

Useful Free Booklets Series

Wokism: Descent into Fascism

How a movement for justice became a machine for
control

By Jean-Georges Estiot

This booklet has been created to encourage open discussion, thoughtful study and careful critical enquiry. It is intended as a resource that invites readers to question, reflect and explore ideas deeply, rather than accept them without consideration. Permission is given to reproduce the content of this booklet for any purpose.

My email is jgestiot@gmail.com and your feedback is welcome.

Hope to Dogma

It started with good intentions. People wanted fairness. They wanted justice. They wanted to include voices that had been ignored for too long. These were noble goals, and for a brief moment, it felt like something important was happening. People were listening. Things were changing. The world was finally paying attention.

Then something snapped.

What began as a movement for equality became a race for moral purity. What began as empathy became accusation. What began as awareness became control. Wokism was no longer about helping people. It was about policing them. You were either on the right side, or you were dangerous. You either said the right words, or you were the enemy. There was no room left for questions. Only slogans.

This booklet is not a defence of ignorance. It is not a love letter to the past. It is not written by someone who wants to bring back the good old days. It is written by someone who noticed that a movement built on freedom of expression now spends most of its time deciding who is allowed to speak. That is not progress. That is a quiet kind of fascism, dressed in rainbow flags and buzzwords.

You are not supposed to notice this. You are supposed to smile and agree. If something feels off, you are told to be quiet. If you speak up, you are corrected. If you keep speaking, you are cancelled. And the most terrifying part is that this is all done in the name of kindness.

This booklet tells the story of how that happened. It is not polite. It is not filtered. And it is not trying to win friends. It is trying to wake people up before every uncomfortable truth is made illegal and every honest thought becomes a hate crime.

The golden moment

There was a time when it made sense to say, I'm woke. It meant you had noticed something that deserved attention. Maybe it was racism in hiring. Maybe it was how women were treated at work. Maybe it was how gay people had to hide who they were just to stay safe. Being woke meant being alert to injustice. It meant looking past your own comfort and recognising that not everyone gets the same deal.

And at first, this awareness made people better. They became more thoughtful. They started listening. They saw stories that had been hidden. They paid attention to

voices that had been ignored. For a while, it felt like society had a chance to become more fair, more honest, and less cruel.

That was the golden moment. It did not last long.

Because the minute awareness became a brand, the movement started to rot. People stopped listening and started performing. Being woke became a competition. Who could care the most. Who could be the loudest ally. Who could confess the most privilege. None of it was about real understanding. It was about approval.

The more people tried to show how good they were, the more hollow it became. Wokism stopped being about the world and started being about the self. Every tweet was a badge. Every slogan was a test. Every conversation was a trap. You could never be careful enough. And the people who were once part of something honest found themselves stuck inside something shallow.

The golden moment was not fake. It just got buried. What followed was not progress. It was a pageant. And the worst part is that many people are still clapping, long after the meaning has vanished.

The purity spiral

Once a movement starts rewarding moral superiority, it does not stop at reasonable. It keeps going. It becomes a race to see who can be the most correct, the most sensitive, the most oppressed, the most offended. And that is exactly what happened. Wokism turned into a purity spiral, where every new rule made the last one look weak.

At first, it was enough to care. Then it was not enough. You had to post about it. Then you had to post the right things. Then you had to post them fast. Then you had to include every group. Then you had to apologise for not including them earlier. And if you hesitated, even for a second, you were no longer on the right side. You were suspicious.

People began to walk on eggshells, not out of respect, but out of fear. They were not becoming more aware. They were becoming more anxious. They checked every word twice, not to be kind, but to avoid being eaten by their own crowd. You could be punished not just for what you said, but for what you did not say fast enough.

In the purity spiral, no one wins. Everyone is at risk. It does not matter how good your intentions are. It only matters how perfectly you perform. And since perfection keeps getting redefined, failure is guaranteed.

This is not a culture of empathy. It is a culture of surveillance. People watch each other for slips. They compete to be the first to condemn. They show their virtue by turning on friends. What used to be activism now feels like a permanent audition for moral approval.

And just like that, a movement that began with open arms became a firing squad that never runs out of targets.

The Cancel Culture

Once the purity game is in full swing, there has to be a punishment for getting it wrong. That punishment is cancellation. You say the wrong word, like the wrong post, make the wrong joke in the wrong year, and that is it. You are done. Your name is dragged, your job is at risk, your apology is demanded. And none of this is for debate. It is a ritual. You were impure. Now you must be removed.

