

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 all began with the best of intentions. People were driven by a genuine desire for fairness and justice. They wanted to bring attention to voices that had been silenced or excluded for far too long. These were meaningful goals, and for a short time, it seemed as if real change might be possible. People were actually listening. Conversations that had long been avoided were now being had. Institutions began to reflect on their practices, and for once, the wider world appeared to care.

Then, almost without warning, something changed.

What had started as a call for equality turned into a contest of moral superiority. Where there had once been empathy, now there was suspicion. Awareness hardened into a system of rules and punishments. The original spirit of helping others gave way to an obsession with enforcing the correct behaviour. You were expected to choose a side without hesitation. You had to say the right things in exactly the right way, or you were cast as a threat. Questions became dangerous. Slogans replaced conversation. Extremists set the tone.

This collection of thoughts is not a defence of being ignorant. It is not written with nostalgia for a time when injustice went unnoticed. It is not coming from someone longing for the past. It is written by someone who observed that a movement founded on freedom of thought and open speech has increasingly become focused on deciding who may speak at all. That is not an improvement. It is a soft form of authoritarianism, cloaked in symbols of inclusion and progressive language.

You are not meant to observe this shift. You are expected to nod along. If something feels wrong, you are encouraged to suppress your doubts. If you try to speak, you will be gently corrected. If you persist, the cost will be your reputation. The most chilling part of all this is that it is carried out under the banner of kindness. What is claimed to be compassion often looks, in practice, like quiet coercion.

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 calling yourself woke meant something meaningful. It

meant you had noticed a kind of unfairness that others might have missed or ignored. Perhaps you saw how people from certain backgrounds were passed over for jobs, or how women were dismissed or sidelined in the workplace. You might have recognised the quiet fear that forced gay people to hide parts of who they were just to feel safe. To be woke, in its original sense, was to be awake to injustice. It required looking beyond your own ease and seeing that others did not always have the same chances or safety.

At first, this kind of awareness had a positive effect. It made people more reflective. They began to listen more carefully and consider different perspectives. Stories that had been hidden from public view were finally told. Voices that had long been ignored were given space and attention. For a time, it seemed that this could help society grow into something more just, more truthful, and more compassionate. That brief period held a kind of promise, as if things might really begin to change for the better.

That moment of clarity, however, did not last.

As soon as being aware became something to signal publicly, as soon as it became a badge of honour or a mark of virtue, the movement began to decay. People no longer focused on understanding others. Instead, they focused on being seen. Wokeness shifted from awareness to performance. It turned into a contest over who could appear to care the most, who could be the most visibly supportive, and who could confess their advantages with the greatest flair. The real aim stopped being insight. It became about seeking praise.

The louder the display of goodness, the less sincere it became. What had started as a way to see the world more clearly became a mirror for the self. Each social media post turned into a kind of symbol, not of care but of status. Slogans were no longer about spreading knowledge but about passing an invisible test. Conversations became dangerous territory, where one wrong phrase could be used against you. Those who had once joined a genuine effort to understand and support others now found themselves part of something that had lost its depth and purpose.

That first moment of truth was not imagined. It was real. It simply got buried under layers of image and noise. What came afterwards did not build on it. It replaced it with something more hollow. The saddest part is that the show goes on. People still cheer and clap for the performance, even though the original meaning has quietly disappeared.

The purity spiral

Once any movement begins to reward people for displaying moral superiority, it quickly stops being reasonable. It turns into a competition, where individuals try to outdo one another by being the most morally correct, the most emotionally aware, the most visibly victimised, and the quickest to take offence. This is what happened when the concept known as wokism evolved into what some have called a purity spiral. In such a spiral, each new demand for social awareness makes the previous one seem outdated or insufficient.

In the beginning, caring about social issues was seen as enough. People were encouraged to be kind, thoughtful, and supportive. However, that soon became inadequate. It was no longer acceptable to care silently. You had to share your views publicly, then ensure that your messages were exactly aligned with the prevailing mood. Soon, it was not just about what you posted, but how quickly you posted it, how completely you included every group in your statement, and whether you had apologised for not having done it sooner. A moment's hesitation or the slightest delay became a cause for suspicion. Suddenly, being thoughtful or cautious could make you look guilty.

As a result, people started to behave as if they were constantly under scrutiny. This did not lead to greater understanding or genuine sensitivity. Instead, it led to a widespread sense of anxiety. Every word had to be examined and re-examined, not to be more compassionate, but to avoid being accused or rejected by your own community. Silence, once a neutral act, became risky. You could now be criticised for not speaking quickly enough, or for not using the right language in time.

In a purity spiral, there are no true victors. Everyone becomes vulnerable. No matter how sincere or well-meaning someone might be, what matters is not their intentions but their ability to match an ever-changing set of social expectations. Since these expectations shift constantly and become stricter with each cycle, it becomes nearly impossible to succeed. The standards of moral performance are always rising, which makes eventual failure almost certain.

This environment does not promote kindness or mutual care. Instead, it resembles a system of constant surveillance. People do not just observe each other. They watch closely, waiting for mistakes. They strive to be the first to criticise, to show that they are paying attention, that they are more virtuous than those around them. Friendships

are sacrificed in the rush to prove moral commitment. What once looked like activism has begun to feel more like a never-ending audition for approval.

