

PATRIOTS
FOR EUROPE FOUNDATION

**THE EUROPEAN UNION:
The Trojan horse of wokism
on the European continent**

A study commissioned by the Patriots for Europe Foundation

The European Union, the Trojan horse of wokeism on the European continent

Not so long ago, in the context of political history, certain new terms burst into the public debate: woke, and wokeism. Fresh from the United States, they cover an ideological potpourri that combines 'decolonialism', gender theory, militant feminism, LGBT activism, climate ideology, the deconstruction of language seen as an instrument or indicator of discrimination...whose aim is to denounce the alleged systemic oppression of minorities who need to be 'woken up', so that they can combine their struggles to shake up the Western white patriarchal system of oppression that is supposed to be the source of all evils and discriminations. A number of essays have been written on this subject already, and there is no question of adding to them here. However, we need to go back to the roots of this ideological movement, which is largely unknown to the general public, in order to understand what drives it and how it has infiltrated the institutions of the European Union.

In the beginning was the United States.

The United States obviously has its own history, very different from that of Europe. Anglo-Saxon Protestant emigrants settled in a sparsely populated continent, gradually driving out the indigenous populations and bringing in an enslaved population from Africa, in particular to work on the plantations. Successive waves of immigration from Europe brought Catholic peoples, particularly Italians and Irish, but the reins of power were long held by Anglo-Saxon Protestants. The country's political and social history has therefore been marked by Protestant Anglo-Saxon pre-eminence, slavery and its aftermath, and the American Civil War. Because History lasts a long time. However, this history has very little to do with the history of the European continent. It is worth pointing this out before discussing an ideological corpus which has been imported wholesale from the United States to Europe.

The distant origin of the slang term 'woke', derived from awake, is said to come from an abolitionist movement born in 1860 across the Atlantic and known as "Wide Awake". Later, Professor Booker Taliaferro Washington, a former slave, published a work entitled "The awakening of the Negro" in the pages of the monthly magazine *The Atlantic* (September 1896). He advocated a pragmatic, non-moralising vision of African-American emancipation. It was in this intellectual context that he became the first Principal of the Tuskegee Normal School for Colored Teachers. His vision is emancipatory but non-confrontational.

The meaning changed in the Sixties. The Oxford English dictionary gives novelist William Melvin Kelley political authorship of the term "woke", based on the title of an article published in 1962 in the *New York Times*: "If you're woke, you dig it".

But it was after the death of young Trayvon Benjamin Martin in July 2013 that the Black Lives Matters movement and the #hashtag of the same name were born. The movement was spearheaded by African-American rights activists Alicia Garza and Patrisse Cullors, who were also queer activists and were soon joined by Opal Tometi. This is undoubtedly the first sign of the "intersectionality" of these struggles, i.e. the combination of grievances of minorities who claim to be "systemically" discriminated against. The deaths of Michael Brown in August 2014 and George Floyd in May 2020 during a police stop and search have given a global dimension to the Black Lives Matter movement, whose work is supported by a foundation that describes itself as follows on its official website: "Black Lives Matter global foundation inc. was created and defines itself as an organization in the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, and whose mission is to eradicate white supremacy and to strengthen local power to intervene in the violence inflicted on black communities by the state and the justice system".

This definition has the merit of clarity: antagonism towards whites and denunciation of state and judicial structures as the support for systemic violence against black communities.

Born in the particular context of the United States, as an initiative of queer activists, this movement would go on to be applied to European realities, which are very different from American realities, and became the root of wokeism, onto which were grafted other claims by minorities who, in a copycat move, claimed to be discriminated against or mistreated.

From black community demands to wokeism.

In a way, the "Black Lives Matter" movement is using the classic motivations of the revolutionary movement, the struggle between the oppressed and the oppressors, a form of neo-Marxism. When it came down to it, Marx was only interested in the proletariat because it was a revolutionary force, not for "charitable" reasons. As the proletariat was no longer considered a revolutionary force, neo-Marxists turned their attention to "minorities" who could constitute a substitute proletariat and become a new revolutionary force.

This is the gist of the study carried out for the progressive think-tank Terra Nova by Bruno Jeanbart and Olivier Ferrand, which was published on 10 May 2011 but is still relevant today. After noting that "working-class people are voting less and less left-wing", the authors see the emergence of "a new left-wing coalition" that would "unite graduates, young people, minorities, working-class neighbourhoods and women". In fact, the prime targets of contemporary wokeism, if you replace the word women with feminists.

From the denunciation of systemic racism and supposed white supremacy, the woke ideology has broadened to denunciation of the injustices and discriminations suffered by sexual, religious and ethnic minorities, but also by people who are victims of so-called "climate crimes" or "ecocides", people with disabilities, etc. In all cases, the aim is to make people aware of the dynamics of domination, so that they can combat them.

Ultimately, for wokeism, any difference, any distinguishing feature, anything that separates is believed to be the symptom of a will to dominate or discriminate. Language itself, which is seen as an instrument of domination, translating the patriarchal oppression of minorities into words and grammar, has to be replaced by cumbersome and unreadable inclusive language. It's a kind of radical egalitarianism over a deep well of sentimentality. For example, fashion photographs featuring physically beautiful models are offensive to less beautiful people, and a symptom of sexism, itself the product of toxic masculinity.

Réjane Sénac, CNRS research director at Sciences Po's *Centre de recherches politiques* and a member of the steering committee for the research and teaching programme on gender studies, explained in an interview with Nastasia Hadjadj (ADN 3 December 2021) that "the accusations against the so-called woke ideology" were examples of resistance to the bringing to light of injustice and discrimination. She stated that she had consulted "130 leaders and activists from feminist, anti-racist, anti-speciesist, ecological and social justice organisations" in order to "understand how these movements conveyed a kind of convergence of struggles" She went on: "The common diagnostic is to denounce a capitalist system that is sexist, racist and ecocidal, and that must be recognised as such if we are to act effectively".

Julien Suaudeau, a writer and film-maker who teaches at Bryn Mawr College, near Philadelphia, declared (ADN 28 March 2022) in the same vein: "Wokeism is a word that means absolutely nothing. This false concept has emerged with a political and ideological intention: to blur the reality of the structures of racist domination in France today".

This denial of the existence of wokeism is a constant feature of its supporters. Rokhyaya Diallo, founder of the association "Les indivisibles", said: "The term 'woke culture' in France only exists in the statements of its detractors. It's presented as a movement, but nobody claims to be it". Similarly, Réjane Sénac wrote a think piece for *Libération* (October 2021) entitled "Le wokisme n'existe pas mais il parle" ["Wokeism

doesn't exist, but it speaks"] If it speaks, then it exists, for that which does not exist cannot speak.

In fact, it speaks a jargon all its own: cultural appropriation, the culture of erasure, decolonialism, misgendering, micro-aggressions, toxic masculinity, invisibilisation, intersectionality, racialised people, white privilege, safe space...A vocabulary increasingly taken up by the left-wing press and which requires a lexicon. An example of micro-aggression is the presence in the public space of a statue of a figure representing past oppression. Colbert or Churchill, for example.

Wokeism is therefore a form of radical revolutionary ideology, a self-proclaimed radicality, whose absolute enemy is Western civilisation, the archetype of white, patriarchal oppression. In addition to the struggles of minorities and black activists in the United States, this ideology is also inspired by Deconstruction, known as "French theory" on American campuses.

Wokeism and Deconstruction.

The idea that everything is socially constructed, including structures of domination and sexual identity, is rooted in the writings of Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, Roland Barthes and Judith Butler, as far as gender theory is concerned.

So if everything is socially constructed, and in particular their idea of the white patriarchal system of domination in Western civilisation, we need to deconstruct the foundations of this civilisation, including knowledge, because according to Foucault (*Discipline and Punish* 1975) "Power and knowledge directly imply one another" In fact, for Derrida, deconstruction is justice, and the consequence he draws from it is that it is appropriate to "grant a permanent compensatory privilege" to the dominated (*Dissemination* p.10).

Sartre did not hesitate to advocate political murder (interview *Tout va bien* no.4 20 Feb 1973 M-A Burnier p 6/8), to put a definite end to purported oppressions:

-Without talking about street fights or armed action, are you personally still in favour of the political death penalty?

J-P Sartre - Yes... A revolutionary regime has to get rid of a certain number of individuals who threaten it, and I can't see any other way than death. You can always get out of prison. The revolutionaries of 1793 probably didn't kill enough people, and thus unconsciously served a return to order, followed by the Restoration.

Along the same lines, he wrote in his preface to Frantz Fanon's book *The Wretched of the Earth*: "To shoot down a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time: there remain a dead man, and a free man".

We are therefore faced with an absolute revolutionary radicalism whose designated victims are Western civilisation and the Western white man who is its symbol and the scapegoat for all the sins of the world. But this radicalism goes beyond the struggle against "white supremacy", because it implies the destruction of everything that naturally and socially structures human societies. In the wake of Martin Heidegger (*Destruktion*) it is a matter of asserting a radical scepticism towards all objective knowledge. It is a radical denial of all objectivity and all knowledge.

Gender theory is particularly illustrative. Gender is said to be an individual given, independent of biological sex, the reality of which is denied. This is the idea expressed in de Beauvoir's famous phrase "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" Our sexual identity is thus "assigned" to us from birth, to the detriment of our right to choose our gender, which is obviously a sign of intolerable patriarchal oppression. Yet XX and XY chromosomes are realities that have nothing to do with any social construction. Should we

be surprised by this revolutionary desire to free ourselves from objective data on sexuality, which are considered archaic taboos? Remember that Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida were among the signatories, along with Sartre and Beauvoir, of the petition published in Le Monde on 23 May 1977 calling for the decriminalisation of sexual relations between adults and children under the age of 15!