At first, cancel culture claimed to hold powerful people accountable. But it did not stop there. It grew. It started to chase people who said the wrong thing, even once, even years ago. It became less about justice and more about fear.

Gina Carano, an actress on a Disney show, was fired for sharing a politically unpopular opinion on Instagram. It was not a crime. It was not hate speech. It was just not approved. J.K. Rowling, one of the most successful authors in the world, was suddenly labelled a bigot for saying that biological sex exists. She was accused of harming people with words that would have sounded normal five years earlier. No one bothered to argue with her. They just demanded she go away.

Even comedy is not safe. Dave Chappelle faced organised campaigns against him for making jokes about gender identity. People demanded his shows be cancelled, his contracts dropped, his voice silenced. Not because he committed a crime, but because he made people uncomfortable.

This is the pattern. You do not have to be cruel. You do not have to be wrong. You just have to be unfashionable. And once the mob decides you are the enemy, there is no trial. Just public shame.

It happens to ordinary people too. A teacher misuses a word and loses their job. A teenager shares the wrong meme and gets doxxed. A software developer donates money to the wrong political cause and is chased out of their company. These people are not monsters. They are people who made a mistake, or said something the internet tribunal decided to hate that day.

What makes it worse is that cancellation does not require proof. It just needs outrage. A few angry tweets. A clipped quote. A trending hashtag. It spreads fast, and by the time the facts come out, no one cares. You are already guilty by association.

This is not justice. It is theatre. It is moral performance for the crowd. It does not ask people to be better. It just tells them to be quiet.

History on trial

In the world of wokism, even the dead are not safe. Once the culture of cancellation took hold, it began reaching into the past. Statues were torn down. Names were removed from buildings. Books were edited or banned. Entire historical figures were judged by today's moral fashion and sentenced without defence. It did not matter what they achieved. One flaw was enough to erase them.

Winston Churchill was condemned for colonial views. Thomas Jefferson was reduced to a slave owner. Abraham Lincoln was criticised for not being progressive enough. Their statues were defaced, removed, or hidden. The goal was not to understand the past. It was to punish it.

Books received the same treatment. Roald Dahl's stories were rewritten to remove unkind words. Mark Twain's language was changed to avoid offence. Agatha Christie's titles were altered to sound softer. The past was cleaned up with a red pen, not to inform, but to protect people from discomfort. What was once literature became a carefully filtered product, designed to avoid feelings, not provoke thought.

This is not progress. It is control. And control over history is one of the oldest tools of authoritarian power. Fascist regimes rewrote the past to make their version of the present feel inevitable. They banned books, edited records, and replaced memory with myth. They needed a simple past to justify their vision of the future.

Wokism does the same. It uses modern purity standards to rewrite what came before. It presents history not as a struggle, but as a morality play. Every figure must be either pure or wicked. There is no room for complexity. No space for context. And no forgiveness for error.

But the past is not there to protect our feelings. It is there to challenge us. To show what people believed, how they failed, how they grew, and how we got here. When a movement decides it can silence the dead, it is not seeking truth. It is demanding obedience. That is not education. That is soft fascism dressed up as social progress.

Trigger culture and the rise of fear

In any healthy society, people disagree. They say things that clash. They offend each other, then talk about it, then move on. But wokism is not built for disagreement. It treats discomfort as danger. If someone feels upset, something must be wrong. If a sentence causes a reaction, the sentence is the threat. This is how trigger culture took over.

A trigger used to mean something serious. It referred to trauma. Now it can mean almost anything. A wrong opinion. A disagreeable tweet. A character in a book. A biological fact. A statue. A word. Even silence can be offensive, if it is not the right kind of silence. People now demand emotional safety in every space, but what they mean by safety is total agreement.

Examples are everywhere. At Oxford, law students were given trigger warnings before studying cases of violence, in case the material upset them. At the University of California, the phrase “America is a land of opportunity” was listed as a microaggression. In Canada, a professor faced discipline for showing a video debate about gender pronouns, simply because a student felt distressed. Students were not hurt. They were uncomfortable. But that was enough.

Authors have been asked to pre-label their novels for content that might upset people. Not violence. Not horror. Just adult themes. Just ideas. In some schools, Shakespeare is flagged with warnings. Mark Twain is treated like toxic waste. Even classic fairy tales are being reworded to avoid offence.

