

Trump defeating the woke ideology

Timo Vilo

Copyright © 2025 Timo Vilo
All rights reserved.

Contents

Preface	3
Introduction	6
Woke-phenomenon	20
Intersectionality	31
Cancellation	39
DEI trainings	49
Body Positive	52
Safe space	54
Virtue signalling	61
Black lives matter	65
Me Too	71
Colonialism	75
Leftism	79
Abandonment of Christianity	87
Restriction of freedom of speech	96
Anti-Semitism	100
The false doctrines of the educational system	106
The concept of justice	114
Resist bad development	124
Finally	127
Courses	101

Preface

This book discusses the phenomenon called woke. The phenomenon is discussed in a broader context than its original emergence. We also talk about woke culture, woke ideology, wokeism, wokeness, and woke people. Many people have associated various ideologies and doctrines with wokeism. For example, improving the status of ethnic groups, improving equality for sexual minorities, intersectional feminism, Black Lives Matter, Me Too, leftism, anti-Semitism, anti-Christianity, and cancel activism. Woke had a completely good and admirable beginning and reason for existing. However, it is often the case that when people handle a good idea, it eventually transforms into a bad one.

The green left especially loves the growing woke culture. According to some studies, the woke phenomenon is already going away, but it may only be going away as a word. The word may be obsolete. But its culture and model remain. So do its demands. Woke culture began with worries about ethnic and gender minorities and women. But woke culture has become an ideology that many people wonder about. Has the world lost its mind?

The starting point of woke culture was completely acceptable. For example, improving the status of Black people in society. Martin Luther King Jr.'s anti-racism sought a world where skin color would not affect

equality. Such actions were completely acceptable and reasonable. For example, a company can hire a skilled person, regardless of their skin color. Both benefits, both the company and the job seeker. It is not right to categorize people based on skin color, for example. You should look at the individual. There are good and bad individuals among people of all colors.

In woke culture, skin color, status, and sexuality are very important. They are really emphasized strongly. And people are also categorized and evaluated based on the same factors. And not just on these factors. But also on speeches, writings, friends, social media, and more.

The Nazis also developed similar classifications of people in Germany. They also wanted to classify people by skin color, sexual orientation, body type, race, disability, age, and hair color.

The idea was the same as it is today. Certain human characteristics were given pluses, others minuses. People's real-life situation, or what they are like as a person, was not considered. Everyone was a representative of their group, regardless of what they had done. Regardless of what kind of education they had, or what kind of thoughts or opinions they had.

Now, this same scoring idea is being offered to people in a new way. In Nazi Germany, many embraced a belief. They thought people could be classified with points. And if necessary, someone could put them in the position of slaves or even kill them.

If asked for their thoughts, people had not thought much. They thought that their opinion was the most reasonable. And when television and the press push woke culture, it seems to be okay. It's shocking that

so many could support such a sick ideology. Perpetrators pushed people into gas chambers. Some did not want to, or had no time to, think things through.

But this always happens to good ideas. In principle, a good idea can become bad, even deadly, in people's hands. An example would be communism. What harm could there be in improving the position of the poor? But it killed tens of millions for an idea and their possessions. Communism did not reduce poverty. It caused a huge rise in the number of poor people and turned the entire Soviet Union into prison camps. The tough times would be worth it. Once we faced the early challenges and defeated our foes, good times would come for all. Woke ideology says the same. We must use harsh measures and drop opponents (canceled). Then a good and equal society would come. In other words, the goal in both is a certain kind of utopia. No utopia has ever succeeded. The people who participated in it have always ruined it.

Speech by US President Donald Trump 20.01.2025

In his inaugural address, Trump optimistically said that "America's golden age begins right now. From this day forward, our country will flourish and be respected."

One of the loudest cheers from Trump supporters watching the speech at the Capitol One arena in Washington, DC, came when the president said: "From now on, it is the official policy of the United States government that there are only two genders: male and female."

This is a self-evident biological truth! But stating it out loud was a significant act. Is Trump the only Western president to have said it out loud? But it was also significant that the American people had voted such a president into power. It speaks volumes about the public's attitude towards the woke.

Trump went on to vow to thwart efforts to "socially control race and gender in every aspect of public and private life."

He promised to create a country that is "color-blind and merit based."

When he said this on Martin Luther King Jr. Day, it carried more weight. Racism cannot be eliminated with racism.

Later, President Trump backed down. On his inauguration day, he signed an executive order. It declared that the U.S. would recognize only two genders: male and female.

It also told the federal government to end "radical and wasteful" diversity, equity, and inclusion programs.

Officials said the gender rule was to "defend women from gender-based extremism and restore biological truth to the federal government."

According to NBC News, the order aims to require the federal government to use the English term "sex" instead of "gender."

The order directs the State and Homeland Security Departments to "ensure that official government documents, including passports and visas, accurately reflect gender," an official told NBC News.

In 2022, the Biden administration allowed U.S. citizens to choose a gender-neutral "X" on their passports.

The new order also blocks taxpayer funds from being used for genderreassignment healthcare, according to NBC News, and adds "privacy protections in intimate settings," such as prisons, immigrant shelters, and sex offender shelters.

An expert who spoke on condition of anonymity told NBC News that the order could mean that transgender people in various settings could be moved to facilities that match their birth sex, not their gender identity.

An example of this would be that transgender women in women's prisons could be moved to men's prisons on short notice.

According to an expert, transgender Americans, especially those with an X in their passports or documents, should be careful when leaving the country, as they may face challenges getting back into the country.

According to the expert, this would be because the border agency would not be able to recognize or enter the X in the system.

According to an anonymous official, the new administration intends to "dismantle the DEI bureaucracy."

According to NBC News, in recent years, Trump and conservatives have criticized DEI initiatives, characterizing them as discriminatory. DEI stands for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

Introduction

In today's woke culture, different groups divide people. Everyone is a representative of a certain group. Groups can be close to the center of power or far from the center of power. A person can also represent several groups. They can be black, poor, and uneducated at the same time, or white, well-off, and educated. Those far from power should have the right to speak. Those close to power should be silent and listen. Straight white men are allowed to express the fewest opinions. Speaking disparagingly about uncles or boomers suppresses their opinions. Woke culture teaches that white, straight men cause the world's ills. These include racial oppression, famine, and income inequality. This is especially true if they value traditional things, like family, Christianity, hard work, and the law. Such a person should be silent, and others speak of him as toxic masculinity. Whiteness is the greatest sin, regardless of whether one does something racist. Just being white is enough to be a bad person.

Christianity is especially reprehensible. The Bible is considered a completely patriarchal book. The entire church system is seen as a white organization. This is due to colonialism, racism, and the weakening of women's status. It also stems from accusing sexual minorities of being

sinners. Many of the world's problems are seen to be specifically related to Christianity and the message of the Bible. The best person is seen as a black homosexual or lesbian, who is at best poor and even better if unemployed. Although poverty could be due to his own fault. For some reason, people do not see Islam as evil. Yet, in the Islamic world, women's and sexual minorities' rights are weak. In many Muslim countries, women have almost no rights. Homosexuals may be thrown off the roof of a tall building. But Christianity, which is based on grace, is still considered bad.

A key tool of modern woke culture is cancellation. It was not part of the original woke phenomenon. Cancelling aims to shut down the visibility and functioning of a target in public. Cancelling has targeted ordinary citizens as well as famous people and companies. A target, whether a person, company, or organization, can be a victim of cancelling activism. This is especially true if someone accuses them of - racism, - sexism, - homophobia, - transphobia, - anti-Muslim sentiment, or - not supporting woke movements. Black Lives Matter or Me-Too campaigns must also be given sufficient support. The target of cancelling did not have to do anything wrong. It was enough to not have been active enough in supporting certain groups.

Intersectional valuation is also an effective tool in advancing woke culture. Intersectionalism studies how people's group identities differ. These include gender, social class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. The dominant identities are bad. They are, i.e., male, especially heterosexual, white, and so-called cisgender. A cisgender person mistakenly thinks they are their natural gender. Good identities are femininity, transgenderism and homosexuality. And this kind of thinking is not some threat to the future of conservative party think tank, but a real and official classification of people.

The Wheel of Power and Privilege, prepared and published originally by Sylvia Duckworth, has 12 characteristics that are used to assess a group of people's relationship with power. At the center of the Wheel of Power and Privilege are those in power, who must remain silent in front of those on the outside of the wheel. Privilege wheels are used, among other things, in the public sector civil servant training.

A few examples:

at the core of power	middle caste	little power
to be silent		right to speak
citizen	with a residence permit	undocumented
thin	average weight	obese
owner	tenant	homeless
white	visible ethnicity	black
straight man	gay man	lesbian

According to intersectional theory, a person is a racist simply because they are white. They don't have to do or say anything racist. But, because they are white, it makes them racist. This is true even if they don't see it. According to the theory, those in power are morally inferior to those with less power. Intersectional theory may come up, for example, in recruitment. Especially in the public sector, for example in broadcasting. If two men apply for the same job and are equally qualified, a black homosexual will beat a white heterosexual. But if there were a black lesbian among the applicants, she would win the pot.

Now, a completely unnatural culture is being pushed into the curricula of social science universities. After graduating, they become journalists or activists in political groups. They work for TV stations, major newspapers, or political organizations.

Social science universities are anxious and outraged if someone claims that a man cannot give birth, that there are only two genders, or that a man cannot menstruate. The person expressing such ideas causes such severe anxiety for other students that the student in question, by decision of the university administration, is excluded from the course lectures. This may sound unbelievable to a reasonable, normal person. However, this has happened. Teaching has not been able to continue due to other strong upheavals. And according to the principles of safe space, this strange student has had to be excluded from lectures. The concept of safe space is once again one of the new tools of woke culture. Of course, it does not consider the safety of ordinary traditional people. The most important thing seems to be the protection of various sexual minorities, but what about the safety of a convinced Christian.