Thus, what began as a movement built on inclusivity and compassion has turned into something much harsher. It now resembles a firing squad, constantly seeking new people to judge, with no sign of ever stopping.

The Cancel Culture

Once the pursuit of purity becomes the primary goal, it inevitably demands consequences for those who fail to meet its impossible standards. That consequence is cancellation. Say the wrong thing, even unintentionally, click 'like' on an unapproved post, or make a joke that does not align with current social values, even if it was harmless years ago, and you risk total social and professional exile. Your reputation is destroyed, your job becomes uncertain, and your public humiliation is expected. There is no space for discussion or reconsideration. This is not a call for understanding or growth, but a modern-day purge. The moment you are seen as morally tainted, the system insists on your removal.

Originally, cancel culture presented itself as a way to challenge the influence of the powerful and ensure that those with wealth or fame were not immune to consequence. However, it quickly lost its focus and began targeting individuals who made a single verbal slip or expressed an opinion that clashed with a shifting standard, even if it had been widely accepted not long before. What was once claimed to be a form of justice began to resemble a campaign of fear. Those who considered themselves morally awakened launched widespread campaigns of condemnation that showed no mercy or proportion.

Take Gina Carano, for instance. She was a well-known actress working with Disney, but she was dismissed from her role after posting a controversial opinion on social media. Her post did not break any laws, nor did it express hatred. It simply did not match the accepted political stance of the time. That alone was enough. Then there is J.K. Rowling, a globally celebrated author, who was denounced as a bigot after she expressed the view that biological sex is a real and relevant concept. Her statements were not aggressive and reflected beliefs that the majority holds. Rather than engaging her in discussion, critics simply demanded her disappearance from public life.

Even comedy, a space traditionally meant for testing boundaries and questioning

norms, has not escaped this wave. Dave Chappelle became a target because his jokes touched on gender identity. People organised campaigns to cancel his performances, terminate his contracts, and silence his voice. Not because he committed any offence recognised by law, but because his material made some people uncomfortable. That discomfort, in the eyes of his critics, was enough to justify his removal.

This is how it works now. You do not have to be deliberately cruel or factually incorrect. You only need to express a view that is no longer fashionable. Once the crowd identifies you as an enemy, there is no opportunity to explain or defend yourself. You are subjected to relentless public shaming without the fairness of a hearing or the grace of forgiveness.

This trend is not confined to the famous. Ordinary people face the same dangers. A teacher might use an outdated phrase and find themselves unemployed. A teenager might share an inappropriate meme and end up publicly exposed and threatened. A software engineer might contribute money to a political cause that is currently unpopular and be forced to resign. These individuals are not villains. They are people who made a misjudgement, or who simply fell foul of a moment's collective fury.

What deepens the injustice is that cancellation does not require evidence. It thrives on anger. A few manipulated quotes, a viral video clip, and a rush of social media outrage are all it takes. The damage is done long before the full story is known, and by then, few are still interested. Guilt is not proven, it is declared.

This is not about fairness or truth. It is not a process that aims to improve society or encourage better behaviour. It is a show performed for an audience, where the goal is to demonstrate one's moral purity by silencing others. It demands conformity, not reflection. It punishes not to teach, but simply to control.

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 but 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.

Book-burning 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 but soft fascism dressed up as social progress.

Trigger culture and the rise of fear

In every functioning society, disagreement is not only inevitable but necessary. People express views that conflict with one another, occasionally causing offence, but this friction is followed by conversation and resolution. Such cycles of tension and understanding are part of how a society grows stronger. However, wokism seems ill-equipped to handle this natural process. It approaches emotional discomfort as if it were genuine harm. If someone experiences emotional distress, the assumption is not that they should develop resilience, but that the cause of the discomfort must be eradicated. A single provocative comment is no longer just a difference of opinion, it becomes framed as a form of violence. This mindset has allowed what is often called trigger culture to dominate public discourse.

The term trigger originally described a very specific psychological response tied

to trauma, particularly in the context of conditions like post-traumatic stress disorder. It signified an involuntary reaction to a severe past experience. Today, however, almost anything can be labelled a trigger. This might include an opinion someone finds distasteful, a brief social media post, a fictional character, a scientifically established fact, a piece of historical art or even the absence of commentary. Silence, unless it communicates the right sentiment, can itself be deemed offensive. The growing demand for emotional safety in every environment has not resulted in greater well-being. Instead, it has produced a climate where safety means conformity, where disagreement is treated as danger.

There are numerous instances that highlight this shift. At Oxford University, law students were given warnings before studying real legal cases involving violence, so they would not feel disturbed by the content. In the University of California system, the simple statement that America offers opportunity was classified as a microaggression, as though optimism itself were an insult. In Canada, a professor faced disciplinary action merely for showing a video that discussed gender pronouns. A student expressed emotional distress, and that alone was sufficient cause for formal complaint. These students were not physically harmed. They were momentarily unsettled, and that was treated as unacceptable.