None of this builds strength. It rewards fragility. The more sensitive you are, the more moral you appear. The more offended you act, the more power you gain. Wokism does not prepare people for life. It trains them to expect the world to adapt to their emotions. And if it does not, they collapse or accuse.

The result is fear. Teachers avoid teaching. Writers avoid truth. Friends avoid topics. Everyone starts censoring themselves, not because they are kind, but because they do not want trouble. This is not emotional safety. It is emotional control. And once the loudest feelings win, facts lose.

Where thought goes to die

Universities used to be places where people were expected to think. Students came to be challenged. Professors were paid to ask hard questions. Ideas were debated, tested, criticised, and improved. That was the point. You did not have to

agree with what you heard. You had to engage with it.

That model is collapsing. Wokism has taken over the institutions that were supposed to protect free thought. The result is not education. It is obedience.

Professors now have to submit diversity statements just to be hired. Entire fields, from literature to psychology, are being reshaped to focus on race, identity, and privilege. Asking questions about any of it is treated as suspicious. If a teacher says the wrong thing, even by accident, they can be reported by students and investigated by committees. In some cases, they are fired.

At Evergreen State College, a biology professor named Bret Weinstein questioned a campus-wide event that demanded white people stay home for a day. He did not shout. He did not insult anyone. He wrote a letter. Students surrounded his classroom, screamed at him, and accused him of violence. He had to leave the college for his own safety.

At Yale, students shouted down a professor because his wife had written an email suggesting that adults could choose their own Halloween costumes. Not wear them. Just choose them. That was enough to cause outrage. Students cried. They called the professor abusive. One of them screamed in his face for failing to create a safe space.

The message is clear. Feeling offended now outranks thinking. If you challenge the approved script, you are not just wrong. You are harmful. And the more people treat ideas as weapons, the less willing anyone becomes to think at all.

Wokism has not made universities stronger. It has turned them into ideological camps where students are rewarded for being fragile, not thoughtful. They are not being educated. They are being trained to see disagreement as abuse, trained to react instead of reason, and trained to put emotion above reality. These institutions are not producing thinkers. They are manufacturing a generation of hypersensitive, thin-skinned adults who treat every opinion they dislike as a personal attack. The result is a society full of graduates who know how to protest, but not how to think.

Vocabulary of the new order

Language used to help people understand each other. You said what you meant. If someone disagreed, you discussed it. But under wokism, language has become a test of loyalty. Words are no longer chosen for clarity. They are chosen to prove you are part of the group. Use the wrong word and you are no longer welcome.

Take gender. In 2021, Brighton and Sussex hospitals told staff to use birthing parent instead of mother, chestfeeding instead of breastfeeding, and human milk instead of breast milk. This was not because the new words made things clearer. It was because someone decided the old words were unsafe. Biology was renamed to avoid hurt feelings.

In schools, children are taught lists of new gender identities, like agender, demiboy, two-spirit, and genderqueer. These are not explained. They are presented as truth. A child who says there are only two sexes can be punished for causing harm. In some classrooms, everyone is expected to state their pronouns out loud, even if no one asked. This is not about confusion. It is about signalling submission.

It does not stop with gender. At Stanford University, a guide recommended avoiding the word American because it might exclude people from Central or South America. The word “freshman” was banned in favour of “first-year” just before the term was gendered. Even the term “walk-in” was discouraged because not everyone can walk. Even the term “blind review” was replaced with “anonymous review”. The reason given was ableism.

One of the most well-known cases of resistance to this forced language came from Canadian professor Jordan Peterson. In 2016, he objected to Bill C-16, which added gender identity and gender expression to Canada’s human rights law. Peterson made it clear he was not against calling people what they preferred. His objection was about being compelled by law to use specific pronouns under threat of punishment. He argued that the government had crossed a line. It was not protecting rights. It was legislating speech. For that, he was accused of hate, bigotry, and violence, simply for refusing to let the state dictate his vocabulary.

In many workplaces, failing to use made-up pronouns like xe, ze, or fae can result in complaints. These terms are not based on language. They are based on ideology. It does not matter if they confuse people. The point is not communication. The point is control.

Old words are also being redefined. Equality is replaced with equity, even though they mean different things. Equality means treating people the same. Equity means giving people different treatment based on group identity. Racism no longer means treating someone badly because of their skin. It now includes systems, structures, and silence. You can be racist without knowing it. You can be racist without doing anything. All it takes is being the wrong type of person in the wrong place at the wrong time.