In many countries, the state supports the medical expenses of gender changers. The person gets psychiatric support. If surgery is needed, taxpayers cover the costs. On the other hand, if a person would like to return to their original gender. Many countries ban psychological help and prayer services for integration due to pressure from gay organizations.

In woke culture, a social goal is pursued, which aims to get rid of the white heteronormative patriarchal world. In other words, Christianity based on the Bible. Gradually, this has become its own religious sect at universities. Christian beliefs are no longer enough. The most dangerous thing about this is that they become television, radio and press journalists.

And some schoolteachers to spread their own gospel to children. And this is how this new religious sect gains new followers and approvers.

The sect's core beliefs are those of intersectional feminism. They are the fight against patriarchy, whiteness, and Christian beliefs.

Some people think that the woke sect is comparable to Marxism. And no wonder. It is about a certain kind of leftist revolution. There is a lot in common. And the woke idea is of interest to the green left.

The woke phenomenon is sometimes called "cultural Marxism." It is closely linked to social justice and critical race theory. Today, this is the dominant ideology of the political left, although it has also crept into conservative circles. Unfortunately, also into churches. Bishops and priests want to gain popularity by organizing various rainbow events. This is a big problem in our time that Christians must face. Now it should not be enough to just silently marvel at the progress of funny events. If we compare it to Nazi Germany, then there too, at first the vast majority just watched the development of events from the sidelines. There were a few activists as well as opponents, but the vast majority were silent observers.

Woke culture is above all a way of thinking and an attitude. The term itself means that a person has woken up to see the true unjust nature of the world, while so many others are sleeping. Wokeists believe they see injustice in our social order. They want to highlight society's false power structures, which stem from racial traits and privilege.

Its proponents use it to describe someone who has awakened to various social injustices. These include studies of sexuality, gender, feminism, queer theory, LGBTQ issues, racism, postcolonialism, disability, and obesity. As well as many other left-wing causes. One of its main goals is to achieve a humanistic utopia by dismantling all differences in all areas of society and life. It is often associated with social injustice, and perhaps one of the most well-known recent awakening-related phenomena has been the Black Lives Matter movement.

New Religion

This is about the emergence of a new religion that will replace the old Bible-based Christianity on which our society was once built. As our society became secularized, a new religion was needed. These people do not understand the righteousness of Christianity. The Western world, shaped by the Bible and Christianity, is unique. It is the only region where human freedom is guaranteed by law. Now these woke people do not understand the value of our culture but want to tear down the old and build something utopian new. Utopias have always failed in world history. Woke culture is based on things like Darwinian naturalistic assumptions, expressive individualism, postmodern philosophy, and Marxist social theory. It is visible in today's green left political parties, universities and educational institutions, Hollywood, the entertainment and news media, and the socialist agendas of global elites.

That's why things like environmentalism, anti-capitalism, socialism, anti-patriarchy, feminism, anti-nationalism, and even anti-Semitism often come packaged together. We need to understand wokeism as a comprehensive and revolutionary competing worldview or religion, because that's what it really is. It's about neo-Marxism, Marxism 2.0. The theoretical ideas of Karl Marx, which in practice led to the deaths of

hundreds of millions worldwide, are now repackaged for a new generation of people who have no historical perspective on the matter.

Change the language, change the world

Woke thinkers believe knowledge is power construct. It operates through discourse. If we can change how we talk, we can change knowledge. We can then overthrow power structures. For this reason, woke culture is fixated on controlling discourse, specifically by problematizing language and imagery that it theoretically deems harmful, and silencing dissent through cancellation. This means that it seeks out and highlights the places where it's supposed distressing problems in society manifest, often quite subtly, to make oppression visible. Change the language and change the world. If you control what people can say, you also control what they can think. This was one of George Orwell's insights in his dystopian novel 1984, where the Ministry of Truth removed or changed the meaning of words from language to control people.

For woke thinkers, it is about power, and those who control power control the truth or narrative. For this reason, it is futile to try to argue with a postmodernist thinker who is committed to facts and evidence. Thus, people who have fully bought into this worldview end up in all sorts of follies. We should remember that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Most Holy is understanding." (Prov. 9:10) If we want true knowledge and wisdom, we must start with God. Christ is the one "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." (Col. 2:3) Thus, any pursuit of knowledge is ultimately foolishness apart from Christ.

However, if simply holding a position of power makes a person evil, then God must be the most evil and oppressive being in the universe, for He has all power and authority. Thus, it must be stated that power and authority are not inherently bad. The existence of authority does not automatically mean oppression or that the problem is "systemic." This is far too simplistic a view of complex realities.

Because of sin, we know that people can become corrupt and even build corrupt systems. But that does not mean that all people and systems are corrupt. However, wokeism sees oppression as caused by the existence of power dynamics, although not necessarily intentional individual actors. Thus, a society, social system, or institution can be considered oppressive without the need to prove individual acts or even a person holding oppressive views. Therefore, in critical race theory, racism can exist without individual racists.

Can Christians become woke?

It seems like everywhere you look these days; the media is talking about the woke phenomenon. Of course, awareness of the injustices in the world is highly valued, and knowing how to take responsibility and try to right wrongs is very important. But how can a Christian relate to this ever-growing ideology? Could Christians also become woke?

Bible-believing Christians have a huge truth in the Bible that allows them to choose from different ideas what is right according to the Bible and God.

The Bible says that God created man male and female. So, there are only two genders.

The Bible says that homosexuality is a sin, so it is not something to be proud of.

The Bible says that men and women should not even dress in the clothes of the other sex. So, any kind of transsexualism is a sin.

The Bible does not separate people by skin color. So, intersectionality falls apart.

Is woke culture a tool created by Satan to mislead the world? Christian cannot understand or sympathize with such people. One just cannot understand their thinking very well. They seem to be beyond rational explanation. Is this demonic?

The problem is not the ambiguity of the Bible. The problem is that Bible-believing Christians are either too cowardly or too confused to say clearly what the Bible really says.

In the Bible, in the 2nd Letter to the Thessalonians, it is said

"For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work; but when he who now restrains is taken out of the way, then the lawless one (Antichrist) will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of His mouth and destroy by the manifestation of His coming, whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders and with all unrighteous deception for those who are perishing, because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved.

And for this reason, God will send them strong delusion, so that they will believe a lie, so that they all may be condemned who have not believed the truth but have had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Why does God send great delusion? Apparently because even now, for example, some of the clergy can stand on two tracks, so to speak. They pretend to be on the side of the word of the Bible, but act against the word of the Bible. When the deception becomes blatant enough, people are forced to clearly choose their side. They can no longer hide their attitude to the truth of the Bible. They are forced to clearly state that they believe in things as they are said in the Bible, even if it seems ridiculous to all so-called reasonable people. Or they are forced to state

that they do not believe in the word of the Bible but believe that modern man has more knowledge of things than the writers of the Bible had. And even God. Now we are in this deception, but the deception will only get stronger. The woke has not yet reached its full power.

But is the wokeism at the current level from Satan or is this deception what Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, that is, sent by God. Now the truth of the Bible about the creation of the world has been rejected. The truth about the creation of man as male and female has been rejected. The truth about the existence of the Holy Land has been rejected. Most of the countries of the world want to divide the Holy Land in two and Jerusalem into two cities. The Bible says that God will send a great deception. That deception must be even greater. This current deception must be just some kind of path to apostasy in a broader sense. In this deception, only a little is given up, but one can still claim to be faithful to the word of the Bible. When humanity, and especially the church, abandons the truth given by God far enough, God will eventually allow humanity to have a world order according to its values, which humans have created themselves.

According to the Bible, in the anti-Christian era, people will go crazy with ideas that abandon Christian values. According to the Bible, there will be a leader whose speeches are admired and who they are ready to follow. Just as Hitler was admired in Nazi Germany. An unemployed and homeless artist became the leader of a great European nation, who made almost all his citizens cheer in ecstasy for his ideas, even though they were completely disgustingly cruel and unjust. Human evil alone is not enough to explain all the blind evil and complete cruelty that was experienced in Germany. There had to be much darker and darker hatred. Perhaps Hitler was some kind of sample, a warning example, of the evil that humanity wants to lead itself to.

One essential thing in God's plan is the people of Israel, who have been given the promise of their own land and an important mission until the end of this world. Another essential thing in God's plan is the church, which has also been given an important mission until the end of this

world. Where the Nazis' goal was to eliminate the Jews from the world, and thus nullify the fulfillment of God's plan, now the goal of the woke is to nullify the Christian faith. Both goals come from Satan.

God has given us the absolute truth that we need. So, while compassion for the injustices of this world is important, we must also compare every idea or philosophy to the Word of God to make sure it does not contradict the truth of the Bible.

Woke ideology should be completely abandoned in churches today. While we should rejoice in the ethnic diversity of the church, the doctrine must be completely biblical, gospel-centered, and guided by the Holy Spirit.

Churches should appoint individuals based on biblical qualifications and Christlike virtues of the heart, not on appearance or skin color. A local church that happens to be ethnically diverse is no more sanctified, holy, or loved by God than a church where people tend to look the same. The angels of heaven rejoice when one lost sinner repents, and they rejoice no more if that sinner is red, yellow, black, or white; they are all valuable in God's eyes.

What is the biblical view of race and gender? Christians and churches are persecuted because many of these woke ideologies are unscriptural. Nevertheless, many of these woke things are making their way into the pulpits and Sunday school classes of many churches. Services are organized around various themes.