"Le planning familial" (Family Planning), an association heavily subsidised by the public authorities, has become the champion of gender theory in France. It has published a "Trans Lexicon" which includes the following definitions:

- "Gender: a culturally constructed social class. In the West, there are two categories, one of which is dominated: women; and one of which is dominant: men". Basically, it is just a reworking in woke jargon of Marx's phrase: "In the family, the man is the bourgeois; the woman plays the role of the proletariat" (*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*). The specific phrase "in the West" clearly demonstrates the system that needs to be deconstructed. As we all know, Muslim, Asian, Indian and African societies are not patriarchal!
- "Assignment at birth: at birth, doctors decide on the basis of a set of norms relating to length of the penis/clitoris if the individual is a boy or a girl".
- "Sex is a social construct. The penis is a penis, not a male sexual organ".

It would be possible to go on with increasingly raving quotations, but it is clear that this ideology rejects all objectivity and all objective knowledge. The only thing that counts is individual feelings. Facts count for nothing. It is therefore a radical revolutionary desire to destroy the whole natural order of things. Since individuals have not chosen what the nature of things dictates, nature is "fascist" and therefore the nature of things must be destroyed. And those who claim to be reminding us of the actual data of nature must be "erased" J.K. Rowling, author of the Harry Potter saga, was the target of a boycott campaign because she had the misfortune to take up the cause of a British researcher, Maya Forstater, on #standwithMaya. The researcher had been sacked in 2018 for having dared to say: "I think that male people are not women. I don't think being a woman/female is a matter of identity or womanly feelings. It is biology". Worse still, Ms Rowling persisted, ironically saying: " 'People who menstruate' ? I'm sure there used to be a word for those people...Someone help me out? Wumben? Wimpund? Woomud? " Since then, the wrath of the ayatollahs of wokeism has had no let-up, and in the name of "intersectionality" some have insisted on detecting traces of racism and Western supremacism in her work.

Wokeism is therefore not only a radical revolutionist ideology taking over from a Marxism-Leninism that has run out of steam, not least because of its historical failure, and adopting its dialectic of dominant/dominated, it is also a totalitarian system of thought that seeks to wipe out its opponents and the civilisation it fights through "erasure". Remember that Stalin also practised "erasure" by making those he had decided to eliminate - politically or physically - disappear from photos. This woke erasure takes the form of tearing down statues, the deconstruction of history in an anachronistic and "decolonial" vision, the destruction of language, boycotts, censorship, legal actions against those who dare to oppose it, and calling into question freedom of expression in order to prevent comments potentially offensive to "minorities" who are the victims of "white patriarchal supremacy". This is a real and serious threat to European and, more broadly, Western civilisation. A ferment of fatal decadence. But it is also a threat to our fundamental freedoms, and freedom of expression in particular. Under a wokeism regime, Voltaire - Islamophobic, easily anti-Semitic, furiously anti-Catholic too, archetype of the cynical white patriarch - would never have got out of the Bastille.

What is surprising is the astonishing ease with which this ideology, imported from American campuses, has been able to penetrate the worlds of media and academia, as well as international institutions such as the United Nations Organization and the European Union.

For some journalists and academics, bereft of the Marxism-Leninism that had failed in Europe, wokeism, a

radical revolutionary ideology, provided a new 'ready-to-think' vehicle recycling the good old revolutionary dialectic of the oppressed vs the oppressor.

For the leaders of supra-national institutions, asserting their power and might means deconstructing the sovereignty of nation states. Wokeism is therefore a very useful instrument for achieving this, since it involves a relentless struggle against the very structures of states, which are believed to be structural agents of systemic oppression. So there is a convergence of objectives.

European construction and national deconstruction.

When General De Gaulle returned to the presidency in 1958, the proponents of "European integration" were very concerned about the fate of the Treaty of Rome, which he had opposed. The archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (AMAE PA-AP 314 carton 1) contain the minutes of the first interministerial committee on Europe on 10 June 1958. De Gaulle indicated that he would "put France in a position to honour the signature affixed to **this trade treaty**". He declared at the time: "It's a trade treaty and nothing more, whether those who claim otherwise like it or not". Did he underestimate the institutional spirit of the Treaty of Rome? Was it wilful blindness?

General de Gaulle could not have been unaware of the principles that had inspired his old enemy Jean Monnet. In a note, now declassified, sent on 6 May 1943 to Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's éminence grise and main adviser, Monnet had written: "we must come to the conclusion that agreement with De Gaulle is impossible; that he is an enemy of the French people and its freedoms; that he is an enemy of European construction and that he must therefore be destroyed in the interests of the French people". This is unambiguous, but it is also interesting because Monnet was already referring to terms that were to be used so often, "European construction" What did he mean by that?

Algiers 1943 was clearly a time of intense reflection for Jean Monnet. Reflection destined primarily for the attention of President Roosevelt. In a memorandum to the US President dated 5 August 1943, Monnet wrote: "There will be no peace in Europe if the states reconstitute themselves on a basis of national sovereignty, with all that this entails in terms of a policy of prestige and economic protection", and he went on to say: "from the economic point of view, it is essential that the reconstitution of economic sovereignty be prevented from the outset" (Jean Monnet Foundation for Europe, Lausanne. Archives Jean Monnet Fonds AME 33/114).

From the outset, the foundation of European construction has been the deconstruction of national sovereignty. This was to remain, in treaty after treaty, the objective pursued by Monnet's successors. Without, of course, saying so clearly, using the European *taqiyya* method known as constructive ambiguity. European construction is being matched by the deconstruction of national sovereignties, with the concept of "shared sovereignty" not corresponding to any reality. In reality, there are only areas of abandoned sovereignty.

It would have been possible to envisage a European cooperation based on nations, a Europe of nations. In his press conference on 15 May 1962, De Gaulle seemed to have lost his illusions about the "trade treaty and nothing more" and came out with a well-known tirade: "I do not believe that Europe can have any living reality if it does not include France and her Frenchmen, Germany and its Germans, Italy and its Italians, and so forth. Goethe, Chateaubriand belong to all Europe to the very extent that they were respectively and eminently Italian, German, and French. They would not have served Europe very well if they had been stateless, or if they had thought and written in some type of integrated Esperanto or Volapük". At a time when European leaders speak only in international American, this quotation takes on its full significance.

Three years later, in his press conference on 9 September 1965, he showed a kind of prescience about the

evolution of the "European construction" dear to Monnet: "Now, we know — heaven knows that we know! — that there is a different concept of a European federation in which, according to the dreams of those who conceived it, the countries would lose their national personalities, and in which, furthermore, for want of a federator ... would be ruled by some technocratic, stateless and irresponsible Areopagus" De Gaulle opposed this vision, which has become reality, instead proposing a move towards a kind of European confederation based on common projects. In time, Monnet won out over De Gaulle.

The result is that the deconstruction of national sovereignties is built into the very genes of the European Union as conceived and desired by Jean Monnet and his instrument Robert Schuman. In his memoirs, Monnet describes himself as a kind of puppet master who manipulates politicians: "First you have an idea, then you look for the man who will have the power to implement it"... "I had better things to do than try to exercise power myself: hadn't my role for a long time already been to influence those who wielded it and to ensure that they used it when the time was right" (Monnet Memoirs). The way it works has not changed, and Eurocrats and agents of influence have learned the lesson well.

The result is that the Member States of the European Union are now subject to a system of control of legality that is, in the final analysis, quite comparable to that exercised by the French State over local authorities. It is a strange process whereby these states impose obligations on themselves, handing over control of them to technocrats with no democratic legitimacy. Richelieu remarked that we "bind oxen by their horns and men by treaties". It would seem that the Eurocrats have read the Cardinal's memoirs. But not our politicians.

Nature abhors a vacuum, and by deconstructing national sovereignty the promoters of the European Union perhaps thought they were giving birth to European sovereignty. Which would be a vain hope, because sovereignty can only reside in the people and/or a historical dynasty, and there is no such thing as a European people any more than there is a European dynasty, and everyone who has tried for them has come unstuck. So there is the "technocratic, stateless and irresponsible Areopagus" presaged by De Gaulle and a de facto vassalage to the United States that Russia's war against Ukraine has only served to reveal.

If the very principle of European construction is based on national deconstruction, then it was natural that wokeism should penetrate European institutions. It would find a favourable ideological breeding ground. Pope John Paul II, in his book "Memory and identity", wrote: "Catholic social doctrine holds that the family and the nation are both natural societies, not the product of mere convention. Therefore, in human history they cannot be replaced by anything else" (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2005). So destroying the nation leaves a vacuum that presages the destruction of civil society and civilisation itself.

When Jacques Chirac was unknowingly being woke, like Moliere's foolish social climber Monsieur Jourdain writing prose: the quarrel over the preamble to the draft treaty establishing a constitution for Europe.

The draft treaty establishing a constitution for Europe, rejected by referendum in 2005 by the French and Dutch electorates, would have constituted a considerable step towards the constitution of a supranational European state and the deconstruction of the European nations as sovereign political entities. A sort of "qualitative leap" symbolically conveyed by the official adoption of a flag, anthem and motto. All this was rejected by the French people, and it's worth pointing this out at a time when the Renaissance party is seeking, by means of a simple legislative proposal, to make compulsory a flag whose official nature was rejected by referendum.

Be that as it may, the preparatory debates on this text gave rise to a "pre-wokeist" offensive concerning the preamble to the draft constitution. Tensions arose in particular over Jacques Chirac's attitude to the

issue of referring to Europe's Christian roots. The debate on "religious heritage" was opened during the plenary session of the Convention for Europe on 24 and 25 April 2003.

An initial, lengthy text provoked strong reactions. It read as follows "Inspired by the cultural, religious and humanist heritages of Europe which, nourished first by the Hellenic and Roman civilisations, marked by the spiritual impetus that has run through it and is still present in its heritage, and then the philosophy of the Enlightenment, have brought to the life of society its perception of the central role of the human person and his inviolable and inalienable rights, as well as respect for the law". It was noted that this convoluted drafting explicitly mentioned the Hellenic and Greek civilisations, which are in the distant past, as well as the philosophy of the Enlightenment, but left out two millennia of Christianity.