This is not how a language works. This is how a language is captured. When words stop pointing to reality and start pointing to ideology, meaning breaks down. People stop being honest. They start being careful. And careful speech is not truthful speech. It is performance. It is survival.

The identity trap

At first glance, identity politics looks like fairness. It says we should listen to people based on their background. It says lived experience matters. That sounds reasonable. But under wokism, identity is not a lens. It is a weapon. It decides who can speak and who must stay silent. It decides who is always right and who can never be trusted.

The trap works like this. If you belong to a favoured identity group, you are treated as a victim by default. Your words carry more weight. Your feelings are taken more seriously. You are given the benefit of the doubt, even when you are wrong. If you belong to a disfavoured group, usually white, male, straight, or Western, you are treated as privileged. Your words are questioned. Your motives are suspect. You are expected to listen, nod, and apologise.

This has nothing to do with actual behaviour. It is based entirely on what group you are in. Good identity, you are believed. Bad identity, you are silenced. Even worse, the categories are permanent. You cannot change them. You cannot escape them. You are either oppressed or you are the oppressor. End of story.

That is why facts no longer matter in these debates. If a woman says something, and a man disagrees, it is called misogyny. If a black person says something, and a white person disagrees, it is called racism. The idea itself is not judged. Only the identity of the person saying it. The result is a complete shutdown of thought.

This is why wokism loves fringe identities. They are harder to question. They create confusion, which can be used as control. A male swimmer who says he is now female is allowed to compete against women. If anyone complains, they are told to shut up and be inclusive. It does not matter that he still has the strength of a man. It only matters that he said the magic words.

Wokism does not believe in individuals. It believes in categories. You are not a person. You are a type. And your type determines how much you are allowed to say, whether you are allowed to be offended, and how many points you score on the moral scoreboard.

Rigged scales

Wokism talks about fairness, but it does not play fair. It replaces merit with quotas. It replaces ability with identity. A person's worth is no longer measured by what they can do, but by what group they belong to. And the tools used to enforce this are now everywhere.

Quotas appear across the modern workplace. In 2021, the BBC announced that 20 percent of its staff must be from ethnic minorities. California pushed legislation to require corporate boards to include women and racial minorities. Some companies now advertise roles specifically for black applicants or non-binary individuals. None of this is based on skill. It is based on ticking the right identity boxes.

Affirmative action does the same thing in education. It was meant to help historically disadvantaged groups, but in practice it has turned into state-managed inequality. Asian students, despite having the highest grades and test scores, are penalised in elite university admissions. At Harvard, internal documents revealed that race balancing was used to reduce the number of Asians, just to keep the visual numbers politically acceptable. Students are not judged by excellence. They are judged by skin colour.

Quotas even infect politics. Canada's Prime Minister Justin Trudeau appointed a cabinet with a 50/50 gender split, not because of qualifications, but because it was politically correct. Parliaments in Europe and Latin America have enforced minimum percentages of female candidates, regardless of whether those candidates were chosen by voters or party members. In some cases, men have been removed from the ballot just to hit a quota.

In film and the arts, the Academy Awards now requires films to meet a diversity checklist to be eligible for Best Picture. It does not matter if the film is brilliant. If the crew and cast are not sufficiently diverse, it can be excluded. Identity first. Art second.

And yet, this logic only ever goes one way. The NBA is made up of around 75 percent black players. No one demands racial balance. No one calls for more white or Asian athletes on the court. In fact, suggesting such a thing would be called racist. But when companies or universities have too many white or Asian faces, the quota machine turns on. Nursing and primary education are dominated by women, but no one calls that a gender crisis.

This is not inclusion. It is ideological accounting. Quotas and affirmative action do not solve injustice. They reverse it. They do not empower people. They sort them. They

punish talent when it appears in the wrong body. They reward mediocrity when it fits the narrative.

A society that runs on quotas cannot be a meritocracy. It becomes a game where the rules change based on who is playing. And the longer that continues, the more people will stop trying to be excellent. Because they will know that excellence no longer matters.

Ideology for kids

Wokism does not wait until adulthood. It targets children early, before they can question, before they can reason, and before their minds are fully formed. Schools, once meant to teach children how to think, are now being used to tell them what to think. Education has been replaced by ideology, and classrooms are being turned into political training camps.