Woke religion rejects the salvation of Christ and replaces it with a utopian vision that true salvation is found in environmental activism, racial activism, sexual activism, and anti-capitalism by vested interests. We can applaud young people who want to make the world a better place,

but they have placed their allegiance to a worldview that is contrary to biblical principles.

At its core, the woke religion is atheistic, denying God and Christ. Much of it is rooted in a Marxist worldview. Second, it also replaces the biblical concept of sin with salvation through environmental activism and racial struggle. Third, it is a utopian vision that assumes we can create "heaven on earth" without Christ.

If we want to address the real social problems in our society, we need to return to biblical principles.

Right now, there is a wave of compromise sweeping the Western world, in all these woke things. The younger generation is being taken away from the churches, thinking that Christianity is hostile and oppressive because Christianity believes in God's order and plan of creation.

This woke critique is causing pastors to compromise and the world around us to reject the Christian faith.

A person who understands and believes the beginning of Genesis is in truth. Such is the enduring meaning of Genesis. It contains the plans that every generation needs.

Woke theology is affecting the church in three primary ways: 1) Woke initiatives are emphasized over theological instruction; 2) supporting woke goals is increasingly seen to save the earth and humanity; and 3) Woke theology is a kind of compromise to teaching.

1. Woke theology has weakened the church. The enemy has used lofty-sounding words like justice and equity to get the church to stop its biblical mission. Instead of focusing on preaching the gospel of Christ, much of the church is now focused on preaching the social gospel.

The social gospel aims to correct perceived injustices in society. While there are unjust systems that need to be addressed, the focus of the church is on proclaiming the saving message of Christ. The church's goal is not to guarantee or impose equal rights, but rather to help people have a right relationship with God through Christ.

2. Woke theology has become a kind of new religion that seeks to displace the traditional church. The focus on Christ is replaced by a focus on issues such as climate change. Salvation through Christ has been replaced by salvation through the establishment of new laws.

The Bible is considered outdated. White people and evangelicals are equated with white supremacists and racist oppressors. Woke theology rejects the core doctrines of the historic Christian church and claims to have a plan for saving humanity and the planet through new forms of education, justice, employment, and housing.

3. Woke Theology is Compromising Christian Teaching. In the name of tolerance, enlightenment, and acceptance, a new moral standard, a new truth, and a new God have been introduced. In Woke Theology, there are many paths to God and heaven, truth is relative, white privilege and racism are systemic and the root of much evil today, science and the elite are the final authority, and biological sex does not define our gender.

In woke theology, we live for ourselves, establish our own path and truth, and reject the idea that there is one way (John 14:6) to God and heaven and that there is one name, Jesus, by which we can be saved (Acts 4:12).

If we are to change our world today, we must, like the apostle Paul, be willing to stand for the truth at the cross, even though it may seem strange to the world.

"For the preaching of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God" (1 Cor. 1:18).

Does a wokeism make its followers happy?

Why are so many woke people so bitter, angry, and resentful?

The way they act is often twisted and hypocritical, easily putting others down and crying victimhood whenever they can. They are often openly against God and are very bitter toward everyone around them, seeking emotional manipulation and taking advantage of others.

Woke-phenomenon

Woke-like thinking apparently originated in the French Revolution. At that time, the idea of complete equality was developed, in which equality would not only apply to the democratic right to vote, but all other things would be equalized. In Karl Marx's work "Capital", the idea was continued, and capitalism was seen as the oppression of the working population. Eventually, a social experiment was conducted in the Soviet Union to put this into real practice. However, when capitalism in the West produced wealth, from which the working population also benefited, the temptation for communist revolution weakened. Eventually, the Soviet social experiment also collapsed. Leftist ideology had to look for new oppressors. And they were found. People began to look for those responsible for oppression in opinions, writings, social media accounts, photographs, and wherever the imagination allowed. Woke means awareness or a person's social awareness and awakening. Woke cares about minorities, discrimination, and hate speech. The word originally comes from a form of English used by the African American population in the United States. The meaning and use of the word were initially fully justified. The position of blacks in America had been weak and unjust for hundreds of years.

The concept of woke came to the attention of the public in 2014 in connection with the Black Lives Matter movement. In the 2010s, woke began to be used among the conservative right in the United States as a derogatory expression, referring to all ideas related to liberalism or green leftism

Woke is originally the perfect participle of the verb wake 'to wake' used by the African American population in their slang, normally woken, which they also use in the meaning of the adjective awake.

The term woke appeared in the 1930s in African American English in the United States. In 1938, singer Leadbelly used the word in his song "Scottsboro Boys," which told of a case in which nine African American boys were accused of raping two white women.[1] Later, the word came to mean a conscious, awakened person among the black population.

The word woke first appeared in the press in 1962, when an article in The New York Times reported that white jazz enthusiasts were using black slang from Harlem. In 1971, a musical about black leader Marcus Garvey used the phrase "stay woke." [1]

The word woke became widely known in 2014 in connection with the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, especially through social media. The concept was associated with awareness of police violence experienced by black people in the United States. The word's popularity was influenced by X (Twitter), where the short word was easy to spread. The year 2016 was the peak year for the use of the word woke. It has appeared in documentaries and music videos about the BLM movement. The word woke was added to the Oxford English Dictionary and Merriam-Webster in 2017.

Social scientist Wilfred Reilly believes that power structures are important in woke thinking. The possession of social power is really a zero-sum game. The uneven distribution of power between different identity groups is the problem. The problem stems from discrimination that is perpetuated by various oppressive structures. The solution to

power inequality would be to equalize social power structures between different groups using quotas and other means of "positive discrimination". In other words, a new kind of discrimination is offered as a solution to reducing discrimination. The expanded use of the word aroused accusations of cultural appropriation. The word "woke" began to be used for purposes completely different from referring to the violence and discrimination experienced by the black population. According to Aja Romano of Vox magazine, "woke" became a one-word summary of left-wing political thought, in which social justice and critical race theory are central. [2] The term "woke" was claimed to describe the mindset of Generation Y, or millennials. Critics say that, as a buzzword used by many white people, "woke" turned into virtue signaling. Virtue signaling refers to behavior that bolsters one's reputation by loudly declaring one's support for good causes, without making any effort to promote them. The term "Pinkwash" was used, and there was also talk of "woke-washing," a way for companies to polish their image.

In the 2010s, the conservative right in the United States began to use the word "woke" in a derogatory sense. In conservative southern states, the term had become a full-blown slur, used for anyone concerned about injustice, climate change, inequality, the status of sexual minorities, or racism.

The issues were partly related to the political divide in the United States. Republican Donald Trump became president of the United States in 2017. Political polarization deepened, with Republican supporters moving to the right and Democratic supporters to the left. Most of the American population began to get tired of the constant left-wing wake-up call. The Democratic Party, especially its more left-wing part, again discussed new issues related to racism and social justice, such as possible compensation for the descendants of slaves. Concepts such as anti-racism and intersectionality entered the political debate from activist and academic circles.

The Black Lives Matter movement brought the word woke back into wide awareness in 2020, when global protests erupted after the death of George Floyd. The phenomenon was called the "woke shift" in which many previously sidelined topics became the subject of discussion in the 2020s. The subordinate position of blacks in American history also became more widely known to the white population.

The excesses of woke

The politicization of universities has been discussed for a long time in the United States, for example. There, universities have tended to cancel events, drop speakers and remove potentially offensive speeches and ideas under pressure.

Something similar has been seen in Finland, for example when Åbo Akademi University banned a men's equality seminar from its premises because some of the university's staff found the program and guests offensive.

In Germany, a biologist was not allowed to give a lecture at the university explaining that reproduction of human requires a man and a woman. The outraged woke students at the university did not allow the biologist to explain how reproduction occurs. They accused the biologist of being transphobic.

According to researcher Evan Smith, in Britain the word woke has been used to describe a wide range of ideas and movements that promote social justice, such as anti-racism, intersectional feminism, transgender rights or a critical examination of the history of the British Empire. Several Conservative Party representatives and tabloids criticized cultural institutions and scholars who had critically raised, for example, the views of former Prime Minister Winston Churchill on race. BBC programs were also criticized and politicians even talked about cutting off funding.

In many other countries, the deep ranks of the people do not see the goals of woke culture as their own. Most of the people are forgotten, and the issues of certain small minorities are strongly highlighted.

But is the situation in which police violence in Minneapolis causes a demonstration in Finland consistent? How can it be that events in the United States cause such widespread protests in a country that has nothing to do with America's problems? So, the socio-economic racial problems and structural problems in the authorities in the United States are a problem that should have nothing to do with Finland. I would understand if the Finnish police had been guilty of shooting without legal grounds. But this was about age-old US structures that no number of demonstrations will fix.

It is completely strange when we talk about, for example, the wave of reaction that followed the BLM movement, where people gather to demonstrate and kneel during the national anthem. And in countries and sporting events that have nothing to do with the things that happened. So, the purpose is to "end racism", which could just as well be "end evil". When we start asking how to end racism, we start getting vague answers about how the police in the United States treat some ethnicities worse. But then we start gathering in squares. In Sweden, including the police, participating in such protests, with the attitude that the problem is in all countries and privileged people.

Woke companies

Woke companies have been increasingly involved in politics. Here are just a few examples from the past year.

A senior HSBC banker was fired simply because he correctly pointed out that some of the climate change rhetoric was blatant and unfounded.

Recently, Tesla was removed from the S&P 500 ESG index, even though it is the largest electric car manufacturer and a few months ago it

had the fourth largest weight in the index. Could this change have more to do with Elon Musk's words and actions than anything about Tesla?

How should we react?