If you complete a university education without ever feeling unsettled, then it is likely that you chose the wrong institution. The true purpose of higher education is not to shield students from discomfort, but to confront them with ideas they have not encountered before. It is meant to challenge their assumptions, force them to question their beliefs and push them beyond the familiar boundaries of their upbringing.

Writers now find themselves under pressure to include warnings before readers encounter controversial material in their novels. This does not mean explicit content or graphic violence, but ideas and themes that challenge current sensitivities. In some schools, warnings precede lessons on Shakespeare. Mark Twain's works are treated with suspicion, as though reading them were dangerous. Even traditional fairy tales are being rewritten to eliminate possible offence.

What next? Will the cover of "Snow White and the seven dwarfs" read "Snow multicoloured and the seven vertically challenged?"

This culture does not cultivate resilience. It elevates vulnerability as a virtue. The more sensitive someone is, the more righteous they seem. The more visibly offended they become, the more influence they acquire. Rather than equipping individuals to

manage a complex and often harsh world, wokism encourages the belief that the world must change to suit their feelings. When it does not, they either fall apart or cast blame on others.

The wider effect is one of anxiety and restriction. Teachers begin avoiding important topics. Authors shy away from uncomfortable truths. Friends grow wary of discussing anything meaningful. People self-censor, not out of compassion, but from fear of backlash. This is not a culture of emotional support. It is a culture of emotional dominance. When the strongest feelings determine what may be said, the result is not compassion but suppression. Facts give way to feelings, and open dialogue is replaced by silent conformity.

Where thought goes to die

Universities were once places where thinking was expected and encouraged. Students arrived ready to be challenged, to hear ideas that might unsettle them, and to grow through that discomfort. Professors were not hired to coddle feelings but to pose difficult questions, to push boundaries, and to expose students to new and sometimes uncomfortable truths. Ideas were debated openly, tested through argument, criticised from every angle, and refined in the process. This was the whole purpose of higher education. Agreement was never the aim. Engagement was.

That tradition is now fading. The rise of wokism within the very institutions that once defended open inquiry has undermined the core values of academic life. Education is no longer about independent thought. It has been replaced with a culture of conformity, where obedience to a narrow set of beliefs is prized above curiosity or courage.

In many universities today, academics are required to submit diversity statements merely to be considered for employment. This practice turns hiring into a test of political alignment. Entire academic disciplines, from literature to psychology, are being reshaped to prioritise themes of race, identity, and privilege. These are not being explored from multiple perspectives but instead are being enforced as unquestionable truths. To raise a doubt or ask a critical question is increasingly viewed with suspicion. Teachers who misspeak, even unintentionally, may find themselves reported by students, subjected to formal investigations, and in some cases dismissed from their positions.

At Evergreen State College, a biology professor named Bret Weinstein objected to

an event that requested all white people to stay away from campus for a day. He did not disrupt anything. He did not insult anyone. He simply wrote a reasoned letter explaining his concerns. The response was swift and severe. Students stormed his classroom, shouted at him, and accused him of inflicting violence. The situation escalated to the point where he was forced to leave the college for his own safety.

At Yale University, a professor was shouted down by students because his wife had sent an email questioning whether the university should dictate Halloween costume choices for adults. She did not encourage anyone to wear offensive costumes. She simply suggested that adults could decide for themselves. Even this mild suggestion caused an eruption. Students claimed to feel abused, cried in public, and one even screamed at the professor for failing to create what they called a safe space.

What these events reveal is a growing belief that feeling offended now carries more weight than thinking clearly. The moment someone challenges the dominant narrative, they are not seen as someone with a different view. They are treated as a threat. The idea itself becomes dangerous. As more people begin to treat opinions as if they were acts of violence, fewer are willing to speak, and fewer still are willing to think deeply about anything at all.

This ideological shift has not made universities more resilient or more thoughtful. It has transformed them into places where fragility is rewarded, and intellectual bravery is punished. Students are no longer taught how to think critically, how to grapple with opposing views, or how to separate facts from feelings. Instead, they are trained to interpret disagreement as abuse, to react emotionally rather than reason calmly, and to put subjective feelings above objective truth. These institutions are no longer shaping minds. They are producing a generation of easily offended, emotionally reactive adults who view any differing opinion as a form of personal harm. The result is a society filled with graduates who have mastered the art of protest but have lost the ability to think.

Vocabulary of the new order

Language was once a tool for understanding. People used words to say what they meant, and if someone disagreed, the response was to talk it through. It was a shared effort to make meaning clear and reach common ground. That approach depended on trust, honesty, and a belief that clarity mattered. Today, under wokism, language has become something entirely different. It is no longer a means of communication

but a loyalty test. Words are chosen not to inform or explain, but to show that you belong to the approved group. Say the wrong word, even accidentally, and you risk being excluded.

This shift is easy to see in the debate over gender. In 2021, Brighton and Sussex hospitals instructed staff to use terms like birthing parent instead of mother, chestfeeding instead of breastfeeding, and human milk instead of breast milk. These new terms were not introduced to make communication clearer. They were introduced because someone decided that traditional words were no longer safe to use. Biology was rewritten to spare someone's feelings, not to improve understanding.