There is no need to go back over all the twists and turns of this discussion, during which Jacques Chirac's attitude and obstinacy surprised, then annoyed, even exasperated his partners, particularly the Italians, Portuguese, Spaniards, Poles and Germans. Unlike the French President, who even objected to the word "religious", Gianfranco Fini, Vice President of the Italian Council, declared that "Judeo-Christian roots are the founding values of the Union".

The final text is as follows "Drawing inspiration from the cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, the values of which, still present in its heritage, have embedded within the life of society the central role of the human person and his or her inviolable and inalienable rights, and respect for law" (paragraph 1 of the draft treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe). The draft, as we know, was rejected by referendum and with it the preamble, but the text was included in the preamble to the Treaty of Lisbon, in paragraph 2.

Apart from the question of whether it was appropriate to try to trace the history of Europe's civilisation in a draft constitution, the behaviour of Chirac and his allies in this battle recapitulates many elements of wokeism:

- The primacy of "feelings" over facts, perfectly reflected in Pierre Moscovici's statement (May 2016): "I do not believe in Europe's Christian roots". It's not a question of believing or not believing, but of observing. Moscovici has the option to reject that heritage, but the fact is that the heritage exists;
- the desire to erase almost two thousand years of Christianity in Europe, a characteristic of the "cancel culture";
- the rewriting of history;
- pressure from a minority, Chirac was supported by Belgium and then by Sweden, i.e. three out of twenty-five Member States, which nevertheless gave in under the threat that France would not sign the draft treaty.

The controversy that arose around this question was a foretaste of wokeism. No one is obliged to be a Christian, to appreciate Christianity or the historical role of the church in Europe, but it is absurd to deny that Christianity has been an essential element of European civilisation and, for centuries, has even been the primary characteristic of that appendage of the Asian continent known as Europe.

Everywhere in Europe, there are churches at the heart of villages and cathedrals at the heart of towns. Christianity has inspired some of the greatest masterpieces of music, painting, architecture and literature. Should we destroy, forget, or erase most of the works of Monteverdi, Bach, Charpentier, Handel, Mozart, Berlioz and so many others? The same goes for paintings by Caravaggio, da Vinci, Titian, Vouet, Le Brun, Le Nain, Van Eyck, Rembrandt, Rubens, Murillo, El Greco, Zurbaran or Velasquez. Or the writings of Saint Augustin, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Pascal, Racine, Bernanos, Claudel, Thomas a Becket, Thomas More, Newman, Chesterton, Petrarch, Dante, Lampedusa, Corti, Saint John of the Cross, Calderon de la

Barca, Cervantes...

Once again, without going into the question of the appropriateness of mentioning the religious or philosophical contributions of European civilisation in the preamble to the constitution, the erasure of centuries of Christianity which, clearly, have forged the European identity, constitutes a form of negationism characteristic of the woke ideology. Wiping the slate of the past clean, "levelling accusation against it", deconstructing the foundations of Western Europe as a scapegoat for all the sins of the world, is a founding element of wokeism. In this sense, Chirac was a wokeist without knowing it.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, Pope Benedict XVI made a profound but also very factual statement about the European project: "...an authentic European 'common home' cannot be built without considering the identity of the people of this Continent of ours. It is a question of a historical, cultural, and moral identity before being a geographic, economic, or political one; an identity comprised of a set of universal values that Christianity helped forge, thus giving Christianity not only a historical but a foundational role vis-à-vis Europe".

Thus "European construction", going beyond the deconstruction of the nations that nevertheless make up Europe, has embarked on the deconstruction of European civilisation through a form of denial of historical realities that goes hand in hand with an over-evaluation of the cultural contributions from outside the European continent, particularly that of Islam.

Falsification of history is, moreover, part of the usual European propaganda, for example, the famous statement attributed to Mitterrand: "Nationalism means war, Europe means peace". In fact, the words of the Socialist President before the European Parliament on 17 January 1995 were: "[What I am asking you to do] ... means overcoming our past. And yet, if we fail to overcome our past, let there be no mistake about what will follow. ...nationalism means war!" However, it is not attachment to one's nation that provokes war, but imperialism, whether territorial and/or ideological, as demonstrated by the outbreak of the 1914/1918 war and the modern American and Soviet wars. Peace in Europe is due first and foremost to the German defeat and the German people's sense of guilt that made them peaceful, to the "trente glorieuses" post war boom years, and to the deterrent force. The European project is the fruit of peace, not its origin. Moreover, the European Union was unable to prevent the war in the former Yugoslavia, for which it bears part of the responsibility because of its lack of co-ordination and Germany's haste in recognising the secession of Croatia and Slovenia without serious diplomatic groundwork. Even more recently, the European Union's action towards Ukraine, motivated by ideological reasons and alignment with the United States, has hardly contributed to peace-keeping, even if the responsibility for the outbreak of war obviously lies with Russia. It is also possible to state that agreeing to open accession negotiations with Turkey, which is illegally occupying a third of the territory of Cyprus, a Member State of the European Union, is rewarding unjustifiable military aggression and an annexation that is radically contrary to respect for internationally recognised borders. Just as the aid granted to the mafia-run Islamic pseudo-state of Kosovo enshrines a unilateral modification of borders, as desired by the United States.

As a machine for rewriting history and deconstructing the nations that are the natural frameworks for the political expression of peoples, the European Union was bound to move in a natural progression from political deconstruction to societal deconstruction. It has found in wokeism the ideological vehicle to complete the ruin of the nations. From wokeism 'avant la lettre', it has moved on to assertive wokeism, which became evident in Commissioner Dalli's guide to inclusive communication for the Commission in October 2021.

The European Union's "inclusive communication": wokeism gone mad.

Helena Dalli, the European Commission's Commissioner for Equality and virtually unknown to the general public, burst into the public debate when the Italian newspaper *Il Giornale* highlighted the European

Commission's *Guide to Inclusive Communication*, published under her remit. The preface to the document, by Ms Dalli, sets the tone for the thirty-page document:

"We must have inclusive communication in all circumstances, to ensure that everyone is valued and recognised in all our communication tools regardless of gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation". The vocabulary is characteristic of the influence of wokeism. The very term 'inclusive' is a common marker of this ideology, and of gender theory.

This is followed by a series of examples, arranged in chapters that astonished many readers. The introduction lays down rules to be followed in all circumstances, such as: "Never use gendered nouns or masculine pronouns (he, his) by default", or "When you ask about gender, don't offer man/woman as the only option, but add 'other' or 'prefer not to say'".

The chapter on gender states that "Pronouns of a specific gender should be avoided for people whose gender is unknown" and that it is preferable to rephrase the sentence to avoid having to use pronouns!

The chapter on LGBTIQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, non-binary, intersex and queer) is a veritable anthology of wokeism. An LGBTIQ-inclusive communication must never "assume that people are heterosexual, identify as the gender assigned to them at birth, or identify in a binary way (male or female)". (p.13). We must also always respect "self-identification", which means that "when referring to trans or non-binary people, we must always use the gender which they identify themselves as rather than the sex assigned at birth" (p.13).

It is also important to "avoid using terms such as 'both sexes' or opening speeches with the words 'Ladies and Gentlemen', so as not to exclude intersex or gender queer people or make them invisible". (p.13)

The chapter on cultures, lifestyles and beliefs advises us not to assume that everyone is a Christian, and recommends that we should not use first names such as Marie or Jean in our communications, but rather Malika or Julio, and that we should not wish people a Merry Christmas (p.19)

So as not to stigmatise stateless people or immigrants, it is also recommended not to use the term citizen because not everyone is a citizen in the European Union (p.19). It is also suggested that words with a negative connotation such as colonisation should not be used, and the example given is strange to say the least: avoid "colonisation of Mars" and prefer "sending humans to Mars", presumably so as not to offend the extra-terrestrials! (p.19)

The chapter on disabilities also informs us that it is preferable to speak of someone with hearing loss rather than a deaf person, and that to say that someone suffers from such and such a condition is disparaging. (p.21)

Apart from the unbearable woke jargon used, this document demonstrates the extent to which the ideology of woke deconstruction has penetrated the European Commission. The most typical ideological assumptions are constantly rammed home:

- Hostility to all things masculine, including grammar and syntax, taken to be a sign of patriarchal oppression. So we need to deconstruct language. Yet humanity can be both masculine and feminine, and it is this otherness that defines humanity as a whole;
- The deconstruction of people's sexual identity, since only the subjective appraisal of what a person thinks they are and not the reality of what they are is taken into account. Thus, for the Commission, sex is "assigned" and not a chromosomal, anatomical or biological fact. Personality disorder becomes the norm;
- Cultural and civilisational erasure, with a desire to erase any reference to Christianity;
- The dilution of the notion of citizenship, as it would discriminate against those who are not citizens

of a Member State of the European Union;

- Censorship of vocabulary to expunge words, expressions, pronouns or articles that bear witness to unbearable patriarchal or colonial domination.

This text is a real deep dive into the enchanted world of wokeism. *Il Giornale's* article had the fortunate effect of provoking many lively reactions to a document that could otherwise have gone unnoticed. At the European Parliament, Nadine Morano MEP tabled a priority question requesting a written response from the Commission (P-005599/2021), her colleague François-Xavier Bellamy questioned Commissioner Dalli at the December 2021 session, and there was a strong reaction from the ID group. A similar reaction came from national parliaments and in the press. *Le Monde*, of course, saw it only as a "battle of the European conservatives" (11 December 2021). Be that as it may, Ms Dalli, who had said she was "proud to launch" this guide (tweet dated 26 October 2021), backpedalled (30 November) and withdrew the document for "reworking". A victory for common sense, one might think, and a defeat for the woke offensive in the European Union? More like a strategic withdrawal. Few observers noted that this guide was merely the counterpart to the January 2018 document entitled *Inclusive Communication at the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union*, which was still in force and duly published.

In many cases, the Commission's text simply repeated the themes of the Council of the European Union's text, perhaps more emphatically but essentially in very similar vein. In the foreword to the publication, the administration's Director General, William Shapcott, says: "Through the language and visual communication we use, we can ensure that no group feels excluded, unwanted or discriminated against". This expression itself reflects a typical aspect of "woke" thinking: the sensitive feelings of minority groups who might feel excluded or discriminated against. This honourable senior civil servant goes so far as to say that "unconscious prejudices" should be avoided - prejudices that are very difficult to track down for the very reason that they are unconscious!