We live in a time when we can be singled out for what we say, or even for our lack of enthusiasm for a particular policy or legislation. That is why Rod Dreher warns us in his book "Live Not by Lies" about the coming "soft totalitarianism." The old, hard totalitarianism came from the state, like Germany and Russia, and was dedicated to the destruction of Christianity. This new totalitarianism usually comes from the left wing of society, but it too is dedicated to the destruction of Christianity.

Today's soft totalitarianism demands loyalty to progressive beliefs. The state enforces its laws less than the elite who shape public opinion and the private corporations that control our lives through technology.

Also, dissidents at the woke parties find their businesses, careers, and reputations destroyed. They are pushed out of the public media, labeled, canceled, and demonized as racists, sexists, and homophobes.

Problems

The concept of woke ideology often generates passionate debate, with proponents claiming that it promotes equality and justice, while critics highlight potential negative aspects or unintended consequences. There are some commonly raised criticisms of what is called "woke ideology", although the criticisms depend on individual interpretations and context:

Overemphasis on identity politics

Critics argue that an excessive focus on identity categories (race, gender, etc.) can lead to division rather than unity, foster tribalism, and reduce people to their identities rather than their individuality or shared humanity.

Woke culture

Woke culture is often associated with woke ideology, where individuals or organizations face public disgrace, boycotts, or career-damaging consequences for perceived wrongdoing. Critics say this can stifle free speech and lead to excessive punishment for minor or unintentional offenses.

Dogmatism and intolerance of dissent

Some argue that certain woke movements embrace a rigid orthodoxy, where any deviation or criticism is met with hostility. This can inhibit open discussion and create a climate of fear.

Abuse of power

In some cases, people accuse woke activism of being used for personal gain, such as virtue signaling or performative alliances, where individuals or companies adopt progressive positions without a genuine commitment to change.

Simplifying complex things

Woke ideology can oversimplify the nuances of social problems and reduce them to a binary of oppressors and oppressed, which can lead to superficial solutions rather than addressing the root causes.

Erosion of Meritocracy

Overemphasis on equality (equal outcomes) over equal opportunities, critics argue, can undermine performance and create environments where competence and skills are relegated to the background to achieve diversity quotas.

Potential Alienation

Woke ideology can alienate individuals who feel marginalized or condemned for not adhering to its principles, especially those with traditional or conservative values. This can deepen cultural differences.

Impact on mental health

A constant focus on social injustices, privileges, and oppression can lead to feelings of guilt, helplessness, or anxiety, which critics say is detrimental to mental well-being.

Legal and educational overreach

Some argue that incorporating wake principles into legislation or curricula can lead to overreach, such as coercive speech (e.g., the mandatory use of certain pronouns) or the presentation of one-sided views on history and social issues.

Polarization

The aggressive tone of some wake movements can polarize discussions and instill resistance, making it difficult to have productive dialogue and compromise.

Woke and issues related to sexuality

Criticisms related to wake culture on sexual issues often focus on the view that this way of thinking can exaggerate or simplify complex issues of identity, gender, and sexuality.

Identity-centric excesses

Critics believe that woke culture places too much emphasis on sexual and gender identities as human characteristics. This can lead to a situation where people are primarily seen as representatives of their group rather than as individuals. For example, if a person is not a minority, their opinions may be unjustifiably ignored.

Free discussion and cancel culture

Many feel that woke culture limits open discussion about issues related to sexuality and gender, fearing that the wrong opinion may lead to "cancellation", or social rejection. This can prevent, for example, expressions of constructive criticism or scientific discussion on these themes.

Downplaying biology

Some believe that woke culture may ignore the biological facts regarding gender and sexuality, emphasizing instead entirely social, opinionated, and cultural factors. For example, discussions about gender diversity can sometimes forget the importance of biological sex, which can be controversial, especially in medicine and sports.

De-normativity

Woke thinking challenges traditional norms of sexuality and gender, which some see as threatening to social stability. For example, critics may question how far norms should be broken and feel that it leads to a mess of identity politics.

Children and education

For some, the main concern is how sexual, and gender issues are addressed in the upbringing and education of children. Criticism is directed, for example, at the fact that concepts such as gender diversity are introduced to very young children, which some believe may be too complex or confusing for a child's stage of development.

Excessive victimization culture

Critics see the wake mindset as a tendency to create a "hierarchy of victimization," where certain sexual or gender minorities are always seen as victims and others are always privileged. This can lead to polarization and reduce empathy between different groups.

Limits to free speech

Many critics fear that wake culture stifles discussion about sexuality, fearing that disagreements will be interpreted as hostility. This can prevent society from addressing difficult issues openly and honestly.

Intersectionality

Another more recent doctrine is the so-called intersectionalism, which is also one of the methods of woke culture. The idea of intersectionalism was developed by Professor Kimberle Crenshaw in 1989. It examines the differences in people's group identities, such as gender, skin color, education, functional ability, age, sexual orientation, mental health, obesity, housing, income, language and citizenship. And specifically, through group identities, not through individual characteristics. According to the doctrine of intersectionalism, the identities that have traditionally been and are in power are bad. These include male gender, especially heterosexual men, whiteness and so-called cisgender, i.e. a person feels that they are in their natural gender. They are already privileged due to their group identity. Supported identities include femininity, transgenderism, blackness and homosexuality. They are in a weaker position due to their group identity. In intersectionalism, all the "oppressed" are on the same side. For example, oppressed workers, women, blacks and Palestinians are featured in the left-wing parties' platforms. And because the left believes that Palestinians are oppressed, it even supports completely reactionary extremist Islamic organizations, such as Hamas and Hezbollah, against a democratic Israel. For example,

the feminist movement may oppose the actions of an egalitarian Israel and support a very patriarchal Palestinian terrorist organization and states where women have no rights whatsoever. In their opinion, what is written in the Quran is not the reason for the weak position of women, but the text has been completely misinterpreted to minimize the position and rights of women.

The Wheel of Power and Privilege, published and originally written by Sylvia Duckworth, contains 12 characteristics according to which a group of people's relationship with power is assessed. At the center of the Wheel of Power and Privilege are those in power, who must remain silent in front of those on the marginalized side of the wheel.

Wheel of Power and Privilege Immigration status Color Brown or dark skin Undocumented Marginalized Icloser to light Skin or white **Mortingish** nordingual High school Learned English College of University English Wealth Middle Some class Able-bodied Rich disability Power Owns property Heterosexual Cisgender Sheltered or **Neurotypical** Sille Gay men Lesbian, Bi, Pan, Asexual renting Trans, intersex. Nonbinary Gender Significant neurodivergence Neurodiversity

According to intersectional theory, a person is a potential racist simply because they are white. They don't have to do or say anything racist, but being white makes them a racist. According to the theory, those in power are morally inferior to those with less power, because they don't have to be careful about what they say or do because of their position. Intersectional theory may come up in recruitment, for example. Especially in the public sector. The person with the most intersectional points is more likely to be selected. If two men apply for the same job and are equally qualified, a black homosexual will beat a white heterosexual. But if there were a black lesbian among the applicants, she would win. The previous left-wing government in Finland included intersectional feminism in its government program. Fortunately, they didn't take the program very far.

Intersectionality describes and analyzes how the combined effect of various factors affects the status of an individual and group identity. Intersectionality means intersecting or intersecting differences between individual identities.

Intersectional feminism, on the other hand, is one of the newest theories of feminism. It examines the status of women as members of the identity groups that are thus formed. The groups differ from each other in the number of privileges they have, which means that the task is to improve the status of the subordinated group. Intersectional feminism focuses its attention specifically on group identities rather than on the individual.

Intersectional feminism is based on postmodern philosophy's ideas about the social construction of knowledge and the importance of power relations in defining knowledge. Because knowledge is constructed in a network of power relations, the perceptions of those in positions of power are more prominent in social discourse, thus ensuring the privileges of these groups. According to the theory, male gender, heterosexuality, and whiteness are such identities that enjoy a position of power. [3]

Intersectional feminism in the 2000s overshadowed earlier forms of feminism, such as liberal feminism, radical feminism, and materialist feminism that sought to improve the material conditions of women. Material issues were replaced by the revelation of power positions and privileges embedded in social discourses. Intersectional thinking could also be used in one's own life, when one sought to recognize one's own privileges and one's own identity position in relation to other groups. In this way, it is believed that it also helps to understand the experiences of being discriminated against by other groups. [3]

Intersectional feminism arose in the United States, especially based on discrimination experienced by black women. The result of belonging to more than one subordinate group is multiple discrimination or intersecting inequality.

In feminist research, the concept of intersectionality is used when trying to understand how a person's social, cultural and political identities (including gender, social class, ethnicity, sexuality, disability, etc.) can combine to create overlapping and parallel forms of discrimination. For example, a black woman may experience discrimination that is not specifically due to her ethnicity, because discrimination does not affect black men in the same way, nor to her gender, because discrimination does not affect white women. This type of discrimination is an example often told by Kimberlé Crenshaw, the creator of the concept of intersectionality. For example, a white woman may aspire to the board of a listed company, where she is part of the oppressive white power structure that the black woman is struggling against. Intersectional feminism distinguished itself from traditional feminism, which centered on white women. According to the criticism it presented, women of different races had been ignored in traditional feminism. As a broader concept of equality, intersectional feminism saw itself as emphasizing the multidimensionality of people, including in the context of differential assessment. People's experiences should not be reduced to just one dimension, such as gender, but should be examined in terms of the

combined impact of different factors on people's lives. From this perspective, broader social structures should also be examined.

Toronto's Ryerson University hosted a "white privilege" conference. In a famous videotaped training session in 2016, a black speaker named Ashleigh Shackelford stood up to a white women's restroom and told them, "All of you white people are racist." Not only that, but she also said they had no real hope of changing: "No, you're always going to be a racist," she said. "Even if you try to be a better person, you're not going to change."