In schools, children are now taught long lists of gender identities with names such as agender, demiboy, two-spirit, and genderqueer. These identities are not carefully explained or debated. They are introduced as settled truth. A child who says there are only two sexes might be accused of causing harm. In some classrooms, students are required to state their pronouns out loud whether anyone asks or not. This is not about solving confusion. It is about showing you accept the rules.

This approach to language does not stop with gender. At Stanford University, staff were told to avoid using the word American because it might exclude people from Central or South America. The word freshman was banned and replaced with first-year, supposedly to remove gender bias. Even walk-in was considered inappropriate because not everyone can walk. Blind review was replaced with anonymous review due to concerns about ableism. None of these changes made the language clearer. They made it more fragile.

One of the best-known objections to this kind of forced language came from Canadian professor Jordan Peterson. In 2016, he opposed Bill C-16, which added gender identity and gender expression to Canada's human rights code. Peterson said clearly that he was not against using preferred pronouns if asked. His concern was with being legally required to use them. He believed the government was no longer protecting rights but controlling speech. For saying this, he was accused of hatred, bigotry, and even violence, all because he refused to let the law dictate his choice of words.

In many workplaces, failing to use invented pronouns like xe, ze, or fae can lead to formal complaints. These terms are not rooted in the structure of language. They are expressions of belief. Their purpose is not to help people understand each other. Their purpose is to demand compliance. Confusion is not a problem. Communication

is not the goal. The goal is to show that you are obedient.

Even familiar words are being changed. Equality, which means treating everyone the same, has been replaced by equity, which means treating people differently based on their group identity. Racism, once defined as treating someone unfairly because of their race, now includes systems, silence, and even ignorance. A person can be called racist without saying anything, doing anything, or even knowing it. All that matters is who they are and where they are.

This is not how language is meant to work. This is how language is taken over. When words stop reflecting reality and start reflecting ideology, meaning collapses. People become guarded. They choose words not to speak the truth but to avoid trouble. They are no longer honest. They are cautious. And cautious language is not real language. It is not used to express thought. It is used to perform safety. It is a way of surviving in a world where the truth must be hidden behind the right set of words.

The identity trap

At first glance, identity politics can appear to be rooted in fairness. It encourages people to listen to others based on their background and to take personal experience seriously. That sounds reasonable and even compassionate. It suggests that understanding cannot be complete without paying attention to how people live and what they go through. However, under wokism, identity is no longer used as a way to see more clearly. It has become a tool to control. It decides who is allowed to speak and who must remain silent. It declares in advance who is always right and who can never be trusted, no matter what is said.

The trap works like this. If someone belongs to a favoured identity group, they are automatically viewed as a victim. Their words carry extra weight. Their feelings are treated as more important. They are given the benefit of the doubt, even when they are mistaken or unfair. If someone belongs to a disfavoured group, often white, male, straight, or from a Western background, they are assumed to be privileged. Their speech is questioned before it is heard. Their motives are viewed with suspicion. They are expected to keep quiet, agree with what they are told, and offer apologies whether they did anything wrong or not.

None of this is based on actual behaviour. It is based entirely on group identity. If you are in the approved category, you are believed. If you are not, you are dismissed. The labels are fixed. You cannot change them. You cannot rise above them. You are

either one of the oppressed or one of the oppressors. There is no room for nuance or change.

That is why facts no longer matter in many of these discussions. If a woman says something and a man disagrees, it is called misogyny. If a black person makes a claim and a white person questions it, it is called racism. The truth of the idea is no longer what counts. The only thing that matters is who said it. This approach shuts down real thinking. It replaces debate with accusation.

This is also why wokism seems to prefer fringe identities. They are harder to define clearly, and harder to question without triggering outrage. They create confusion, and that confusion can be used to keep control. For example, a male swimmer who says he is now female is allowed to compete against women. If others speak up and say it is unfair, they are told to stay quiet and show inclusiveness. The swimmer's physical advantage does not matter. All that matters is that he has said the right words.

Wokism does not treat people as individuals. It does not care about character, effort, or intent. It only sees categories. You are not a person with a unique view. You are a representative of a type. That type decides how much you can say, whether your pain counts, and how much moral credit you are given. What matters is not who you are, but where you fit in the identity hierarchy.

Rigged scales

Wokism speaks the language of fairness, but it does not follow the rules of fair play. It sets aside merit and replaces it with quotas. It places identity above ability. A person's value is no longer judged by what they can do or what they have achieved, but by what group they happen to be part of. The systems used to enforce this view are now found across nearly every part of modern life.

Quotas have become standard in many workplaces. In 2021, the BBC declared that one fifth of its staff must come from ethnic minorities. California introduced legislation requiring corporate boards to include women and people from certain racial groups. Some companies now post job adverts specifically for black candidates or those who identify as non-binary. None of these policies are driven by skill or experience. They are designed to fill identity targets.

In education, affirmative action has led to similar outcomes. Though originally intended to support disadvantaged groups, it has become a way for the state to

manage inequality from the top down. Students are not judged fairly. They are sorted by race. Asian students, who often score highest on exams and school performance, have been penalised in university admissions, especially at elite schools. At Harvard, internal records showed that race balancing was used to limit the number of Asian students, not because they lacked talent, but to prevent the student body from appearing too heavily Asian. Excellence was set aside to make the numbers look politically safe.