This text contains the same obsessions as the Commission's text. For example, it is "advisable to avoid using the term 'man' wherever possible". Examples include "the business world rather than businessmen, the average citizen rather than the man in the street" (p.9). It is suggested that "gender neutral terms should be used, i.e. terms that are not marked from the point of view of grammatical gender" (p.7). It is also advisable to absolutely avoid "sexist language such as: we are looking for a dynamic manager with leadership qualities" So the anti-male obsession is not specific to the Commission's text but is widespread across the institutions.

The English version of the document also stresses the need not to use the term 'Christian name' but instead forename or first name. In de-Christianised France this is hardly shocking, but in Anglo-Saxon countries the wording 'Christian name' is (was) still used a lot. Be that as it may, this is already another instance of the desire to erase the traces of Christianity in a secularised European Union, and which no longer has anything to do with the "Vatican Europe" denounced by Alain Savary under the Fourth Republic (he was a signatory, along with sixty or so of his colleagues, of the pamphlet *Contre la petite Europe cléricale et réactionnaire* 1954) However, even if Europe is indeed very de-Christianised, Christianity remains the leading religion of the European continent and its imprint on European civilisation and history is simply a historical fact. This is a perfect example of 'cancel culture'.

While the European Union professes a certain degree of Christianophobia or outright Christianophobia, on the other hand, it is clearly complacent towards Islam.

Islamism: a complacent European Union?

Victim framing and contrition are the two parallel attitudes that structure militant wokeism. Victim framing of minorities allegedly subjected to "systemic" discrimination or oppression by the patriarchal Western

world. Contrition is then demanded of those construed as oppressors in the form of repentance, the rewriting of history, pulling-down of statues, etc.

The Muslim populations present in the European Union have obviously been set up as a "discriminated" minority, subject to overt or covert hostility, discriminated against and subjected to overt or covert hostility, which is described by the neologism "Islamophobia". It was pointed out that this concept had been used by Khomeini and his regime to condemn women who refused to wear the veil. The 'progressive' press immediately seized on the subject to refute the origins of the word and the concept, tracing it back to the beginning of the 20th century in the writings of officials from the Ministry of Colonies and ethnologists such as Alain Quellien, Paul Marty and Maurice Delafosse. It's an utterly pointless argument, because the origin of the word doesn't presuppose how it's used. The important thing is to know who is using it and for what purpose?

The "breviary" for the proper use of Islamophobia, to paralyse any criticism of Islam and deny that there is a link between Islamic terrorism and Islam (!), is undoubtedly the report by the British think tank The Runnymede Trust entitled "Islamophobia: a challenge for us", submitted to the British Home Secretary Jack Straw in 1997. This text denounces the allegedly "structural" nature of Islamophobia and advocates the involvement of opinion-makers, influencers and other media figures to influence and change the way non-Muslims view the Muslim religion, so that it is seen as "open", "positive" and "progressive". A typical operation in "manufacturing consent" and opinion forming, it is a mild form of propaganda, but at the same time more perverse because it introduces an attempt to morally condemn those who wish to retain their free will.

The Muslim Brotherhood - an organisation created in 1928 in Egypt and classified as terrorist by many states - and its proxies in Europe, have found in the so-called "structural Islamophobia" an extraordinary tool not only for propaganda but also for paralysing reactions against Muslim practices that do not conform to the values of freedom in force in European societies, such as women and young girls wearing the hijab, differentiated timetables for certain sporting activities, the refusal of medical examinations by men in the case of Muslim women, or the demand for halal meals in school canteens. Rejection of these practices is immediately denounced as a sign of intolerable Islamophobia, discriminatory and oppressive towards the Muslim minority.

The European Union seems to have imprudently fallen into the islamophobia trap, as part of its submission to the woke ideology. On 1 February, Helena Dalli appointed Marion Lalisce as coordinator of the European Commission's anti-hatred-of-Muslims campaign. The post, created in 2018, had been vacant for some time. It is interesting to note that a similar post was created in 2015 to combat anti-Semitism, unfortunately required by the revival of a new anti-Semitism, often linked to the conflict between Israel and Palestine, and fuelled by Islamism. On the other hand, Christians, who are the victims of the most numerous acts of hostility, with numbers rising sharply, +70% between 2019 and 2020 (report of 16 November 2021 by the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe), are not the object of the European Commission's concern, as vice-president Véra Jourovà pointed out: "the Commission is not planning a specific strategy to combat Christianophobia and has no plans to appoint a coordinator to deal with this issue" (reply to question E-005548/2021).

The most significant communication is the message delivered by Ms Delli on the occasion of Ms Lalisce's nomination. After expressing her satisfaction, she went on to outline her goals. The new coordinator "will have to ensure that measures are taken to combat hatred, as well as structural and individual discrimination against Muslims". The mention of "structural discrimination" is characteristic of a woke approach. It assumes that European societies are guilty of "systemic Islamophobia". However, there is no specific evidence to corroborate this assertion and it constitutes a form of submission to Islamic propaganda built around the theme of Islamophobia. The rest of the declaration only reinforces the presupposition that Muslims are, by nature, a discriminated and abused minority, since "we must combat hatred against Muslims in all areas, including education, employment and social policy". In reality,

however, this is essentially an empty statement. Everywhere, education is completely open to Muslims, as are the various social benefits that are widely available. It wasn't Muslim pupils who were beheaded by cruel Islamophobes, but teachers - Samuel Paty, a victim of Islamic hatred and the cowardice of his administration - and Dominique Bernard. As for the question of employment, this depends very much on the level of training, but it is clear that in certain professions, such as construction or the car industry, there are large numbers of Muslims, which proves that the doors to employment are not closed. The issue of the level of education is also linked to the question of integration and assimilation. If, through political weakness or carelessness, we allow parallel societies to develop where the host country's language and way of life are excluded or actively fought against, it is clear that integration into the education system will not be made any easier.

The personality of the new coordinator is also interesting. This Arabic-speaking European civil servant has an interesting curriculum vitae. A graduate of the School of Oriental and African Studies (London), the College of Europe and the University of Toulouse-Mirail, she has held various positions in the EU's external relations department. So a logical pick for its new roles.

Her tweet at the beginning of the year is extremely revealing: "Happy New Year from the heart of my country, the European Union. I wish my second homeland, the Arab world, and all the world's Muslims a happy holiday". Like a good zealous European official, she erases her own country, France, in favour of the administrative and regulatory empire that is the European Union as her substitute homeland, and adds the Arab world as her second homeland. Personal choices which perhaps foreshadow the choices to be imposed on European nations in the future?

The UN, De Gaulle's "contraption", under pressure from Pakistan, the country which, along with North Korea, has the highest levels of persecution of Christians, introduced an international day against Islamophobia in 2022. Of course, nothing has been said about the persecution of Christians, which is on the rise throughout the world, particularly in Muslim and Communist countries (360 million Christians were persecuted worldwide in 2022, according to the NGO Open Doors). This is all we might expect of this organisation, which has become the spearhead of wokeism at international level.

A "high-level event" was co-organised by Pakistan - a state where persecution of Christians is "systemic" - and the UN, to mark this day, set for 15 March (UN info 10 March 2023). Although this commemoration is only optional, the European Commission obviously associated itself with it by Ms Lalissee's declaration. In particular, she stated: "Combatting hatred and discrimination towards Muslims and people perceived as Muslims is an integral part of the more general work of combatting racism and discrimination". Muslims are obviously entitled to the respect due to all human beings. But a critical study of Islam as a religious, social and political system is just as obviously everyone's right and freedom. Conflating Islam with a race, which is common in Woke and/or Islamo-leftist discourse, is obviously erroneous but deliberate. The Islamic community is made up of very diverse peoples: North Africans, Arabs, Turks, Iranians, Albanians, Chinese, Indonesians, Pakistanis, Indians... The term racism as regards hostility to Muslims is totally inappropriate if words are to have any meaning. No one would think of equating the countless anti-Christian acts with racism. But this deliberate confusion with regard to Islam is by no means innocent, adding as it does a strong moral connotation, because racism is the most unforgivable sin of our time. This means that any reticence towards or criticism of Islam or practices linked to Islam will immediately be qualified or suspected as racism. It is therefore morally reprehensible, but may also be subject to legal proceedings. This can already be seen, where any criticism of the ritual slaughter of animals, considered by Ms Lalissee as a manifestation of racism (tweet of 22 March 2023: "fighting prejudices and hate and tackling legislation against ritual slaughter"), or criticism of certain practices such as women wearing hijab, are denounced as racist and Islamophobic attitudes by Muslim or Islamo-leftist activists.

The European Commission does not seem to be troubled by the issue of women wearing hijab. To illustrate a communication campaign on the theme "The future is in your hands", the Commission decided to feature a young woman wearing a hijab in the foreground. Is this the future European women want? Worse still,

in September 2022, to illustrate a poster for the European prize for innovative teaching, the Commission chose a photo showing a little girl wearing a hijab just above the European Commission logo. This was at the very time that 20-year-old Mahsa Amini was murdered by the Iranian morality police for not wearing her headscarf "correctly". This led to days of demonstrations in Iran, which were harshly repressed, including the hanging of some demonstrators. The Commission really does have a sense of decency and timeliness in its communication! But submission to wokeism has its imperatives.

But the signs of the European Union's strange deference to Islamism do not stop there. According to Global Watch Analysis, which uses data from the European financial transparency system (ECFTS), the European Commission and the Council of Europe have financed Islamic Relief, the Islamic Human Rights Commission and the Forum of European Muslim and Student Organisations, all of which are linked to the Federation of Islamic Organisations in Europe, the structure that coordinates the actions of the Muslim Brotherhood in Europe. The Muslim Brotherhood is classified as a terrorist organisation by several countries, including Israel.

