Why does the Chinese proverb inform, "When there's food on the table there are many problems. When there's no food on the table, there's only one problem"? Answer:

Freeing man from economic stress, which is a good thing to do, also frees him up to fixate on other troubles, real or imagined. Know here that Karl Marx himself came from a well-to-do home. Had he needed to toil in the fields sunup to sunset just to subsist, it's doubtful he'd have co-written *The Communist Manifesto*.

A Proposition Nation?

Weinstein also outlined two factors he believes drive human collaboration: genetic relatedness (kinship) and reciprocity (mutual benefit). The West's strength, he asserted, lies in prioritizing reciprocity. This results in diverse individuals working together for shared wealth and progress. In contrast, kin-based systems limit collaboration, he averred.

Weinstein credits the Founders for this reciprocal standard, too. They created a framework that minimized advantages based on lineage, he essentially said, facilitating said collaboration.

Weinstein painted even more broadly as well, stating that

what we call the West, I believe, is most fundamentally about the agreement to put aside our lineages and collaborate because there is wealth to be produced.

United States of Money?

Peterson appeared to place greater emphasis on the importance of that "meta-narrative," however. And I would, too, take issue with Weinstein's interpretation of the West's fundamentals. The reality is that during the West's rise and heyday, its countries certainly had a sense of being a "national family." For example, Briton G.K. Chesterton wrote in the early 1900s about how, sure, his countrymen might have their disagreements. But at the end of the day, they would always be "English."

Then there were the sentiments expressed by founder John Adams in a July 1815 letter to Thomas Jefferson.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on August 23, 2025

“The consanguinity [relationship based on common lineage] of our politics and our religion has been our great advantage,” he wrote. “It has made us one people, united in sentiment and in affection, as well as in interest and in destiny.”

Adams explained that this consanguinity was instrumental in our Revolutionary War victory and a significant bulwark of our new nation. He contrasted this with challenges more diverse lands faced.

In reality, though, the U.S. was never about prioritizing *or* ignoring old ethnic identities.

It was, during its most sober moments, about forging a new, common “ethnic” identity: *American*.

President Theodore Roosevelt emphasized this, do note, in his famous 1915 “no room in this country for hyphenated Americanism” [speech](#).

Unfortunately, this now all seems a bit quaint, as hyphenating oneself is the norm today — even among patriots.

Diversity in Confusion

Regarding other matters, Weinstein also mentioned, innocently, that it’s “not a question” in America of “what God” you pray to. It is true, too, that this has no bearing on your constitutional rights.

But what God we pray to will have a major bearing on whether we’ll keep them.

As I explained in “[The Acceptance Con](#)” (2013), a people’s theistic orientation influences their conception of right and wrong.

Speaking of which, multiculturalism [is also a corollary](#) of, and a Trojan horse for, moral relativism (explained [here](#)). This may be its most dangerous aspect, in fact.

Lastly, there’s another kind of cultural divide in America, one that also has a “multicultural” effect: the homegrown philosophical divide. For instance, “liberals” and “conservatives” are now so different that they could be conceived as distinct and incompatible cultural groups.

The bottom line is that a common culture leads to having a common country. A thoroughly “multicultural” land can be held together — but only through the iron fist of tyranny.

For those interested, the Peterson/Weinstein discussion is below.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.