The same logic now runs through politics. When Justin Trudeau became Prime Minister of Canada, he appointed a cabinet that was half male and half female. This was not because qualifications demanded it, but because the image was considered correct. Across Europe and Latin America, some parliaments have enforced rules requiring parties to present a fixed percentage of female candidates. These rules apply regardless of who party members or voters actually support. In some cases, male candidates have been removed from the ballot simply to meet the gender target.

This trend has reached the arts as well. The Academy Awards now demands that films meet a diversity checklist to be considered for Best Picture. It does not matter how powerful or well-made a film might be. If it fails to tick the right diversity boxes for cast or crew, it can be excluded. Talent and creativity are no longer enough. Identity comes first.

Yet, this logic is never applied equally. The NBA, for example, is about 75 percent black. No one calls this a problem. No one demands more white or Asian players to balance the numbers. In fact, to suggest such a thing would be labelled racist. But if a company boardroom or a university lecture hall has too many white or Asian people, the quota system is activated. In nursing and primary teaching, where women greatly outnumber men, there is no panic about gender imbalance. The rules only apply when they suit the narrative.

This is not genuine inclusion. It is a form of ideological bookkeeping. Quotas and affirmative action do not correct injustice. They flip it around. They do not lift people up. They sort them into categories and hand out rewards and punishments based on appearance, not achievement. Talent is overlooked if it comes in the wrong package. Mediocrity is rewarded if it matches the preferred identity.

A society built on quotas cannot be a place where merit rules. It becomes a rigged game, where the outcome depends on who you are rather than what you do. The

longer this continues, the more people will stop striving for excellence. Because they will see that excellence no longer matters.

Ideology for kids

Wokism does not wait patiently for children to reach adulthood before it begins its work. It targets them early, reaching into classrooms before young minds have fully formed, before they possess the ability to reason independently, and before they can recognise when they are being manipulated. Schools, which once existed to guide children towards clear thinking and the pursuit of truth, are now being used to implant a fixed set of beliefs. The purpose of education has shifted from encouraging open enquiry to enforcing ideological conformity, and the classroom has been transformed from a place of discovery into a space for political instruction.

Children as young as five years old are being taught that gender is not a biological reality but a feeling that exists within the self. In some schools, they are asked to declare their pronouns publicly, even though they have not yet been taught the basic rules of grammar. Picture books such as *I Am Jazz* are read aloud to show that a boy can become a girl simply by stating it, and pupils are taught, without discussion, that there are over fifty different genders. Any child who expresses confusion or disagreement is not corrected with patience or reason but accused of bullying and treated as if they pose a threat.

Sex education, once centred around biology and intended to match the developmental level of the child, has now been replaced with material that would once have been considered far too explicit for a school setting. In several regions across Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom, students have been shown detailed diagrams of sexual activity and introduced to topics such as gender fluidity and alternative sexual practices. In some instances, schools have taken it upon themselves to socially transition children by changing their names and pronouns, all without the knowledge or consent of their parents. Teachers have been instructed to withhold this information, effectively placing schools in the role of secret-keepers against the family.

In such an environment, the line between fantasy and reality is no longer firmly held. There have been growing reports of children identifying as animals and being supported in these identities by school authorities. In Australia, one school allowed a girl who claimed to be a cat to behave accordingly. In parts of the United States,

similar stories have emerged involving children who insist they are foxes, wolves, or other animals. Rather than helping children reconnect with reality, schools have chosen to affirm these beliefs, suggesting that it is more important to avoid offence than to offer guidance grounded in truth.

The same approach is applied to history. Children are not taught the events of the past so they can learn from them with a clear understanding. They are instead placed into roles based on race and told how to feel. White children are informed that they benefit from invisible systems of power and must recognise their privilege, while black children are told that they are permanent victims of oppression. In 2020, a primary school in New York sent home a worksheet for parents and children to complete together, focused entirely on white privilege. The purpose was not to explain complex historical events or social dynamics but to assign blame and cultivate guilt based on skin colour alone.

Within this framework, facts no longer carry weight. They are replaced by emotionally loaded slogans such as diversity, inclusion, equity, privilege, and oppression. These words are repeated with such frequency that they begin to function as dogma, closing down conversation rather than inviting understanding. Children are not taught to think critically or to explore opposing views. They are taught to conform to a narrow set of ideas. Questions are discouraged, and those who voice doubts are treated as if they have committed a moral failing. Everything is emotional, and everything is filtered through a political lens.

Wokism targets children precisely because they are more easily shaped than adults. A child who grows up believing that personal feelings carry more weight than observable facts, that identity can redefine reality, and that disagreement is a form of violence, will become an adult who does not question authority. That adult will not stand firm when faced with nonsense. They will comply with whatever they are told. In the end, this is not about fairness or understanding. It is about shaping minds before they are strong enough to resist.

Wokism and the death of comedy

Comedy is often one of the first casualties when a society falls under the grip of a controlling ideology, and wokism is no exception. It cannot stand being mocked, questioned, or exposed to honest laughter. Jokes that once brought people together by highlighting the shared strangeness of life are now treated as acts of hatred.

Comedians who deviate from the approved script are swiftly punished, whether through cancellation, boycotts, or being labelled as threats to public safety.