Because wokeness believes that group identity is primary, white people are automatically guilty because they belong to that group. It's the original sin of wokeness, just like the biblical story of Eve taking the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to eat. Or, in the case of good people with the right group identity, original sinlessness.

This is why, even within woke ideology, certain people from oppressed groups cannot be racists or sinners. However, many people don't realize how demeaning this philosophy really is to black people, for example, because it flattens all black people in a certain way and shares a narrow culture. But black people from America, Europe, the Caribbean, and Africa are very different and think and experience racial issues differently. Woke ideology basically says that all black people are the same. It is, in fact, very racist.

Ironically, wokeness itself is quite racist - it is just reverse racism. Wokeness attempts to eliminate racism from the world with racism.

Criticism

Intersectional feminism has been criticized for abandoning equality between individuals and replacing it with group interests. It has also been claimed that after women's equality with men has been practically

achieved in many countries, intersectionalists have resorted to vague claims whose truth value is difficult to ascertain.

The Finnish government also pushed through a law according to which gender can only be changed by notifying the authorities. A person can therefore be in the gender that feels most appropriate at any given time.

However, gender reassignments that require notification will create opportunities for abuse, for example in prisons, physical entrance exams, sports and military service. In prison, every prisoner can in practice secure their own cell with this gender reassignment that requires notification.

In physical entrance exams, for example in police and rescue schools, it is possible to pass the female quota by changing gender. The best female athlete of the year can now be a man. A boxer who competed in the women's category at the Olympics and won a gold medal turned out to be a man. Mandatory military service will be avoided in the future by gender reassignment, subject to notification.

One might ask whether gender reassignment is the only way for a white heterosexual man to gain a better position in the privilege wheel. He probably won't change his sexual orientation, and he can't change to black. But to woman he can.

Criticism of intersectional feminism often comes from both supporters of other feminist theories and those who are generally opposed to feminist ideologies. Here are some commonly raised criticisms, although it is important to note that these are points of contention, not necessarily inherent "bad qualities":

Complexity and overgeneralization

Some argue that intersectional feminism's focus on multiple axes of oppression can become too complex and difficult to implement in

activism or policymaking. The framework can sometimes be criticized for lacking clear solutions due to its complexity.

Perceived fragmentation of feminism

Traditional feminists argue that intersectionalism can divide feminism into smaller identity-based groups, potentially diluting common efforts toward common goals. For example, focusing on differences between women can weaken solidarity within the feminist movement.

Accusations of relativism

Intersectional feminism is sometimes accused of focusing too much on individual perspectives, which can lead to subjectivity or "oppression olympics" (arguing over who is more oppressed).

Potential for Woke Culture Abuse

Some opponents argue that intersectional feminism can contribute to an environment of woke culture, where individuals or groups are criticized or rejected for not fully aligning with intersectional principles.

Criticism of universalist feminism

Some universalist feminists argue that intersectionalism shifts the focus from common struggles (e.g., gender inequality) to differences, which ignores broad, universal feminist goals.

Criticism of academic jargon

Intersectional feminism has been criticized for being inaccessible due to its use of academic language and theories, which makes it difficult to engage with grassroots activists or the public.

Cancellation

Internet social media platforms have enabled rapid and extensive participation in various discussion forums. Also giving negative assessments of other people or organizations. One such is the so-called canceling.

Canceling is mostly a form of online activism, which is a kind of boycott of targets. It is public intervention in the condemnable actions and oppressive behavior of a person, group, company or institution. Actions perceived as problematic are condemned and they are wanted to be excluded from public discussion.

It calls for taking responsibility and reflecting on one's own opinions and behavior perceived as problematic.

Like many other things, cancel culture originates in the USA. There, radical students and teachers belonging to marginal groups have tried to prevent people who are critical of them as a group from expressing their own views at universities.

If everyone agreed, of course, there would be no need for cancellation. Such a situation is basically impossible in universities and the scientific world, because perhaps the most central element of the scientific world

is criticism, but also constructive disagreement and curiosity about everything new. One can ask whether scientific research is carried out at all in all faculties. Or is it just about expressing opinions?

Opponents of cancelled culture say that cancelled culture is about restricting freedom of speech, silencing and arbitrariness.

Many journalists have been fired after an article they wrote has attracted criticism. Often it has been an article that critics have considered racist. Statues of some historical figures have been toppled because their actions towards races or indigenous peoples have been seen as wrong.

The cancelling campaign can also involve threats of violence. J. K. Rowling has said that she has experienced harassment and received death threats when commenting on the differences between trans women and biological women.

Woke people define words that are not allowed to be used, words that are allowed to be used, and words that should be used. For example, the culture of the US military was reformed under Obama to conform to the ideals of the woke ideology. An army chaplain was then forbidden from mentioning Jesus in his speeches so that his speech would not offend anyone. A public campaign of disapproval is directed at a person or company that is considered guilty of wrong opinions or discriminatory attitudes, with the aim of causing damage, getting the company boycotted or the person fired from their job, for example. And this is what has happened. It is not enough that you have not committed any wrongdoing, you also must do the right things to be a good citizen. For example, participating in a pride parade or putting rainbow flags in your store window during Pride Month.

The Southern Poverty Law Center, known for its lawsuits against white supremacist groups, its classification of hate groups and other

extremist organizations, and its promotion of tolerance programs, has declared many Christian organizations to be hate organizations. For example, The Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF), which supported the opinions of Finnish MP Päivi Räsänen, who wrote to Finnish church representatives after they participated in the Pride parade that homosexuality is not pride but shame, the state prosecutor filed charges against her and the case is still pending in court. An American conservative legal support group for Christians seeking to protect the traditional religious rights and practices of Christians in public, taxfunded schools, has been declared a hate organization among woke people. This was of course reported in the Finnish media that the American hate organization is supporting Päivi Räsänen. However, the organization is, for example, classified as a human rights organization by the UN.

Since the woke phenomenon is a political leftist movement, it can also accuse anyone with even the slightest right-wing leanings of being a Nazi. Anyone who discusses immigration in a matter-of-fact way is called a racist. This is done to silence the person in question and make them look stupid and someone whose words are not worth taking seriously. This is done by drawing negative attention to the person for their words or gestures, which are defined as extremely inappropriate, even though they are not crimes. The actions can also be decades old.

Cancel demands have been directed at both famous and ordinary people and companies. The target is particularly often a victim of cancel activism if they are accused of racism, sexism, homophobia, anti-Muslim sentiment or insufficient support for the Pride, Black Lives Matter or Me-Too campaigns. In the case of behavior, a common accusation is sexual misconduct.

Internationally known people whose work events have been canceled due to cancel activism, or whose reputations have been tarnished, include Ryan Adams, Woody Allen, Roseanne Barr, Louis C.K., Gina Carano, Ann Coulter, Matt Damon, Plácido Domingo, Al Franken, Kevin Hart,

Al Jolson, Colin Kaepernick, R. Kelly, Amy Klobuchar, Marilyn Manson, John McEnroe, Martina Navratilova, Mario Lopez, Steven Pinker, Michael Richards, J. K. Rowling, Kate Smith, Kevin Spacey, Lawrence Summers and Donald Trump.

Among the companies that have been targeted by cancel culture are PepsiCo for exploiting the Black Lives Matter protests in its advertising, Equinox Group because its owner was revealed to be a supporter of President Donald Trump, Starbucks, which banned employees from wearing Black Lives Matter clothing, Nike, which used a historical American flag from the time when slavery was legal on its shoes, and Uncle Ben's, which used a stereotypical image of a black man in its product. When activists start criticizing a company, it risks reducing sales of the company's products. Companies sometimes give in to the activists' demands.

According to Forbes magazine's Evan Gerstmann, the targets and victims of cancel culture are mostly ordinary people. He cites an African American school security guard who was fired after he was heard telling a black student not to use the n-word about him, while also saying the word himself. An American teacher was fired after using the wrong pronoun for a transgender student. A California university professor was put on leave after using a Chinese word for "that," which some thought sounded like the n-word. In New York state, a university professor was boycotted by his activist students after attending a protest in support of the police. An employee of the aircraft manufacturer Boeing lost his job after being heard writing 30 years earlier that women should not be recruited as fighter pilots.

Finnish examples

In 2019, the Emma Awards jury decided after a vote to drop the band Maustetytöt from the awards, where they had been nominated in four different categories. An early version of the song "Tein kai lottorivini

väärin" had sung about some n-words. However, the final recorded version no longer mentions the n-word. According to Renaz Ebrahim, the journalist who presented the dropping, the song was "problematic" in addition to the n-word. According to Ebrahim, the band had not apologized in time either. [4] Gettomasa's song "Lössi", which received five nominations, used the word vagina as a swear word, which Ebrahimi considered misogynistic, but it was not too problematic because Gettomasa agreed to discuss the matter with her. In 2021, Ebrahimi discussed discrimination and cancel culture with Esko Valtaoja on Finnish radio's Sannikka program. According to Ebrahimi, it was very shocking that she had to be in an unsafe space where a white man had used the n-word next to a brown woman and thus belittled the oppressed.

In 2020, an anti-fascist network revealed that an employee of the Record Store Äx chain was part of a band playing far-right music. The company terminated the employee's employment contract, and the employee said that he felt that he was bought off. According to the employer, the employee would have been allowed to continue working for the company if he had resigned because of racism.

Left Alliance member and economist Markus Jäntti called on researchers to boycott requests for interviews from Helsingin Sanomat, and others announced that they would cancel their subscriptions because the newspaper's editorial stated that there is less science and more ideology in the social sciences and especially in the arts than in the natural sciences.