Islamic Relief, which has received €40,026,424 from the European Commission since 2009, was the biggest beneficiary. The fact that its chairman and board were forced to resign because of anti-Semitic abuse and apologies for Islamic terrorism in no way dissuaded the European Commission from renewing Islamic Relief's status as a "humanitarian partner" until 2027 (see written question E-0028 16/2021).

Worse still, the "Collectif de lutte contre l'islamophobie en France" (Collective against Islamophobia in France, which dissolved itself before being dissolved by the French government because of its role in inciting the murder of Samuel Paty, is also said to have benefited from European largesse to the tune of €810,000 between 2012 and 2017, and funding from George Soros' Open Society.

The European Commission thus seems to be adopting the woke claim that Muslims are subject to systemic discrimination in Europe and should therefore be granted a "permanent compensatory privilege", to use Derrida's phrase. The result is financing that is hazardous, to say the least, as well as a communication of deference. By showing that it believes in structural Islamophobia, it is playing into the hands of Islamist movements that claim to prohibit any criticism of Islam and its customs in the name of combatting supposed racism, a claim that is absurd because Islam is a religious, legal and social system, not a race.

The neologism "Islamophobia", spread by the movement close to the Muslim Brotherhood, literally means the irrational fear of Islam. However, in its report for 2022, Europol indicates that Europe suffered 18 jihadist attacks in 2019, 14 in 2020 and 11 in 2021. In a publication of September 2021, the Foundation for Political Innovation notes that between 1979 and 2000, 2190 Islamist attacks were recorded worldwide, causing the death of 6818 people. Between 2013 and 2019, there were 23,315 attacks and 122,092 deaths. So the fear of a certain form of militant Islam is not all that unreasonable. On the contrary.

It should also be pointed out that by showing deferent sympathy for Islam, the European Union, which is determined to deny the Christian foundations of European civilisation, is contributing to the erasure of the latter and the falsified rewriting of our history. For the rest of the world, and in particular for the Islamic world, Europe and more broadly the West is equated with Christianity and Roman civilization, as expressed by the use of the Muslim derogatory terms of "roumi" or "crusaders" often used by Islamists. By professing a form of spiritual and cultural amnesia, the European Union is depreciating itself in the eyes of certain determined adversaries of our civilisation, and encouraging entrenchment of Muslim Brotherhood ideology on its own territory, in typically wokeist post-colonial penitent fashion.

This acceptance of the dogma of the victimisation of Muslims, used by the Muslim Brotherhood to disarm any criticism or even commentary on the political, legal and religious system of Islam, is also one of the elements in the blaming of the Western white man, the real scapegoat for all humanity's abuses: imperialism, slavery, racism, abusive patriarchy As if such actions were the hallmark of the European man. It should be remembered that Muslim civilisation practised slavery from the outset and until recently,

whether African or European, through piracy in the Mediterranean. It also had a particularly cruel aspect, since many men, if they could not be ransomed, were doomed to castration, and women to sexual slavery, in the harems of the Sublime Porte. Slavery was also practised in China, as it was in Amerindian societies, where it was associated with human sacrifice. As for imperialism, it has existed throughout history and in all civilisations. The first Arab-Muslim kingdoms went on to conquer the Byzantine Empire, followed by the Ottoman Empire, which colonised Europe right up to the gates of Austria. As for patriarchy, there is no need to dwell on its reality in the Muslim world and Asian societies.

All these realities pale into insignificance in the face of the ideological desire to accuse the white man as standard bearer of a neo-colonial and supremacist vision of the world. It is as if the exceptional development of science and technology and the considerable expansion of the West around the world were reflecting back a less than favourable image of themselves to the less developed countries of the South. The result has been a deep resentment coupled with a desire for political and economic revenge, which is all the stronger because the feeling of humiliation has been systematically nurtured by certain governments and, in Europe, by certain militant minorities organised into pressure groups which have the ear of some elements of the media and whom the oligarchy fears.

The European Union, which has always been very receptive to American influences, has not failed to adopt the clichés of the woke ideology regarding the "systemic" racism of Western societies, in this case European.

Racism: European companies criticised by the Commission.

On 18 September 2020 the Commission presented an "EU Plan of action against racism 2020/2025" to the European Parliament, the EU Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. No one disputes the legitimacy of combating racism, but it could be argued that this action is more a matter for subsidiarity, i.e. for the Member States themselves, than of the European Union, since combating racist acts is, by definition, a local issue. Be that as it may, the Commission produced this document which harks back to the existing legislation on non-discrimination, particularly in employment, advocates penal sanctions and combatting "hate speech", a term which would require a strict definition, as it is clear that some associations have a very broad idea of hate speech and that simple criticism of one or another aspect of religious traditions or, for example, Islam, or even a historical commentary, could swiftly result in prosecution.

The most interesting part of the document is undoubtedly its introductory section and the various official press releases that accompanied its release, because they reflect the Commission's approach and its ideological ulterior motives.

In the usual triumphalist and overblown style of Commission press releases, the following were repeated from Ms von der Leyen's "State of the Union Address" on 16 September 2020 (doesn't the United States have copyright on that...?): "progress on fighting racism and hate is fragile – it is hard won but very easily lost. So now is the moment to make change. To build a truly anti-racist Union – that goes from condemnation to action".

The comments are interesting for several reasons: firstly, because the President of the Commission suggests that until now the European Union has been racist, since "now is the moment to make change" and "to build a truly anti-racist Union". This is a strange statement, underpinned by the woke presupposition that Western societies are by nature "systemically" racist. So, according to Ursula von der Leyen, the EU was not "genuinely anti-racist", i.e. it was racist and had to act without delay. In truth, the Member States have not waited to adopt numerous pieces of anti-racist legislation.

Commissioner Helena Dalli, champion of wokeism within the Commission, could not hold back: "With this

action plan, we acknowledge that racism is not only perpetrated by individuals but is also structural [...] This is why, amongst others we address law enforcement, social attitudes, stereotypes and economic concerns". It's all there: 'structural' racism, the Commission's almost totalitarian determination, the hallmark of wokeism, to track down social attitudes and "stereotypes", which is tantamount to wanting to condition people's way of thinking and being, which goes way further than sanctions for criminally reprehensible acts. It should be pointed out that the Commission claims to be getting involved in the management of law enforcement services, which is in no way within its remit. What we have here is a woke way of thinking coupled with a desire to exceed the powers conferred by the Treaties!

The Commission's official press release was a foretaste as far as the text itself was concerned. In fact, the introductory text is a kind of digest of woke themes when it comes to the denunciation of so-called 'white supremacism' and 'systemic racism' in our societies. As expected, the text refers to the "global Black Lives Matter movement" (international, admittedly, but Western), considered a "stark reminder" of the deep-rooted racism in our European societies!

Some categorical assertions follow: "people of Asiatic and African descent, Muslims, Jewish and Roma people have all suffered from intolerance". This is a very general statement, with no nuance and no factual basis given other than ideological presupposition. It could be pointed out that the resurgence of anti-Semitism is essentially due to Islamism, hatred of Israel and Islamo-leftism.

The Commission continues in full spate: "But other, less explicit forms of racism and racial discrimination, such as those based on unconscious bias, can be equally damaging". So now our Eurocrats want to "look into our hearts and minds" and delve into our subconscious to hunt down possible forms of unconscious racism! We already knew about the thought police. The Commission has invented the unconsciousness police.

The plan goes on in the same vein: "there are different forms of racism" ... all of which "share the reality that the value of a person is undermined by stereotypes based on prejudice". However, stereotypes and prejudices are not, by definition, methods that are consciously employed. The Commission cites "Islamophobia" among the forms of racism, even though it has been established that this term has been utilised by Islamists, particularly those close to the Muslim Brotherhood, to prohibit any criticism of Islam or its practices.

To complement its woke approach to the issue, the Commission goes on to point out that "racism can also be combined with discrimination and hatred on other grounds, including gender, sexual orientation, age, and disability or against migrants. This needs to be taken into account through an intersectional approach". This is the classic woke 'potpourri', which consists of combining all the supposedly oppressed or discriminated against minorities to achieve a convergence of liberation struggles against the oppressive Western patriarchal order.

The Commission's text provides the reader with a translation of its jargon, indicating in a footnote that "The European Institute for Gender Equality defines 'intersectionality' as an 'analytical tool for studying, understanding and responding to the ways in which sex and gender intersect with other personal characteristics/identities, and how these intersections contribute to unique experiences of discrimination' ". It is not a given that this poor scholarship with pretensions to science will further enlighten the reader, but it is certain that it takes us deep into the most paradigmatic wokeism. Officially supported by the European Commission, which ultimately is asserting that the societies of the Member States of the European Union are guilty of systemic and sometimes unconscious racism that needs to be eradicated.

In reality, the aim is not to eradicate racism but Western man, his culture, his history, his scientific advances and his spirituality, to punish him for having dominated and then gained ascendancy and a technical lead over the rest of the world. In fact, it is the very essence of Europe that needs to be brought to repentance, humiliated and destroyed. The worst thing is that the European Commission is making itself the zealous

instrument of this predicted ruin.

But it is not alone among the European institutions: the European Parliament and its majority could not miss out when it came to accusing the West. Carried away by the general emotion caused by the death of George Floyd in well-known circumstances in the United States, the majority of the European Parliament, influenced by the "Black Lives Matter" movement, voted on 19 June 2020 to condemn "white supremacy in all its forms" and called for "disproportionate use of force and racist tendencies in law enforcement" in the repression of the riots that followed this dramatic event, "to be publicly denounced".

The turmoil that had gripped the Western world explains the content of the resolution. Nonetheless, in just a few lines it sums up the permanent indictment that wokeism makes against Western societies: white supremacy and the 'systemic' racism that perverts the application of the law. The white man has become the source of every injustice. But Parliament's anti-white obsession extends even to the training it gives its staff. For example, on 23 March 2023, as part of the events programme for the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, Parliament's Directorate General for Personnel organised training sessions to eliminate racism in language under the title "Anti-racism - why words matter".