The boundaries of what is acceptable are narrow and shift constantly. You are no longer allowed to make jokes about race, gender, religion, body type, mental illness, cultural habits, or anything else that falls under the banner of sensitivity. The list of forbidden topics expands so quickly that many comedians have chosen to avoid risk altogether. They now steer clear of anything that could be misunderstood or twisted out of context. Instead, they play it safe, sticking to material about food, pets, or other harmless topics. Anything sharper or more reflective of real life is seen as a gamble that could cost them their careers.

A handful of well-known comedians have decided not to play along. Dave Chappelle refused to back down after making jokes about transgender activists, despite protests and widespread calls for Netflix to cut ties with him. Ricky Gervais openly mocked identity politics during the Golden Globes and was quickly branded as cruel and heartless. Chris Rock, once celebrated for his fearless observations, now admits that he avoids performing at universities because students are too easily offended to handle humour. Jerry Seinfeld and others have expressed similar concerns, saying that younger audiences no longer understand comedy the way it used to be understood.

This change is not limited to the stage. It is deeply rooted in the mindset of the audience itself. Wokism teaches people to attend comedy shows not to laugh but to scan for offence. Laughter is pushed aside in favour of judgment. A joke is no longer a moment of connection. It becomes a test of moral correctness. If it fails that test, the comedian must either apologise or face removal from the public stage.

Satire, once a powerful tool used to challenge authority and expose hypocrisy, is now seen as an act of aggression. Under wokism, it is treated not as insight but as harm. The result is a comedy world that is quieter, blander, and far more afraid. Those with real wit and courage are either silenced or pushed to create their work in hidden corners of the internet, far from mainstream venues where fear has taken hold.

When a society reaches the point where it can no longer laugh at itself, it begins to lose its sense of balance. It forgets how to step back, how to reflect with humility, and how to separate the ridiculous from the serious. Everything becomes precious. Every word, every idea, and every emotion is treated as sacred, untouchable, and fragile.

This is not a sign of progress. It is a sign of fear wearing the mask of virtue.

The illusion of lived experience

Wokism has introduced a peculiar and powerful rule: personal experience must be treated as more reliable than evidence. This concept, often referred to as lived experience, has been elevated above facts, above logic, and above the kind of common sense that once formed the basis of shared understanding. If someone claims they have experienced oppression, their account is to be accepted without hesitation. To express doubt is to cause harm. To request evidence is to be accused of denial and insensitivity.

This change grants extraordinary authority to emotions. If a person states that they felt unsafe due to a joke, a facial expression, or even another person's silence, then that feeling becomes the accepted version of truth. It no longer matters what occurred in reality. The only thing that matters is how it was perceived. Objective facts are no longer allowed to compete with the force of subjective feeling. Lived experience is treated as something sacred, something beyond question.

This transforms conversation into a kind of trap. When someone declares that a particular system is racist, or that certain words constitute violence, and you respond with disagreement, you are quickly accused of invalidating their experience. Even if you present well-sourced facts or data, the response is often that you are not qualified to speak because you do not belong to the same identity group. Lived experience becomes a shield against scrutiny. It ends discussion by framing disagreement as a personal attack.

The inconsistency of this rule becomes plain when lived experience fails to support the dominant narrative. A black person who expresses conservative opinions is often insulted or dismissed. A woman who questions modern feminism is told she has internalised her own oppression. A gay person who critiques pride events is accused of betraying their community. Their experiences are not welcomed. They are ignored or erased because they challenge the approved message. Lived experience is only permitted if it fits the script.

This approach becomes especially troubling when adopted by institutions. Schools, corporations, and government bodies increasingly host events where individuals are encouraged to share how they felt excluded or harmed. These personal accounts are accepted as fact without investigation. There is no attempt to

verify claims or understand context. The purpose is not to arrive at the truth. The purpose is to affirm a predetermined narrative, one that reinforces the ideology.

This new standard places emotion above evidence and abandons the idea of shared truth. Instead of building a society where people are united by reason, it creates one where feelings take absolute precedence. In this system, everyone is right if they feel strongly enough. The only people who can be wrong are those who continue to believe that facts, analysis, and evidence still matter.

The oppression Olympics

Wokism constructs its entire worldview around the concept of oppression, but it does not treat all forms of oppression equally. Certain types are brought to the forefront, repeated endlessly in media and education, while others are quietly ignored. The aim is not fairness or justice. It is the pursuit of moral status. The more a person can present themselves as oppressed, the more authority they are granted in public discussions. This has produced a strange and unhealthy competition, where individuals race to prove that they are among the most marginalised.

This begins with identity. Within this system, a straight white male is placed at the bottom of the moral scale. He is labelled as privileged by default, regardless of his circumstances. A black woman is seen as having more authority because of her race and gender. A black lesbian woman is considered even more credible. If she also identifies as disabled or transgender, her moral standing rises further. Each additional label adds weight. The system does not reward strength of character, sound reasoning, or genuine achievement. It rewards how many identity boxes a person can tick.