Children as young as five are being told that gender is not a biological fact but a personal feeling. In some schools, they are asked to declare their pronouns before they know what grammar is. Books like "I Am Jazz" are read aloud to explain how a boy can become a girl simply by saying so. In other classrooms, they are taught that there are more than fifty genders. Questioning any of this is treated as bullying.

Sex education has been twisted beyond recognition. Instead of learning about anatomy and reproduction at an appropriate age, children are now exposed to material that would once have been considered adult content. In parts of Canada, the United States, and the UK, students have been shown diagrams of sexual positions and taught about gender fluidity and alternative sexual practices. Some schools have socially transitioned children without informing parents, changing their name and pronouns behind closed doors and telling teachers to keep it a secret.

In this climate, even reality itself is up for grabs. There are growing numbers of cases where children are allowed, even encouraged, to identify as animals. A girl in Australia claimed to be a cat and was accommodated by the school. In the United States, stories have surfaced of children who insist they are foxes, wolves, or other creatures. Instead of correction, they are given affirmation. Reality bends to avoid hurting feelings.

The same methods are applied in history. White children are told they benefit from invisible systems of privilege. Black children are told they are permanent victims. In 2020, an elementary school in New York sent parents a worksheet about white

privilege to complete with their children. The goal was not to teach history. It was to assign guilt.

Slogans replace facts. Words like diversity, inclusion, equity, privilege, and oppression are repeated until they become unchallengeable truths. Children are not taught how to think critically. They are taught to conform. Questions are punished. Doubts are pathologised. Everything is emotional. Everything is political.

Wokism targets children because it knows they are easier to shape than adults. A child taught that feelings are more important than facts, that identity overrides reality, and that disagreement equals harm, will grow into an obedient adult who never dares to question authority.

Wokism and the death of comedy

Comedy is one of the first things to die under a controlling ideology. Wokism is no different. It does not tolerate being laughed at, questioned, or exposed. Jokes that once brought people together by pointing out shared absurdities are now treated as hate crimes. Comedians who stray from the script are cancelled, boycotted, or labelled dangerous.

The rules are strict and constantly shifting. You cannot joke about race, gender, religion, body type, mental illness, cultural differences, or anything else considered “sensitive.” The list of off-limits topics grows so fast that many comedians no longer take risks at all. They self-censor or stick to safe material, like food or pets. Anything sharper comes with career risk.

Several well-known comedians have pushed back. Dave Chappelle refused to apologise for making jokes about transgender activists. He was met with protests and calls for Netflix to drop him. Ricky Gervais mocked identity politics during the Golden Globes and was accused of being cruel. Chris Rock, once a bold social commentator, now openly admits that he avoids university campuses because students cannot take a joke. Jerry Seinfeld and others have said the same.

It is not just about the performers. It is about the audience. Wokism trains people to go to a comedy show looking for something to be offended by. Laughter is replaced with judgment. A joke is no longer something to enjoy. It is something to analyse for moral purity. If it fails the test, the comedian must apologise or disappear.

Satire used to be a weapon against power. Now, under wokism, it is treated as a form of oppression. The result is a comedy scene that is quieter, safer, and more

afraid. The truly funny are either muzzled or forced to create their work underground, outside of mainstream platforms.

When a society can no longer laugh at itself, it becomes sick. It loses perspective. It starts taking every idea, every feeling, and every word as a sacred object. That is not progress. That is fear disguised as virtue.

The illusion of lived experience

Wokism has created a strange new rule: personal experience now beats evidence. This is called “lived experience,” and it has been placed above facts, logic, and common sense. If someone claims to have experienced oppression, their version of events must be accepted without question. To doubt their story is seen as harm. To ask for proof is treated as denial.

This gives enormous power to feelings. If a person says they felt unsafe because of a joke, a look, or even silence, then that feeling becomes truth. It no longer matters what actually happened. Only how it was experienced. Facts are pushed aside. Lived experience becomes a sacred object that must not be challenged.

This turns conversation into a trap. If someone says the system is racist or that words are violence, and you disagree, they accuse you of invalidating their experience. Even if you present statistics or facts, you will be told that you cannot understand because you do not share their identity. Lived experience shuts down debate by turning disagreement into a personal insult.

The absurdity becomes clear when the same people ignore lived experience that does not serve their agenda. A black person who supports conservative ideas is often dismissed or attacked. A woman who questions feminism is told she has internalised oppression. A gay person who criticises pride events is accused of betrayal. Their lived experience is erased, because it challenges the script. You are only allowed to speak your truth if it matches the approved version.