The most recent cases include the decision of Turku city daycare centers to remove the board game Afrikan Tähti (African Star) from their premises. The decision is based on the game's outdated image of Africa, which features scantily clad Africans dancing traditional dances. One reason has been the colonialism of the past. But that's world history. Should we hide all the events of the past from children? Couldn't we learn something from them?

A theater performance caused an uproar when a cisgender male actor played a trans woman at the National Theater. According to activists, this should not have been done. Old "Pekka ja Pätkä" films are being censored because they use the n-word. In the old children's game of fearing a black man, today you must change who you fear. Traffic signs that depicted a girl and a boy going to school have been changed to genderless characters. For some, it was too much to show that genders, or boys and girls, still exist. That is strange, because according to current knowledge there should be several genders. Why couldn't there be an example of two on a traffic sign? You can no longer talk about a supervisor, but you have to say a superior. Will you soon even be able to say father and mother, or should we call everyone only parents?

Aki Ruotsala, a believing Christian who was elected CEO of Pori Jazz, was fired because of old writings. In his writings, Aki Ruotsala had said, among other things, that homosexuality can transform into heterosexuality. That was enough for the Pori Jazz organization to fire its newly elected CEO.

Sparking a discussion

Professor Rothstein talks, for example, about the professorship at Linnaeus University he applied for in the spring of 2023. Obtaining the position would require a deep understanding of norm criticism, decolonialism, feminism, queer ideology and postgrowth theory.

In his application, he asked, among other things, what would happen if he concluded in his research that one of these theories cherished in the faculty did not actually correspond to scientific truth.

The ironic application attracted attention not only from the university but also from the media and created a discussion that Professor Rothstein must have been aiming for. Then he withdrew his application.

Rowling has been accused of being transphobic with such enthusiasm and force that it has been special to follow. In a behavioral science sense, the phenomenon offers a lot. Several young celebrities, such as the actors in the Harry Potter films and gay celebrities such as Olympic swimmer Tom Daley, as well as several writers, have joined the witch hunt. Rowling's cancellation is related to the heated human rights situation in the United States and Great Britain, which is completely different from what we have in Finland. Activists, and mainstream media journalists in Finland too, have stated that Rowling has not really been cancelled, citing, among other things, the fact that she is still working. However, she has received death threats and experienced threats to her family and children. Her career has also been harmed.

People of goodwill on both the left and the right are secretly asking themselves the same question: how to discuss race. Has it gotten so crazy? People of color are told to read books and listen to music, but wearing certain clothes is "racial possession." We hear that being white automatically gives you privilege and that being black makes you a victim. We want to speak out, but we are afraid that we will be seen as unawakened or, worse, labeled racists. The problem is that well-meaning but destructive anti-racism has become, not a progressive ideology, but a religion. One that is illogical, unattainable, and unintentionally neo-racist. This new religion teaches the original sin of "white privilege" and the weaponization of cancel culture to eliminate heretics. The new religion could be called "anti-racism," but it has a racial essentialism that is barely distinguishable from the racist arguments of the past. Fortunately for black people and for all of us, it is not too late to oppose resurgent racism.

Problems with Cancelling

Cancelling, as it relates to Wokeism, involves withdrawing support or publicly criticizing someone, often on social media, for their actions,

statements, or behaviors. While canceling can hold individuals accountable, there are several negative aspects or drawbacks to consider:

Lack of nuance

Cancelling often reduces complex situations to overly simplistic assessments that ignore context, intent, or the possibility of misunderstanding.

People may be judged based on incomplete or distorted information, leading to unfair outcomes.

Mob mentality

Cancelling often involves large groups acting together, which can increase hostility and create a climate of fear.

The effect can feel more like public shaming or attack than thoughtful criticism, discouraging open discussion, or dissenting opinions.

Disproportionate consequences

Punishment (e.g., loss of job, marginalization) is often disproportionate to the act.

People can face lifelong consequences for small or old mistakes. Canceling does not consider personal growth or change.

Lack of accountability of cancelers

People who participate in canceling are often anonymous or not accountable for their actions.

This can lead to harassment, bullying, or false accusations that have no impact on those instigating the cancellation.

End of open dialogue

The fear of cancellation may cause people to avoid expressing their opinions or having honest conversations.

The effect is to stifle free speech, creativity, and opportunities for education or understanding.

No room for improvement

Cancelling often assumes that people cannot change or learn from their mistakes.

This prevents individuals from having the opportunity to apologize, make amends, or grow, and perpetuates a culture of punishment rather than rehabilitation.

Impact on mental health

Cancellation can lead to severe mental distress, depression, or social isolation for the person targeted.

The psychological harm can be long-lasting and devastating, especially if the individual lacks a support system.

Inconsistent standards

The standards for cancellation are often subjective, inconsistent, or unevenly applied.

This creates confusion about what behaviors are unacceptable and leads to perceived or real double standards.

Focus on individuals, not systems

Cancellation often targets individuals rather than addressing broader systemic issues that enable problematic behavior.

Limits meaningful progress or reform by diverting attention away from the root causes of problems.

Polarization

Cancellation can deepen divisions by fostering an "us versus them" mentality.

Can harden opposing viewpoints and make it difficult to collaborate or understand each other.

While withdrawal can sometimes bring about necessary accountability, these negative features suggest that a more balanced, considered approach is needed that prioritizes dialogue, education, and justice.

DEI trainings

Diversity, equity, inclusion (DEI) refers to the fair (often fairer) treatment and full participation of groups of people who, for some historical reason, have been underrepresented or discriminated against because of their identity or disability. Diversity, social justice and inclusion are three closely related values that many organizations have stated that they adhere to in order to support, in particular, groups of people who differ from each other on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, ability, gender or sexual orientation.

DEI policies can be understood in several ways.

In 2024, DEI policies have been criticized for politicizing organizations, and its alleged economic benefits have been questioned.

According to an article published in The Wall Street Journal in 2024, many companies have begun to withdraw from the DEI movement, which promotes diversity and inclusion, which was still spreading in the Western corporate world at the beginning of the 2020s.

Behind the good-sounding ideals of the DEI personnel policy, an identity political program has been identified, proclaiming intersectional feminism and anti-racism. The ideology was spread to the corporate world not only in the name of social responsibility but also in the name of productivity. The program has also been criticized for, for example, trying to eliminate racism with a new racism.

In Finland, the activities of Finnish tv company YLE have been criticized when it has become known that instructions have been given to journalists, according to which more people from certain groups of people must be selected for interview. For example, homosexuals, ethnically diverse people, and so on. There have been doubts about YLE's ability to provide neutral information activities when the editorial activities have become politicized. It should also be noted that YLE operates with tax funds and is not required to report fully on the use of the tax funds it uses.

After Donald Trump was re-elected as president in 2024, many large US companies, such as Meta, Amazon, Walmart and McDonalds, abandoned their DEI policy. On January 20, 2025, Trump signed a presidential decree "Ending the Favor of Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs". The regulation states, among other things, that the Federal Government shall designate:

"The Office of Management and Budget, OPM, Director, assisted by the Attorney General and the Director of the Office of Human Resources, to coordinate the elimination of all discriminatory programs, including unlawful DEI and Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility programs" (DEIA) in Federal Government mandates, policies, programs, regulations, and actions, by whatever name they may appear. To implement this directive, the Director of OPM shall review and revise, as necessary, all existing Federal labor practices, union contracts, and training practices or programs, with the assistance of counsel, to comply

with this regulation. Federal employment practices, including performance evaluations of Federal employees, shall be based on individual initiative, skills, performance, and hard work and shall not, in any event, take into account the implementation, goals, practices, mandates, or requirements of DEI or DEIA." [5]

Body Positive

Body positivity is a social movement that aims to gain equal respect and rights for all types of bodies.

As part of the first wave of feminism from the 1850s to the 1890s, the Victorian dress movement aimed to end the trend in which women were forced to shape their bodies by wearing tight corsets to fit society's standard of small waistlines. A minority of women participated in this adaptation but were often ridiculed regardless of whether they succeeded in shrinking their waists. Wearing tight corsets has been shown to have many negative health risks, including damage to internal organs, such as chest deformity and abdominal atrophy. Depending on the type of corset, the damage could be irreversible and extremely uncomfortable for the women who participated. Women were ridiculed for their selfishness if they failed to reduce their waistlines and criticized for having too small a waist if they succeeded.

Newer body positivity aims to improve the human rights of marginalized and discriminated bodies, such as fat, disabled and trans people. Body positivity is about the right of a person to have their body respected even if it does not meet beauty ideals. It is not a concept about weight control, well-being or physical health. It does not take a position on what lifestyles

are healthy or unhealthy. It is also not related to self-love or a positive attitude.

The roots of fat positivity can be found in the 1960s, when obesity activists in the US fat acceptance movement began to emphasize that an individual's size and their health were different things. Obese people felt that they were unequal in employment and healthcare services. They also drew attention to the fact that the commonly used BMI was based on measurements of white men and was not applicable to people of other races. Some body positivity activists believe that white bodies are valued more than black bodies.

Modern body positivity and the name used for it (body positivity) began in the 1990s, when the organization The Body Positive was founded in the United States. Body positivity became known to the public in the 2010s. Its hashtag # Body positivity is popular on social media. The concept has also been partially commercialized on social media. [6]

Criticism

In the late 2010s, ideology began to receive criticism for its permissive attitude towards obesity. Critics believe that obesity is a health risk that people do not dare to talk about, because even experts are afraid of violating a person's right to be exactly who they want.

Safe space

The Safe Space Principles are a practical tool for creating a respectful and non-discriminatory environment. Everyone has the right to a safe workplace where they can be themselves and feel respected for who they are. The Safe Space Principles should be considered regularly in every workplace. When everyone commits to them, a more open and respectful environment is created.