The training session was opened by the Vice-President of the Parliament, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, accompanied by Kristian Knudsen, Director-General for Personnel, and Erika Laud-Gietema, Director of HR Support and Social Services in the Parliament's Personnel Directorate General. A totally official session, completely supported by the institution. So what did we learn at this conference?

First of all, a visual claimed that the symbolism of the colours of the Christian religion was racist, since the colour white was associated with God, angels, heaven, light, innocence, virginity, beauty and virtue, while black was associated with the devil, hell, darkness, sin, guilt, ugliness and evil. This would include Africa and West Asia, Islam, Judaism and other religions. In addition to the anti-white obsession, a little touch of Christianophobia was added, which is very well received in European institutions.

It would have been possible to emphasise, if we wanted to stick to the "colour code", that the colours of Judaism and Islam are more or less identical to those of Christianity. What's more, it seems difficult to consider that black is not dark and white is not light. This is pure woke delirium that belies reality, totally endorsed by Parliament's administration.

But it's worth taking a closer look at the themes expounded by the main speakers on this course, Susan Arndt, Professor of English Studies and English Literature at the University of Bayreuth, and Rolade Berthier, English language trainer and independent researcher.

As reported in Ubtaktuell, the campus magazine of the University of Bayreuth, Professor Dr Susan Arndt gave the keynote address on the theme of "the (historical) interaction of colonialism, racism and language". In particular, she asserted that "racism claims that there is a 'human race' in order to make whiteness the privileged norm", which, in her view, "leads to otherness, the main purpose of which is to deny full humanity to those excluded from white supremacy through the construction of people of colour". In the course of the discussions she also asserted that "whiteness influences knowledge production processes". The Ubtaktuell website also states that "the training focused on how legislation and educational policy strategies can be translated into concrete measures to combat structural racism. On the one hand it was about banning racist terms (and banning them in all EU contexts) and on the other hand it was about the question of how debates in wider society can be endowed with greater critical consciousness, greater knowledge of words and greater competence". And it concludes that "any language can only be improved by being less discriminatory and more inclusive". Here we are mired in 'decolonial' woke jargon and denunciation of white supremacy, in simple terms anti-white racism and imposed self-flagellation.

Rolade Berthier writes in her blog that "we use the term 'blacklist' to mean something negative or forbidden. Doesn't this reinforce the idea that black is undesirable and white desirable? " She asks that other words such as prohibited, refused, blocked or unauthorised list be used in preference.

She also regrets, for example, that the use of the word guru "all the time, calls into question its original value" of respect in Buddhist or Hindu traditions. She also stresses that "an immigrant is a human being; a human being cannot be illegal" and suggests that the terms "undocumented individual/family/person" should be used instead, or that the focus should be on the action, i.e. illegal entry". She concludes: "Words can make the difference between respect and dehumanisation". Under a well-intentioned guise, the aim is to purge the language in the name of racist obsessions and create a "NewSpeak" worthy of George Orwell's novel.

This is how the European Parliament is becoming the vehicle for wokeism in Europe, without realising, it seems, that it is deconstructing Europe itself and not just the nations that make it up.

The Council of the European Union could not remain unscathed. On 19 March 2023, on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, the High Representative, on behalf of the European Union, made a statement including these words: "Fighting racism also means eliminating barriers, reducing wealth disparities, criminal justice bias as well as defying stereotypes and prejudices". Underlying this is the idea that there is a legal and economic structural racism, driven in particular by the collective unconscious reflected in stereotypes and prejudice. This predisposes us not only to thought policing, but even to policing the unconscious.

He goes on to say: "In the past year, antigypsyism, xenophobia including anti-migrant hatred and sexual orientation were the most reported grounds of hate speech in the European region". This declaration, which is rather vague as to the sources (the "most reported grounds" mentioned), stems from the usual "intersectionality" of the presumed discrimination against and oppression of various minorities, which are combined to increase their revolutionary power in the context of the generalised deconstruction of European society. The term "European region" is particularly relevant here. It is no longer Europe, or even the European Union, but just another region in the great undifferentiated mass of globalisation. Globalisation, whose woke deconstruction is a powerful ideological tool.

But the submission of European institutions to the ideological injunctions of wokeism is also strikingly evident in its openness to the gender theory of which it has become a zealous propagator.

Gender theory: the EU's orthodox dogma.

On 5 March 2020, the European Commission presented a document entitled "A Union of Equality: Gender Equality Strategy 2020-2025". The text is prefaced by a quotation from Ursula von der Leyen, in the usual style of her communication officers, i.e. somewhat emphatic and hollow: "We should not be shy about being proud of where we are or ambitious about where we want to go" (political guidelines).

But apart from this self-congratulation, what does the text say, what ideology underlies it?

From the outset, the reader is told that : "Thanks to robust equal treatment legislation and jurisprudence, efforts to mainstream the gender perspective into different policy areas, and laws to address particular inequalities, the EU has made significant progress in gender equality in the last decades." A footnote explains that " 'Gender' shall mean the socially constructed roles, behaviours, activities and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for women and men". The tone is set. The Commission's approach to the issue of relations between men and women and equal access to jobs, professions and remuneration is that of gender theory. We should recall that gender theory, invented by the American Judith Butler, a militant lesbian, philosopher and by no means a scientist, consists of a hypothesis according to which the sexual identity - boy or girl - genetically determined for each of us from the moment of conception, a genetic determination inscribed in all our cells, is not the result of sex and biological data but of the sociocultural environment, and of "cultural assignation" and "stereotypes". This means that our female or male identity has little or nothing to do with the genetic, morphological, anatomical and biological reality

of our bodies. In fact, the consistency between our sex and our "gender" is imposed on us by society. That is, an intolerable oppression. Gender theory underestimates, or even denies, the biological reality of the human being, but overvalues the sociocultural construction of sexual identity. That makes it not objective but rather, subjective. Only sexual orientation, chosen or not, would characterise the individual.

In fact, gender theory reverses the facts. It is the reality of sexual, chromosomal, physical and physiological differences between men and women that have led to social constructions, and not the other way round.

We may well wonder why the European Union is adopting an ideology that is not based on any scientific data, is philosophical in nature and what is more is expressed in an obscure jargon that takes deconstruction theories as its starting point. To follow an American way of thinking? To go beyond the deconstruction of nations to the deconstruction of European societies? Or quite simply because triumphant relativism and absolute individualism end up considering that the givens of nature are 'fascist' because the individual has not chosen them. The Eurocrats should remember a Polish proverb: "God always forgives, man sometimes, nature never".

The authors of the text continue: "Unfortunately progress with regard to gender equality is neither inevitable nor irreversible. We therefore need to give a new impetus to gender equality". It should be stressed that there are no specific facts to support the claim that progress is not irreversible. On the contrary, there is a 'ratchet effect' in this area, at least in legal terms, which contradicts the assertion. This is immediately followed by another worrying assertion: "Too many people still violate the principle of gender equality through sexist hate speech and by blocking action against gender-based violence and gender stereotypes". It's fair to ask what kind of world the authors are living in. Is "sexist hate speech" commonplace, or is it simply used to justify the development that follows? Unless the word hate no longer has anything to do with reality. Tasteless comments, alas yes, but it's not a question of hatred, rather of stupidity or bad manners. But neither stupidity nor bad manners are an offence, otherwise the prisons would be even more overcrowded than they are. It's hard to imagine anyone other than delinquents opposing "action against violence". As for the mention of "sexist stereotypes", this is the obligatory kow-towing to gender theory which, as we have seen, is the Commission's preferred reading. Are we going to prosecute parents who give their daughter a doll and their son a fire engine? And are we going to deny that occupations requiring a high level of physical strength more often attract men than women? Should we look back to the defunct Soviet Union, where women were often assigned to earthmoving work?

To complement the legislative action, the Commission launched a communication campaign entitled #EndGenderStereotypes, in the style of the purest woke gender and deconstruction theory, right from the title in the international English that has become the quasi-official language of the European Union, this "integrated volapük" announced by General De Gaulle.

The first image shows a young man, and a handsome one at that, knitting, apparently on a suburban train. Clicking on the 'Discover More' box reveals the aim of the campaign: "raise awareness about the role gender stereotypes play in society". This is followed by a woke plea, a caricature of the obsessions of the proponents of gender theory: "What gender instantly comes to mind when you think of a certain toy, a job, a sport, or even a colour? Gender stereotypes are deeply ingrained in our culture and are a root cause of gender inequalities. Often, we are not even aware of them, but they affect each of us - both women and men". In these few sentences, we accuse our culture, which is the transmitter of "stereotypes" and therefore discriminatory, and our "mind" and conscience. This is something like self-criticism, and the Commission is allowing itself to intrude on our conscious and unconscious thoughts. Welcome to the worst kind of totalitarianism.

Why stop there: "Each of us has different identities, and at their intersections, we can face unique experiences of discrimination. Gender stereotypes limit everyone's freedom. That is why it is important to question them". This is a pure example of the jargon used in gender theory and taken up by the woke theme of systemic discrimination resulting from our culture or subconscious. We need to be brainwashed,

because taking the facts of nature into account is obviously a fascistic attitude.

The campaign continues with a series of childish examples, such as a woman firefighter, which is supposed to surprise us, and is accompanied by the following text: "From the skills we acquire as children to what we study in school and the careers we pursue, stereotypical expectations for women and men, girls and boys, can limit our aspirations, choices, and freedom. Therefore, we need to question what is due to free choice; and what is due to our stereotypes". Here again, the Commission means to meddle in our intimate choices and cast doubt on our free will. It seems a short step to compulsory re-education, so true is it that wokeism is in many respects a re-run of the ways of thinking and acting typical of the Marxist-Leninist dialectic.

This is followed by the inevitable photograph of a father doing his daughter's hair, because "The roles and responsibilities of men and women in their families and jobs are determined not only by their free choices but also by gender stereotypes. Striving for gender balance in the workplace, at home, and in society requires broadening one's perspective on these issues, by challenging conventional norms and beliefs". On the one hand, the Commission has no right to interfere in the organisation of tasks in the workplace, and even less so in the home, and on the other, it has no right to demand anything in this area, which is a matter of free will and individual freedom. Totalitarianism is not far off for this European Commission, which has gone quite mad and intends to regulate everyone's life down to the smallest detail. When will everyone have an electronic bracelet to measure the exact division of tasks in the home?