This is especially dangerous in institutions. Companies, schools, and government offices now host listening sessions where people are invited to describe how they felt excluded or mistreated. These stories are treated as fact, even when no one checks them. The goal is not to understand what happened. The goal is to validate a narrative.

This new rule replaces reason with emotion. Shared truth is abandoned. In its place is a system where feelings have the final word. And when everyone is right just

because they feel something, the only people who are ever wrong are those who still believe in evidence.

The oppression Olympics

Wokism builds its worldview on the idea of oppression, but not all oppression is equal. Some forms are spotlighted. Others are ignored. The goal is not justice. It is status. The more oppressed a person claims to be, the more authority they are given. This has created a race to the bottom, where people compete to prove they are the most marginalised.

It starts with identity. A straight white male is at the bottom of the woke ranking. He is considered privileged by default. A black woman ranks higher. A black lesbian woman even higher. Add a disability or a transgender identity and the status increases again. Each label adds a layer of moral weight. The system does not reward character, reason, or effort. It rewards identity claims.

This creates strange incentives. People now list their hardships like qualifications. Students write about their trauma to boost college applications. Employees highlight their background in diversity statements. Social media influencers announce new sexual identities or mental disorders to gain followers and credibility. It becomes a contest of suffering, and the winners are those who appear the most broken.

This also explains why certain groups are ignored. If a working-class white man loses his job and falls into poverty, he is rarely seen as a victim. His struggle is not counted, because his identity does not serve the narrative. Jewish people, despite being a historically persecuted group, are often excluded from the hierarchy of oppression, especially if they are successful. In some activist circles, they are even rebranded as oppressors.

The result is not solidarity. It is division. People are sorted, ranked, and measured by how much pain they can claim. Disagreement is dismissed by pointing to someone's place on the ladder. A person lower on the scale is assumed to know more. A person higher up is told to stay quiet and listen.

This is not empowerment. It is a game of victimhood, played with real consequences. It encourages people to see themselves as weak, to find meaning in grievance, and to believe that moral worth comes from suffering rather than action.



The recycling of racism

Wokism claims to fight racism, but it has reinvented it instead. In place of judging people by their skin colour, it now judges them by their racial category in the name of justice. It calls this anti-racism, but it operates using the same logic racism always has: one set of rules for some, another set for others.

In the new system, whiteness is treated as a flaw. White people are told they carry invisible privilege, even if they are poor, disabled, or struggling. They are told to listen, apologise, and stay silent. Books like "White Fragility" teach that any objection to this guilt is further proof of it. If you deny your privilege, it means you are deeply controlled by it.

Meanwhile, other racial groups are told they cannot be racist. The logic is that racism equals power, and only white people hold power. So a black or brown person can insult, stereotype, or exclude based on race, and it is excused as "punching up." In some institutions, white people have been told to leave meetings or sit in silence while others speak. This is presented as progress.

This double standard now shows up in hiring policies, scholarships, university admissions, and corporate diversity programmes. Some job offers openly state that only applicants of colour should apply. Certain scholarships are off-limits to white students. None of this is seen as discriminatory, because it is done in the name of equity.

The irony is glaring. An ideology that claims to reject racism is using skin colour to decide who gets what. It divides people into camps and treats race not as something irrelevant, but as something central to every decision. Children are taught that their skin comes with moral weight. Adults are expected to carry historical guilt or permanent victimhood, depending on where they land.

Real anti-racism means judging people by their actions and character, not their ancestry. Wokism does the opposite. It assigns value by group identity and teaches that past injustice must be corrected with new forms of injustice.

This is not healing. It is a new cycle of division dressed up as morality.

The corporate conversion

Once woke ideology gained momentum in universities and activist circles, it did not stay there. It moved quickly into the corporate world, where image matters more

than principle. Companies that once focused on products, performance, and customer satisfaction began shifting their attention to diversity statements, rainbow logos, and public displays of ideological loyalty.

Every June, major corporations flood their social media with support for Pride. Logos are changed to rainbow colours. Marketing campaigns feature slogans about inclusion and belonging. Yet these same companies often remain silent, or take a very different stance, in countries where being gay is illegal. In some Middle Eastern and Asian markets, the rainbow disappears. The message is not about values. It is about strategy.