A Safe Space is an imaginary place that is intended to provide a sense of physical and mental safety for those present and participating. This is achieved by requiring those who come to observe the Safe Space Principles and by addressing violations of these principles.

Safe Space Principles may include, for example, openness, openmindedness, encouragement, giving space, inclusion, respect, integrity and the right to self-determination of one's own identity. A safer space is meant to be free from biases and assumptions, conflict, discrimination, harassment, criticism, or potentially threatening actions, ideas, or conversations.

Safe Space Guidelines

Respect the personal physical and mental space of others. You cannot know someone's boundaries without asking about them. So, ask before you touch them, for example. Listen and change your behavior if someone tells you that your behavior makes them uncomfortable.

Respect everyone, don't make assumptions. Don't make assumptions about anyone's sexuality, gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, values, socioeconomic background, ability, or health. Respect pronouns and names. Be aware of your own privileges.

No body discrimination. Don't comment on someone else's body. Also, leave out comments about others' portions and eating. Respect the opinions, beliefs, experiences and differing points of view of others. Do not mock, ridicule, belittle, marginalize or embarrass anyone with your words, behavior or actions.

Be responsible for your own actions and behavior. Be aware that your actions have an impact on other people, despite your good intentions. Give space. Try to ensure that everyone can participate in the discussion. Do not bully others' opinions and speak up. Also respect the privacy of others and handle sensitive topics respectfully. Intervene in the event of harassment, even if you witness it, and ask the person being harassed if they want help or support. Do not just stand by a bystander.

Respect

Respect the integrity of others, which applies to both physical and verbal interaction. Give others space. Do not bully others' opinions and speeches. Respect the privacy of others.

Don't mock

Don't use derogatory or derogatory language, push aside or embarrass anyone through your words, behavior or actions. Also, don't criticize their appearance or gossip.

Don't assume

Don't make assumptions about anyone's sexuality, gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, values, health, ability to function or anything else. Also, don't question ways of acting that deviate from the norm.

Communication

Accept others' opinions, perspectives and new topics without prejudice. Speak clearly, even to people outside your own reference group. Ask for and give help with a low threshold.

Intervene in discrimination

Anyone who notices inappropriate or discriminatory behavior has a duty to intervene and report it to a predetermined contact person. Discrimination is always intervened in.

Apologize

Apologize if you offend someone intentionally or unintentionally. Don't question the other person's experiences, even if you disagree. Instead, think about why the other person might have felt offended. [7]

Safe space abuse

The concept of safe space should not be understood as a way to silence a group of people.

Sydney nightclub Club 77 has introduced new safety rules aimed at preventing harassment. The rules say that reaching out to other people is welcome, but "all contact must be based on verbal consent."

This also applies to staring at someone from a distance, the rules say.

If the attention you give someone is unwanted, it is harassment.

The complainant is always believed

The nightclub has a dedicated harassment contact person every night, identified by their pink security vest. If someone feels they are being harassed or the subject of unwanted attention, they can report it to the pink vest harassment contact person, who will then remove the customer who has been staring without permission from the nightclub.

Club 77 says that their policy regarding harassment reports is that they always believe the person who reported the incident. So, there's no point in trying to claim that you didn't stare. The person suspected of harassment will be removed from the nightclub and the police will be called.

Question raised:

The guidelines said that staring from a distance is also prohibited. And that you should always ask permission first. So should you go and ask permission to stare first and then return to your seat to stare.

Similar rules elsewhere

Nightclub owner Dane Gorrel tells an ABC News interviewer that his nightclub strives to be a safe space for its customers. According to him, similar safety rules have been implemented in other similar nightclubs around the world.

On its website, Club 77 welcomes all genders, and especially members of the LGBTQI community, to have fun and express themselves.

"We have zero tolerance for racism, homophobia, transphobia, sexism, ageism, and all forms of discrimination. Our staff is trained to create a welcoming environment for LGBTQ, non-binary, and non-white people." Of course.

Criticism

In this phenomenon, too, in practice, sexually deviant or trans people are assumed to be discriminated against in principle. But does the principle of a safe space guarantee, for example, the status of a Christian believer? Is he allowed to be himself with his own opinions. If a homosexual comes forward and speaks openly about his own understanding of homosexuality, can a Christian also speak openly about his own understanding. Or must he remain silent? And just nod in agreement. The answer is that he is expected to remain silent. The reason is that in Western countries, Christianity is considered the dominant culture. So they have more opportunities to promote their own opinions according to intersectionality. But the problem here is that a Christian who, for example, believes in the word of the Bible, belongs to a small minority. Not to any majority population.

Additionally, the safe space guidelines state that "do not make assumptions about anyone's sexuality, gender, nationality, ethnicity, religion, values, health, ability, or anything else." What about when there is a person present whose gender, for example, you are unsure of. Or you

are not sure what their own gender is. It is difficult to relate naturally to another person if you do not know how to talk to them.

A safe space often refers to a place or environment where people can feel safe without fear of discrimination, harassment, or violence. While safe spaces are inherently positive and important to many, they can also come with critical perspectives or challenges. Here are some examples of potential downsides:

Excessive censorship and limiting discussion

In some cases, the rules for maintaining a safe space can lead to excessive censorship, which limits open discussions and the expression of opinions.

This can make it difficult to address complex or controversial topics and contribute to the phenomenon of avoiding uncomfortable but necessary conversations.

Hierarchy of experiences

Safe spaces may give more space to the experiences of some groups than others, which can lead to a sense of inequality within the group.

This can create insecurity and a feeling that not everyone's opinions or experiences are valued equally.

Reduced resilience in the outside world

If people in safe spaces consistently avoid challenging situations, this can reduce their ability to face and deal with conflict or disagreements in real life.

This can create an unrealistic perception of how the world works, as not all environments are safe.

Closed community and the experience of being outside

Safe spaces can inadvertently create an "us versus them" dynamic where outsiders feel unwelcome.

This can lead to the isolation of communities and reduced interaction between different groups.

Difficulties in defining safety

What is considered safe can vary significantly between individuals. This can lead to conflicts about what is acceptable and what is not.

A lack of shared understanding of the boundaries of safety can lead to conflict.

Abuse or excessive control

In some cases, safe space rules can be used as a tool for exercising power, for example by silencing criticism or excessively controlling the group dynamics.

This can lead to abuse and prevent constructive feedback or different perspectives from being presented.

Virtue signalling

Virtue signaling is the expression of social or political opinions with the intention that the listeners will consider the speaker to be a good person or a company to be a good company. Sometimes the term moral posturing is used in the same sense.

The term is used in a derogatory and derogatory sense. It implies that the speaker has some other motives, is hypocritical, and does not truly believe in the cause that he publicly claims to support. People and companies that virtue signal have been accused of following popular fashion trends and only offering empty expressions of support. The accused of virtue signaling is not necessarily considered to do anything for the cause he supports but rather assumes that it is enough to simply position himself on the side of a cause that is considered virtuous. But whose fault is it that, for example, companies must present something that is not their core values? The reason can be attributed to active cancelers, whose goal is to exclude everyone who does not shout enough with them.

Since the mid-2010s, numerous public figures, politicians and companies have been accused of virtue signaling in various contexts, such

as in the Black Lives Matter movement. The term is often used as a derogatory term by right-wingers who oppose excessive political correctness and liberal moral sermons on issues such as racism and climate change.

The term was apparently coined by British journalist James Bartholomew, who used it in an article for The Spectator in 2015. However, there are older examples of the term in academic literature.

Everyone's favorite and the most acceptable black man in the world, Barack Obama, said that woke culture is simply virtue signaling, which is used to bolster one's own status and virtues by loudly declaring that one supports things that are publicly considered good, without making any effort to promote them.

Virtue signaling is sometimes also seen as mandatory. For example, politicians are required to attend Pride marches to demonstrate their social awareness.

Athletes are required to kneel for BLM before sporting events.

Businesses are required to display rainbow flags in their shop windows to avoid accusations of lack of understanding.

British police have been accused of recently becoming more known for their enthusiasm for marching in Pride parades and kneeling in front of BLM protesters than for fighting crime. [8]

Problems

Virtue signaling can have negative aspects depending on its context and purpose. Here are some common criticisms of virtue signaling:

Lack of genuine commitment

Virtue signaling often involves publicly displaying values without taking meaningful action to back them up.

For example, a company may promote environmental awareness through advertising but continue to engage in practices that are harmful to the environment.

Superficial commitment

Activities may focus more on appearance than substance, diverting attention from real issues.

Posting a hashtag on social media without any real solutions can dilute the movement's goals.

Separation

Can promote division by creating an "us vs. them" mentality where people are judged for not publicly expressing their values.

For example, accusing others of indifference to an issue simply because they do not make public statements.

Performative nature

When people or organizations engage in virtue signaling purely for social or financial gain, it undermines the sincerity of the cause.

For example, a celebrity who supports a charity but only for publicity purposes rather than truly believing in the cause.

Displacing real activism

Virtue signaling can distract from concrete actions that can make a difference.

Example: Spending time and resources on public statements instead of directly participating in solving a problem.

Capitalizing on causes

Can exploit serious problems for personal or corporate gain.

Example: A brand might use imagery or slogans from a social movement in marketing campaigns without furthering the cause.

While virtue signaling is not inherently bad, negative aspects often arise when it prioritizes self-promotion over meaningful engagement. When done sincerely and combined with action, expressing values can help raise awareness about important issues.