Such a system encourages people to treat personal struggle as a kind of social currency. Students now describe their emotional hardships in college applications in hopes of gaining an advantage. Job applicants are encouraged to highlight their background in diversity statements, not to demonstrate skill or experience, but to show that they belong to the right group. Social media influencers increasingly reveal new sexual identities, mental health diagnoses, or trauma stories, not always out of honesty, but to gain followers and build credibility. This turns suffering into a competition, where the prize goes to those who seem the most damaged.

This also explains why some forms of hardship are excluded. A working-class white man who loses his job and struggles to feed his family is rarely seen as a victim.

His pain is not recognised because his identity does not align with the woke narrative. Jewish people, although historically persecuted for centuries, are often left out of the new hierarchy of oppression, especially when they are successful. In some activist groups, they are even reclassified as part of the oppressor class.

The outcome is not unity or understanding. It is division. People are ranked by their identities and measured by how much suffering they can claim. Disagreement is dismissed not by argument but by status. If a person from a lower-ranked group speaks, their words are accepted without question. If someone from a higher-ranked group disagrees, they are told to be quiet and listen, simply because of who they are.

This is not a path to empowerment. It is a game of victimhood, and it has very real effects. It encourages people to define themselves by weakness, to seek meaning in grievances rather than action, and to believe that moral worth comes not from what they do, but from how much pain they can display.

The recycling of racism

Wokism presents itself as a force against racism, but instead of eliminating it, it has simply reshaped it. Where once people were judged by the colour of their skin and that was rightly condemned, wokism now insists that people be judged by their racial category in the name of justice. It calls this anti-racism, yet it functions by the same logic that racism always has: applying different rules to different people based on race.

In this new framework, whiteness is no longer just a skin tone. It is treated as a defect. White people are told they benefit from unseen advantages, even when they are poor, disabled, or struggling with hardship. They are told their role is to listen, to apologise, and above all to remain silent. Books like *White Fragility* teach that resisting this guilt is not a sign of reason but a deeper sign of guilt. If you deny your privilege, it is claimed that you are even more controlled by it, caught in a web you cannot see.

At the same time, people from other racial groups are told they cannot be racist. The explanation given is that racism equals power, and that only white people have power. This leads to a twisted set of standards. A black or brown person can insult, stereotype, or exclude based on race, and this is dismissed or excused as punching up. In certain institutions, white individuals have been told to leave meetings or to sit quietly while others are allowed to speak freely. This is presented as fairness and forward progress.

The same double standard has crept into hiring practices, educational opportunities, and workplace policies. Some job advertisements now openly state that only people of colour should apply. Certain scholarships are restricted to non-white students. None of this is considered discriminatory, because it is framed as equity, a word that now means giving different groups different treatment based on identity rather than ability or need.

The contradiction could not be more obvious. An ideology that claims to oppose racism now uses race as the main deciding factor in who is heard, who is hired, and who is helped. It divides people into rigid categories and treats race not as something to be moved beyond, but as the most important thing about a person. Children are taught that their skin carries a moral burden or moral innocence. Adults are expected to feel either inherited guilt or lasting victimhood, depending entirely on where they happen to fall in the racial structure.

True anti-racism would mean judging people by their actions, by their choices, and by the content of their character. Wokism rejects this principle. It assigns value based on group identity, and it claims that the only way to repair past injustice is to create new injustice in its place. This is not the road to healing. It is the beginning of a new divide, wrapped in the language of virtue and fairness, but driven by the same old impulse to sort, separate, and control.

The corporate conversion

Once woke ideology found a foothold in universities and activist movements, it did not remain confined to those spaces. It spread rapidly into the corporate world, where reputation often carries more weight than principle. Businesses that once centred their efforts on product development, performance, and customer service began shifting their focus to producing diversity statements, updating their logos with rainbow colours, and staging public displays of ideological loyalty to match the current social mood.

Each June, corporations flood their social media with messages in support of Pride. Company logos are repainted in rainbow hues. Marketing campaigns deliver slogans about belonging, visibility, and inclusion. Yet this support is selective. The same companies that champion LGBTQ+ rights in Western markets frequently go quiet in countries where homosexuality is illegal. In parts of the Middle East and Asia, the rainbow vanishes entirely from their branding. The message is not driven by belief. It

is driven by calculation. These gestures are strategic, not moral.

Entire departments for diversity and inclusion have been created across industries. In some companies, staff are now employed full-time to monitor the language used in internal communication, to ensure pronouns are respected, and to organise training sessions on unconscious bias. Job applicants are asked to write diversity statements as part of the hiring process, declaring their alignment with the required values. Employees are sent to mandatory workshops where they are told that fairness based on skill or effort is a myth and that workplaces must be reshaped according to identity categories.

Advertising has also taken a sharp turn. Products are no longer marketed purely for their usefulness or quality. They are now sold as statements of moral alignment. A box of cereal, a pair of shoes, or a soft drink can is turned into a symbol of political virtue. Companies such as Gillette, Nike, and Ben & Jerry's have produced advertising campaigns that go beyond promoting their goods, instead delivering messages that scold, instruct, or moralise. These campaigns are aimed not only at making a profit but also at gaining approval from activist audiences.