Diversity and inclusion departments have grown across industries. Some companies now have full-time staff dedicated to reviewing language, tracking pronoun usage, and setting up workshops on unconscious bias. Job applicants are asked to submit diversity statements. Employees are sent to mandatory training sessions where they are told that meritocracy is a myth and that the workplace must be restructured according to identity.

Advertising has also changed. Products are no longer just sold based on quality or usefulness. They are presented as moral choices. A cereal box, a pair of trainers, or a soda can becomes a symbol of political virtue. Companies like Gillette, Nike, and Ben & Jerry's have all launched campaigns that scold or lecture the customer. The goal is not just profit. It is public approval from the activist crowd.

Sometimes this backfires. Bud Light lost billions after partnering with a transgender influencer in a campaign that alienated its core audience. Target received backlash for pushing gender ideology in its children's clothing line. But even when it goes wrong, the companies often double down, insisting that they are "on the right side of history."

What matters most is not truth, integrity, or consistency. It is public appearance. Corporate leaders fear backlash from activists more than they care about long-term trust. So they pre-emptively conform. They adopt the slogans. They repeat the mantras. They sponsor the causes. Not because they believe them, but because they fear the consequences of silence.

This is not corporate responsibility. It is ideological branding. And it shows just how quickly fear and fashion can override common sense in even the most profit-driven environments.

The global reach of wokism

Wokism began in Western universities and activist circles, but it has spread far beyond. What started as a local ideology is now being exported across the world, often pushed by media, corporations, and international institutions. Countries that never asked for this framework are being told to adopt it or risk being labelled backward, intolerant, or oppressive.

Western embassies now fly the rainbow flag during Pride month in countries where same-gender relationships are illegal. Aid organisations require partner nations to sign onto gender and identity policies that make little sense outside a Western context. NGOs that once focused on clean water and vaccines now hold diversity workshops. This is not cultural exchange. It is ideological pressure.

Social media accelerates this export. Western activists frame their struggles as global movements. If a controversial law passes in Texas or London, people in Kenya, India, or Brazil are told they should care, take a position, and even protest. Local concerns are pushed aside. Everything must align with the Western emotional narrative.

Some leaders resist. In places like Hungary, Poland, and parts of Africa, politicians have publicly rejected woke policies, calling them a form of cultural imperialism. They argue that these ideas undermine local traditions, disrupt family structures, and spread confusion, especially among young people. In response, they are labelled fascist, nationalist, or anti-democratic.

This push for global conformity is not limited to governments. International companies bring woke messaging into every market they enter. A sportswear brand that demands gender-neutral bathrooms in California may quietly avoid the topic in Saudi Arabia. But at global conferences, they will still declare their full support for inclusion, knowing that silence is considered complicity.

Wokism presents itself as progressive, but its spread resembles a soft form of imperialism. It tells other cultures what to believe, how to speak, and which values to celebrate. Disagreement is not treated as a difference of opinion. It is framed as hate.

This is not the global sharing of ideas. It is an ideological export with no off switch, carried by algorithms, enforced by fear, and disguised as progress.

Conclusion

Wokism began with good intentions. It spoke of fairness, equality, and justice. It

claimed to give voice to the voiceless and correct the wrongs of history. But like many ideologies, it grew hungry for power. It replaced dialogue with dogma, swapped reason for emotion, and turned disagreement into heresy.

In its rush to fight oppression, it became the very thing it was born to oppose. It now imposes rules, demands loyalty, silences critics, and punishes free thought. What started as a call for inclusion has hardened into a tool of exclusion. What claimed to challenge injustice now creates new forms of it.

Wokism no longer seeks to persuade. It seeks to control. It reshapes language to police thought, weaponises identity to silence debate, and trains people to view the world not as complex but as divided into victims and villains. It confuses children, replaces education with slogans, and shames anyone who does not comply.

What makes it so dangerous is not just its ideas, but its reach. It hides behind kindness, cloaks itself in compassion, and accuses anyone who questions it of cruelty. It claims to defend the weak while crushing dissent. It offers safety but demands obedience.

This is not progress. This is ideological fascism in friendly packaging. A movement that once stood for freedom now fears free speech. A cause that once promised fairness now hands out punishments.

To resist it, we must first name it. Not with slogans or outrage, but with clarity. Wokism feeds on guilt. Just like fascism, it grows through fear. It survives because good people remain quiet.

That silence must end. Truth is not cruelty. Clarity is not hate. And rejecting an ideology that punishes thought is not bigotry. It is self-defence.