The last image shows "a female president decorating a high-ranking military woman", an image that is supposed to surprise us. But the history of Europe is littered with queens and empresses who have held the weightiest offices of power, and it is the era of democracy in fact that has relegated women to second place in this field. This is followed by a plea to "tackle the stereotypes that prevent women from rising to positions of leadership". It should be noted that this is less and less the case and that in this area, as in others, it is personal will, individual choice and competence that must take precedence. Not administrative quotas.

The European Commission has a militant wing to implement its dogma inspired by gender ideology; the European Institute for Gender Equality. One of the aims of this European agency is to help political policy-makers "design measures that are inclusive, transformative and promote gender equality in all areas of life", "provide research, collect and analyse data on gender equality with an intersectional perspective", "provide technical support for gender mainstreaming in all EU and national policies" At least the European Commission is not hiding the fact, which it clearly stands by, that its approach to male/female relations is based on gender ideology, something that certain "useful idiots" refuse to see.

In its presentation, the agency takes up the Commission's literature: "We are helping to make the European Union a Union of equality, where women and men, girls and boys, in all their diversity, are free to follow the path they have chosen in life, have equal opportunities to flourish and can also participate in and lead our societies". The phrase "in all their diversity" is worth deciphering. The aim is to adopt all the categories identified by the proponents of gender ideology (cisgender heterosexual, lesbian, gay, trans, queer, but also asexual, pansexual, non-binary, two-spirit) and therefore to make them official and to make the jargon specific to gender ideology official.

Children must not escape the propaganda of gender theory, which is why the European Union has designed an "Educational Toolkit to Help Fight Gender Stereotypes in Primary Schools", based on the example of transport, a sector in which the Commission believes there are not enough women because of "sexist stereotypes". We learn that "Out-of-school and family contexts are often rich in implicit messages related to gender; teachers have a responsibility to make the implications of such messages visible and challenge them.". The text in French is careful to use inclusive language, but note also the assertion that the role of teachers is to counter what children receive in their families in terms of education if this does not correspond to the woke ideology of the European Union. A scandalous and totalitarian intrusion into the

educational responsibility of parents, based on supposedly 'implicit' stereotypes.

It would be possible to comment on the Commission's annual reports on gender equality at the risk of being repetitive. Let's be clear: no one can be opposed to equal pay for women and men for equivalent jobs and qualifications, unfavourable treatment with regard to maternity is unacceptable, free choice in access to professions and training must be guaranteed, and working conditions and promotions must be equal based on talent. This has nothing to do with the search, sometimes underlying, for a form of mathematical equality in the exercise of responsibilities or the desire for women to become "just another guy", which hardly seems to correspond to the respect due to the female half of humanity. We are faced with an ideological delusion which claims that, ultimately, human beings are undifferentiated beings who can choose their "gender identity" as they please.

A proper aspiration is to preserve everyone's freedom to choose their profession and pursue their career as they see fit without encountering undue obstacles. Equality and justice between men and women are obviously valuable objectives. The same goes for combating violence against women (or men, which does exist, albeit less frequently) within the family and elsewhere, which can result from cultural or tribal practices such as sexual mutilation or pressure to wear certain clothing.

But none of this has anything to do with the promotion of gender ideology, even to children, undertaken by the European Union in a kind of intoxication of deconstruction - of which it will also end up being the victim. Under no circumstances has the European Union, which only has powers of attribution, been mandated to act as a tool for the spread of wokeism in Europe. It is overstepping its rights and seriously violating those of the Member States, which have the right to combat the forces of societal dilution.

As a result of its subservience to gender ideology, the European Union has taken the part of the LGBTQI minority, or minorities.

EU: a preferred option for the LGBTQIA minority...

In recent years, the "LGBTQIA..." minority has been able to organise itself into an influential and effective group, taking advantage of the growing power of gender theory in international organisations, certain media and part of the academic world, following in the footsteps of American fashions. The European Union has followed the lead of the movement begun in the United States.

On her Twitter account, Ursula von der Leyen said on 17 May 2023: "I am proud to stand with the LGBTQ+ community. Today and every day. The EU will continue to champion your rights". Her institutional concern for this minority was reflected in the fact that she attacked Hungary because the Hungarian parliament had adopted a law which reduces or prohibits access by minors to content representing "divergences from personal identity corresponding to sex at birth, a sex change or homosexuality", and because a publisher of children's books had been asked by the public authorities to include the text that a book described behaviour that did not correspond to the "roles traditionally attributed to men and women".

Insofar as family law (Art. 9 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights) and legislation concerning minors do not fall within the competence of the European Union, the Commission has relied on legal arguments of an economic nature, such as the Audiovisual Services Directive, the Electronic Commerce Directive, as well as the principles of freedom to provide services and free movement of goods (Art 56 and Art 34 TFEU). It is, moreover, a usual tactic of the Commission, when it does not have clearly established powers in an area, to make extensive use of, or even misuse, the powers it does have to regulate matters beyond its strict competences. For example, before the Lisbon Treaty gave it shared competences in the energy domain, it destructured the European energy market, particularly electricity, through its exclusive competences as regards competition.

Be that as it may, the Commission has made use of a legitimate cause, combatting the injustices done to homosexuals and a fortiori the violence to which they may be subjected, to impose its vision, deeply influenced by gender ideology and wokeism, which is clearly reflected in both the institutional communication and the ideological structure of the texts, as well as in the words used.

Following on from the theme of "A Union of Equality", the President of the Commission presented an "LGBTIQ Equality Strategy" in 2020. In a perfectly "diversity-aware" text, Commissioner Helena Dalli declared: "Today, the EU asserts itself, as the example to follow, in the fight for diversity and inclusion....Everybody in the European Union should feel safe and free without fear of discrimination or violence on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression or sex characteristics". The statement is interesting because it mixes the quite justified assertion that no one should "fear discrimination or violence on the grounds of sexual orientation" with the addition of "gender identity or expression", thereby enshrining gender theory as the official theory of the EU. Commissioner Vera Jourovà adds in the same typically woke spirit: "Everyone should feel free to be who they are – without fear or persecution". Quite apart from the idea of "persecution" which is somewhat over the top, the Commissioner's text in French does not say "everyone should be free to be the person they are" but "the person they want to be", a statement in line with gender theory. There is no such thing as reality, only the subjectivity of the individual, which must be imposed on society as a whole, on pain of being accused of discrimination. But do we have the right to impose on the rest of society a purely subjective vision of things, detached from any genetic, biological or morphological reality? Isn't this a form of totalitarianism on the part of certain minorities, for that matter, very minor minorities?

The information sheet published in November 2020 is very revealing. Ms von der Leyen is quoted as saying that "being yourself is not your ideology". This goes to the heart of the matter, since for gender theory there is no objective reality but only social construction, and thus is variable, like "gender", which could be "fluid".

The same text indicates that in 2019, 43% of LGBT people felt they had been discriminated against. This is subjective again. The question is not whether you felt or perceived that you were discriminated against, but whether you were in fact discriminated against, especially as any discrimination may lead to prosecution.

This document quotes a person who describes themselves as "intersex", in plain English as neither male nor female, in "plural gender" jargon: "I'm an intersex person and I'm proud of it, it's just a matter of time before everyone has heard about it and understood that biological sex is not something binary". But biological sex is binary. You carry either XX or XY chromosomes. Nothing could be more binary and scientifically concrete.

The fact that the Commission quotes this person shows that the institution fully endorses gender ideology, i.e. the deconstruction of the gendered identity of human beings. Moreover, the person quoted goes on to say: "it will take more time before people accept that everyone is free to choose their identity". Why should we impose a purely subjective, individual vision that is cut off from the actual reality of things? Sexual identity dysphoria is a mental condition, but the law is not therapy. It is not up to political and administrative institutions to recognise personality disorders as a social fact. This is a matter of respectful personal supervision, not "institutionalisation". Moreover, if we follow this logic, why should it be the case only for sexual identity disorders and not for other personality disorders?

The very text of the EU strategy for LGBTIQ people is interesting because of the premise that underlies it. The tone is that of a victim mentality, in keeping with the woke ideology that sexual minorities are subject to "intersectional" discrimination because of "prejudices" and "stereotypes", terms widely used in communications. One example of "prejudice" noted by the Commission is that "57% of people questioned" would be uncomfortable with the idea of one of their children having a sexual relationship with a trans person. Should we really be surprised?

But what is most revealing is that the Commission (point 2 of the strategy) takes issue with the fact that the LGBTIQ movement is increasingly referred to as an ideology in online and offline communications and that the same is true "with regard to the ongoing campaign against 'gender ideology' ". It is a challenge to freedom of opinion and expression but also, in a way, an affirmation that gender ideology is the official ideology of the European Union, which cannot be challenged. Shades of Trofim Lyssenko! Clearly, the European Commission is condemning us to a "Brave New World" that even Aldous Huxley did not dream of - or rather, have nightmares about.

It is evident that gender ideology is the approach adopted by the Commission to tackle combating discrimination against homosexuals. It's all there, the jargon and terminology, the tendency towards totalitarian thinking, the scientific pretensions and the ultimate objective of deconstructing the gendered identity of human beings, the privileged instrument of wokeism. It is not certain that the cause of eliminating injustice and violence against homosexuals will gain from this, quite the contrary.

Unconditional support for LGBTQI activism also comes from the left of the European Parliament, which adds a touch of Christianophobia, which always goes down well in today's European Union. Swedish far-left MP and LGBTQI activist Malin Björk, for example, supported an exhibition of photographs by Elisabeth Ohlson designed to shock Christians. It featured a naked black man on a cross, embraced by an equally naked white man. Or Christ, in the symbolism of the Resurrection, surrounded by "leather-clad gays" with S&M overtones. This exhibition was apparently supported by Martin Schulz, leader of the European Socialists and originally from East Germany, who has certainly learned the lessons of his former masters. With perfect hypocrisy, the photographer declared: "Jesus loves queer people just as much as anyone else". No one is going to buy the idea that the purpose of these photos was to remind us that Christ came into the world to redeem and save all men - in fact the point was to shock and cause scandal. Without running any risks, in fact, because in Europe Christians do not massacre those who mock their religion or offend their faith, unlike certain representatives of another religion.