There are times when this approach backfires. Bud Light suffered massive financial losses after working with a transgender influencer in a campaign that disconnected from its traditional customer base. Target faced strong opposition after promoting gender ideology in its children's clothing range. Yet even in the face of public backlash, many companies do not step back. Instead, they reaffirm their stance, claiming that they are standing firm on principle and that they are on the right side of history.

The real priority is not truth, consistency, or integrity. It is the avoidance of controversy. Corporate leaders are more afraid of negative attention from activist groups than they are concerned with maintaining long-term trust with their customers. So they adjust in advance. They echo the right slogans, sponsor the approved causes, and follow the ideological trends. Not because they are convinced, but because they are afraid of what might happen if they remain silent.

This is not an example of corporate responsibility. It is ideological branding. It reveals how quickly fear, image, and fashion can replace sound judgement, even in spaces that claim to operate on logic and profit.

The global reach of wokism

Wokism began within Western universities and activist groups, but it did not remain there for long. What first appeared as a homegrown ideology has now expanded across the globe, pushed forward by powerful institutions, media networks, multinational corporations, and international organisations. Countries that neither asked for this ideology nor find it relevant to their own traditions are being told they must adopt it or risk being branded as backward, intolerant, or oppressive.

Western embassies now fly the rainbow flag during Pride month, even in countries where same-gender relationships remain illegal. Aid organisations that once concentrated on vital issues such as clean water and disease prevention now include requirements that partner nations adopt gender and identity policies that make little cultural or practical sense outside the Western context. NGOs have shifted their priorities, hosting workshops on diversity and inclusion instead of focusing purely on survival and development. This is not mutual exchange. It is pressure disguised as partnership.

Social media has made this ideological export even faster and more invasive. Western activists often present their political struggles as if they were global causes. When a divisive law is passed in Texas or London, people living in Kenya, India, or Brazil are expected to pay attention, choose a side, and speak out. Local realities are drowned out. All concerns are expected to bend to the Western emotional script.

Some national leaders have chosen to push back. In countries like Hungary, Poland, and across several parts of Africa, politicians have publicly rejected the imposition of woke policies. They argue that these ideas weaken traditional values, disrupt social norms, and sow confusion among children and young people. Their opposition is met not with dialogue, but with condemnation. They are swiftly labelled as fascist, nationalist, or enemies of democracy.

This drive for global conformity does not come solely from governments. Multinational corporations now carry woke messaging into every market they enter. A sportswear brand may insist on gender-neutral bathrooms in California while quietly avoiding any mention of the issue in Saudi Arabia. Yet at international conferences, that same company will loudly proclaim its commitment to inclusion, knowing that even silence is now framed as complicity.

Although wokism presents itself as modern and forward-thinking, the way it is being imposed increasingly resembles a soft version of imperialism. It tells other societies what they must believe, what language they must use, and what values they

must elevate. Any disagreement is not treated as a legitimate difference in worldview. It is framed as hatred or ignorance.

This is not a healthy global conversation. It is not the respectful exchange of ideas between cultures. It is the aggressive export of a rigid ideology, fuelled by algorithms, maintained by fear, and presented as inevitable progress. There is no option to opt out, and no pause for reflection. The result is not unity. It is a forced alignment that often silences more than it uplifts.

The final word on wokism

Wokism began with the promise of fairness, equality, and justice. It spoke on behalf of the unheard and sought to address the mistakes of the past. Its language was filled with hope and its message appealed to conscience. It claimed to restore dignity to the overlooked and to correct long-standing wrongs. Yet, like many ideologies that begin with noble aims, it soon became hungry for influence. It abandoned open dialogue in favour of rigid belief, dismissed careful reasoning in favour of strong emotion, and began treating disagreement as betrayal.

In its determination to fight oppression, it ended up mirroring the very structures it claimed to resist. It introduced new rules that must be followed, demanded signs of public allegiance, silenced those who questioned it, and punished those who thought for themselves. A movement that once called for broader inclusion has hardened into one that excludes all who fail to conform. An idea that set out to confront injustice has instead created fresh divisions and unfairness.

Wokism no longer tries to convince others through discussion. It seeks to dominate. It rewrites language so that questioning becomes forbidden, uses identity as a tool to end conversations, and trains people to see the world not in shades of grey, but in rigid categories of victim and villain. It distorts education by replacing knowledge with slogans, leaves children confused about their place in the world, and turns nonconformity into something shameful.

Its danger lies not only in its message but in its ability to spread. It hides itself behind kind words, cloaks its demands in the language of care, and brands any critic as heartless. It claims to protect the vulnerable, but only by silencing those who speak differently. It promises safety, but at the cost of submission.

This is not a step forward. It is the return of ideological control, wrapped in polite language. A cause that once defended liberty now treats free speech as a threat. A

movement that once asked for fairness now enforces punishment in its place.

Resisting this does not require anger or shouting. It requires honesty and courage. Wokism thrives on guilt, just as authoritarian ideologies have always thrived on fear. It spreads because decent people are too afraid to speak.

That fear must no longer win. Speaking the truth is not cruelty. Defending reason is not hatred. And rejecting an ideology that punishes independent thought is not prejudice. It is a necessary act of protection.

More free booklets can be found at:
https://github.com/jgestiot/free_books/blob/main/README.md

Revision 1.4