But in addition to its provocative nature, by hijacking the symbols of the religion that has been the crucible of European civilisation, this exhibition was part of the drive to deconstruct our culture, our history and our civilisation. Gratuitous mockery and sniggering can also be very effective weapons of deconstruction.

But the deconstruction of Europe would not be complete without the deconstruction of language. We have seen that the inevitable Commissioner Dalli had launched an attempt, a test balloon, within the broader framework of communications. The European Parliament actively took the plunge with a document entitled *Use of gender-neutral language in the European Parliament*, preceded by a foreword by the vice-president of the parliament, Dimitrios Papadimoulis.

The European Union and the deconstruction of European languages.

The foreword by Mr Papadimoulis is an almost caricatural example of woke jargon with a pinch of Eurocracy: "The High-Level Group on Gender Equality and Diversity requested Parliament's services to update the gender-neutral language guidelines, which provide practical advice in all official languages on the use of gender-fair and inclusive language". This gibberish is almost incomprehensible to the average person. Clearly not a good sign.

In fact, the document is a concentrate of wokeism, the purpose and effect of which is to impose norms for deconstructing language designed "to promote change in society". This is a subversive approach. The definition given of neutral language is an unabashed exposé of the ideology of deconstruction that has contaminated European institutions: "Gender-neutral language is a generic term covering the use of non-sexist language, inclusive language or gender-fair language. The purpose of gender-neutral language is to avoid word choices which may be interpreted as biased, discriminatory or demeaning by implying that one sex or social gender is the norm. Using gender-fair and inclusive language also helps reduce gender

stereotyping, promotes social change and contributes to achieving gender equality".

In reality, the aim is not to promote gender equality but gender confusion and erasure of their differences. Underlying all this are ideas of militant feminism that want to erase the male part of humanity from language, and then from social structures, at all costs.

The task of demolishing European languages is complicated by their diversity and differences in grammar and syntax. The result is a convoluted approach to European multilingualism which states that there are "gender-neutral" languages such as English, Danish and Swedish. It is advisable to use a "neutralisation strategy", for example not referring to policeman or policewoman, but police officer, avoiding chairman and instead using chair or chairperson...

Other languages are characterised by grammatical gender, such as German, Romance languages and Slavic languages. The authors are most regretful that it is "almost impossible, from a lexical point of view, to create widely accepted gender-neutral forms". It is therefore advisable to use "alternative approaches" such as feminising words, or replacing the generic masculine form with double forms such as 'tutti i consiglieri e tutte le consigliere', which makes the sentence much more elegant and fluid...! In the same paragraph, we can read that for the terms "nurses" and "midwives", for example, "the feeling of discrimination has been particularly strong". But the editor is reassured that "the use of generic masculine terms is no longer the absolute practice". The question is what strategy should be used for generic feminine terms such as those in French like "personne (person)", "sentinelle (sentinel)" or "vigie (vigil)"?

Finally, there are genderless languages such as Estonian, Finnish and Hungarian. These "do not generally need a particular strategy to be gender-inclusive". It's a rare case of Hungary not being "stigmatised"!

The text then describes "the issues common to most languages", foremost among which is "generic use of the masculine gender". "Strategies to avoid such generic use" should therefore be adopted. The text also recommends that "the use in many languages of the word 'man' in a wide range of idiomatic expressions which refer to both men and women, such as manpower, layman, man-made, statesmen, committee of wise men, should be discouraged". Other "issues" concern "The names of professions and functions" and "The use of titles".

It's hard not to be dismayed by the puerility of some of the remarks, but it does manifest a kind of anti-masculine obsession, as if the male part of humanity had some intention, through linguistic rules and usages, of discriminating against and oppressing the female part of humanity.

What we have here is the expression of an aggressive neo-feminism, part of the potpourri that is the woke ideology, designed to impose on the world as it is its "dominant/dominated" oppositional theories, which are a reinterpretation of class struggle theory. The neo-Marxists and absolutist revolutionaries are in fact looking for a substitute for the proletariat, which is considered to have become gentrified and to have lost its revolutionary force. Incidentally, this male/female opposition is perfectly in line with the thinking of Karl Marx, who wrote: "In the family, the man is the bourgeois; the woman plays the role of the proletariat" (*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*).

Beyond this revolutionary dialectic, through language, the aim is also to denounce the supposed supremacy of the white patriarchy in Western societies. It is in fact a full-scale attack on our societies. By deconstructing language, we destroy the possibility of naming things, facts and beings. It is the general impoverishment of thought and the dumbing down of the people who will then have imposed on them a new totalitarianism with its "NewSpeak". A people that will have been turned grey and dull, transformed into an undifferentiated magma where nothing will be established or constructed and where the very sense of the reality of beings and things will have disappeared.

The deconstruction and erasure of European languages is also manifested in the invasion of International English, combined with Eurocratic jargon loosely taken from English in the linguistic praxis of the European

Commission. Although, in principle, the Commission's three working languages are English, French and German, in reality 72.5% of the Commission's original texts are drafted in English, 11.8% in French and 2.7% in German (*Eyes on Europe* 21 July 2021). We should note that after the United Kingdom Brexit, the only English-speaking nations are Ireland and Malta, i.e. 5.4 million people out of a total population of 447 million.

It is one thing that for practical reasons bad English became the lingua franca of the European Union, but it is quite another for it to have become a kind of official language for the Commission. The dominant language is always that of the culturally, militarily and economically dominant country. Which today is the United States and the EU is particularly aligned with them, as we know. However, article 3 of the Treaty on European Union states: "[the EU] shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced.". It may respect the "rich ... linguistic diversity", but it does not safeguard it. This is also a way of deconstructing national identities in order to assert its ideological imperium.

Conclusion: has the European Union become a weapon of mass destruction of the physical Europe?

Countless texts, communications and declarations emanate from the European Union. The texts have been chosen here theme by theme because they are particularly illustrative. The European Union, and in particular the European Commission and the European Parliament, are deeply penetrated by the woke ideology, that mishmash of different ideologies of deconstruction. Gender theory, decolonialism, clear or implied denunciation of "white supremacy", Islamophilia and underlying Christianophobia, the rewriting of history and the deconstruction of language - all the elements of the woke deconstruction are being taken on board by the European Union. Worse still, gender theory has become something of an official ideology in the EU, with the slightest criticism being denounced as scandalous and evidence of discrimination, even though it has no scientific basis whatsoever.

What's more, the various ideologies that comprise wokeism are anthropologically very reductive, since they essentialise one element of a personality to the detriment of the whole being: being white or black, having this or that sexuality, belonging to this or that religion... It is a form of negation of the reality of beings in all their complexity which, moreover, claims to make the subjective feelings of individuals or communities an absolute right, to which society and its actors must submit on pain of being accused of discrimination or even oppression. In the end, it is a purely ideological vision that instrumentalises one or another specificity as a lever for radical revolutionary action. This radicalism is also found in the negation of the reality of beings and the nature of things, a kind of desire to transform the subjective into the objective, the ideological diktat into the official truth. In fact, wokeism is an inhuman ideology that claims to reformat man and history according to its ideological axioms. This is the driving force behind all totalitarianism. And that's why it must be opposed with the utmost vigour.

We may well wonder why the European Union has blindly embraced wokeism in this way? Admittedly, we are used to European mimicry of the United States, as the "State of the Union Address", ridiculously imported from the USA, demonstrates, just like the EU's permeability to ideological fashions, including the most dangerous.

The project of European construction, conceived by Jean Monnet, presupposed the deconstruction of national sovereignties. The current Union, which claims to be less and less European in the very wording of the texts it produces, seems to have moved on to the next stage: the deconstruction of European societies themselves so as to be able to reign imperially over individuals torn from all physical ties with their homelands, their cultures, their families (a word that has been banished and replaced by the Eurocratic term "inter-generational solidarity") and even their gendered identity; a vast herd of consumers of "happy globalisation" and the dream prey of social control, right down to the subconscious, in the name

of combatting stereotypes and prejudice! Welcome to modern-day totalitarianism.

Reorienting the European Union politically and ideologically is no longer even just urgent, it is a vital necessity for Europe itself. The construction of Europe, despite the ulterior motives of its creator, was able, in its early days and to a certain extent, to contribute to restoring a certain economic vitality to a Europe ravaged by war. Even if it was the "trente glorieuses", the thirty-year post war economic boom that led to the growth of the original European communities rather than the other way round. After getting bogged down in regulatory inflation, the European Union has embarked on a mad ideological struggle against European civilisation and its greatness. In its wild intoxication, the European oligarchic system is bent on destroying what made Europe strong. The Western white man has become the "man to kill" and with him the civilisation he had built. With its light and shadows, like any civilisation.

Faced with the seemingly irresistible rise in power of the great Asian nations, China and India in particular, the return of the imperialist aims of the Muslim world, and American cynicism, a deconstructed Europe, weakened morally and demographically, is condemned to exit history. The European Union, converted to wokeism, is the most effective instrument of this fatal erasure. Let's not condemn ourselves to destroying the EU in order to save Europe, let's take back control of it and turn it into a tool that serves the nations that are its very flesh and blood.

Stéphane Buffetaut, 7 July 2023

PATRIOTS

FOR EUROPE FOUNDATION

Study published by Patriots for Europe Foundation
25 Boulevard Romain Rolland – 75014 – Paris – France
SIRET number: 823 400 239 00021
President of Patriots for Europe Foundation: Andràs Laszlo
Director: Raphaël Audouard
Published in 2023
contact@pfe-foundation.eu
www.pfe-foundation.eu

The Patriots for Europe Foundation is partly funded by the European Parliament and is solely
sole responsibility for this publication. This publication is not for sale.