Black lives matter

The movement began in 2013 when the hashtag BlackLivesMatter began to be used on social media platforms such as Twitter and Tumblr after George Zimmerman was acquitted of all charges in the fatal shooting of unarmed Trayvon Martin. The movement gained national and international attention in 2014, when protests broke out in New York City and Ferguson, Missouri, following the deaths of black men Eric Garner and Michael Brown. Since the Ferguson protests, supporters of the movement have demonstrated against numerous deaths of African Americans by police or in police custody. The Black Lives Matter movement is a decentralized network of activists with no formal hierarchy.

The movement's resurgence into the headlines and international attention came after the death of George Floyd because of the actions of New York City police officer Derek Chauvin and the subsequent global protests. An estimated 20 million people participated in Black Lives Matter protests in the United States in 2020, making it one of the largest movements in the country's history. Lacking a clear leadership, the movement encompasses a wide range of views and demands, but the most prominent are related to reforming the criminal justice system.

The popularity of the Black Lives Matter movement has fluctuated rapidly over time. While public opinion of the movement was negative in 2018, it grew increasingly popular in 2019 and 2020. According to a Pew Research Center survey released in June 2020, 67 percent of American adults expressed some support for the Black Lives Matter movement. However, a subsequent survey in September 2020 showed that support among American adults had fallen to 55 percent. The decline was significant among white and Hispanic Americans, while support remained broadly stable among black adults.

Black Lives Matter protests have taken place around the world. Especially in large cities in North America and Europe.

Donations

As of spring 2020, the movement had raised a total of \$10.6 billion in donations. Donations have come from many large companies, such as Amazon and Microsoft, public figures and politicians around the world, including in Finland. Donations have been used, among other things, to secure bail for rioters who committed violence. US Vice President Kamala Harris has urged her supporters to pay bail for those arrested. Donations eventually came in large numbers. They also freed one person suspected of murder and another suspected of rape and robbery. The worst part is that neither of these cases was related to the events that began with Floyd's death.

Many moderate whites who supported the Democrats and the civil rights movement switched to the Republicans when the race riots turned violent and often anti-white. Protests racist police violence turned into riots, arson, and looting of stores.

Review

According to the Finnish newspaper Suomen Uutiset, statistics on police violence do not support the claims of the Black Lives Matter movement. Researchers who have studied police violence in the United States have said that the phenomenon of police violence in the country is not specifically explained by racism. For example, researchers who studied deaths in arrest situations found that there was no statistical connection between the skin color of either the police officer who used deadly force or the victim. The most common population group killed by police in the United States is white men. Structural racism is not generally seen very clearly in all homicides, since typically in homicides the perpetrator and the victim are of the same skin color. In cases where this is not the case, black people are somewhat overrepresented, although as perpetrators of homicides, not as victims. The same statistical overrepresentation is also observed in the FBI's hate crime statistics.

Property has been vandalized at many Black Lives Matter events. In Minnesota alone, the damage has already exceeded \$200 million.

The campaign has faced accusations of being confrontational following the killing of white police officers in Dallas. Former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani criticized Black Lives Matter as "racist" because the movement does not organize protests when a black person is killed by another black person.

Opponents of the movement have criticized the movement for being Marxist, after founding member Cullors described his ideology as Marxist in a 2015 interview. Black Lives Matter, which is against racism, has since grown into a broad movement supported by a wide variety of people, few of whom identify as Marxists. [9]

All Lives Matter

The Black Lives Matter movement has also been criticized for its slogan, All Lives Matter.

One of the arguments of the All Lives Matter movement is that Black Lives Matter only highlights black people and forgets others, even though "all lives matter."

While many support the movement's goals, it has been criticized for a variety of reasons. These criticisms generally fall into the following categories:

Lack of organizational transparency

Critics claim that BLM lacks a clear organizational structure, which can make accountability difficult.

There have been concerns about how the funds raised by the movement are allocated or managed.

Leadership controversy

Certain BLM leaders have been accused of misusing donations or engaging in behavior that undermines the movement's goals. These allegations have raised skepticism about the organization's intentions.

Perceived extremism

Some critics believe that certain protests held under the BLM banner have been associated with violent or destructive behavior, although this is often debated and varies by event and location.

The movement has occasionally been accused of promoting divisiveness or anti-police rhetoric.

Broad and Decentralized Agenda

The movement's broad focus on social justice, police reform, and systemic inequality can be seen by some as unfocused, making it difficult to achieve measurable results.

Critics argue that the lack of a coherent, unified strategy undermines its effectiveness.

Political polarization

BLM has been drawn into broader political debates, and opponents have accused the movement of being too partisan or aligned with specific political ideologies.

This politicization can alienate potential allies who may agree with its core message but disagree with its perceived political connections.

Impact on law enforcement

Some opponents argue that BLM's emphasis on police reform has led to a decline in law enforcement morale or a reluctance to engage in proactive policing.

The term "refund the police", often associated with BLM, has been polarizing and misunderstood, leading to backlash even among some supporters of other parts of the movement. In the United States, "defund the Police" is a slogan that advocates transferring funds from police departments to non-police public safety and community support

projects, such as social services, youth programs, housing, education, healthcare, and other communities.

Link to property damage

While most BLM protests are peaceful, some have suffered property damage or clashes with law enforcement, which critics say undermines the movement's credibility.

Me-Too

The M-Too movement, which began as a powerful campaign to expose and combat sexual harassment and violence, has had a significant social impact. However, like any social movement, it has faced criticism for perceived negative aspects or unintended consequences. And not all criticism is unfounded. Any good cause will eventually have untoward incidents. Below are some of the concerns commonly raised about the movement:

Lack of due process

Critics argue that some allegations made under the Me-Too banner have led to public condemnation and serious consequences for individuals before proper investigations have been conducted. This has raised concerns about the erosion of the principle of "innocent until proven guilty."

Experimenting on social media

Social media has played a key role in amplifying Me-Too narratives. While this has empowered victims, critics argue that it has also facilitated

a mob mentality in which accusations can spread quickly without context, evidence, or accountability.[10]

Risk of false allegations

While false allegations are statistically rare, the movement has drawn attention to the potential harm they can cause to reputations, careers, and lives. Critics fear that Me-Too may inadvertently create an environment where false allegations are more difficult to challenge.

Generalization

Some critics argue that the movement sometimes paints all power in the workplace or in relationships as inherently abusive, perhaps without considering the context or the agency of the individuals involved.

Backlash against women

Ironically, the Me-Too movement has led to unintended consequences for women in some workplaces. For example, some male leaders reportedly avoided mentoring or working closely with female colleagues for fear of being prosecuted. Such actions can harm women's career prospects.

Polarization

Me-Too has been polarizing, and some people have felt alienated by the movement's narrative or its approach to justice. Such polarization can make it difficult to build consensus on how to address sexual misconduct.

Impact on nuance and context

Critics argue that the movement sometimes fails to distinguish between different degrees of misconduct and treats all offenses, from inappropriate comments to violent assault, as equally serious. This "one-size-fits-all" approach can dilute the focus on more serious cases.

Culture of Fear

Some workplace cultures have reportedly become overly cautious or fearful in response to #MeToo, which critics say can create an unhealthy environment where people are afraid to interact naturally or communicate openly.

Marginalization of Certain Voices

While #MeToo has brought many cases to the forefront, some argue that it has primarily highlighted the experiences of privileged or highprofile individuals and ignored stories from marginalized communities or less visible industries.

Overshadowing of broader gender issues

Critics suggest that the focus on sexual harassment and violence has sometimes overshadowed other important gender issues, such as the pay gap, parental leave policies, or systemic inequality in the workplace.

Important Note

While these criticisms are often cited, it is important to acknowledge the broader achievements of the Me-Too movement in raising awareness, empowering victims to speak out, and fostering conversations about

consent, power dynamics, and workplace ethics. Balancing the movement's goals with principles such as due process and fairness is an ongoing challenge.

Colonialism

Colonialism (from the Latin word colonia 'colony', 'settlement') refers to the processes by which a state or group of people conquers another country and its people outside its own territorial boundaries and exploits it, develops it and interferes with its local political structures and culture.

The establishment of colonial administration was one of the most important means of acquiring natural resources and human labor for the needs of the accelerated intercontinental trade. The effects of colonialism on the periphery of empires varied greatly in different places and at different times. In America, the conquests resulted in the connection of the continent to the international economic system.

As a result of colonialism, a modern currency was introduced in Africa for the first time. The French Empire was particularly monetarily unified, which still had an impact after the African countries gained independence. The British colonies, on the other hand, were generally monetarily independent.

When the development of exports became the most important goal of the colonies' economies, they developed their infrastructure such as railways, canals, ports and irrigation systems.

During the colonial period, much of the world became Westernized. Christian missionary work, especially Catholicism spread by the Spanish, played an important role in this process, through which the natives were converted and "civilized". Missionaries, regardless of nationality and religion, generally supported colonialism and the cultural arrogance associated with it. Missionary work involved education and social work for the natives, and as a by-product of this, Western cultural values spread to the colonies.

In addition to developing infrastructure, many colonial administrations, especially in the 20th century, developed education and health care for the inhabitants of the colonies and created, for example, an insurance system, a pension system, and family and maternity benefits. Europeans also introduced the European concept of the state to the world. Europeans also drew state borders in Africa, albeit arbitrarily, which has caused problems later.

Anti-colonialist perspective

The economic effects of colonialism were very diverse, and the topic is still hotly debated. According to one perspective, pre-colonial societies were developing independently before colonialism and would have continued to develop if colonialism had not destroyed the conditions for development. Colonies were turned into producers of underpriced raw materials for the European market, or producers of cheap labor. Income and tax revenues did not go to the development of the colonies, but to the colonial masters, and the development of education and infrastructure in the colonies only occurred under political pressure in the final stages of the colonial period. This resulted in the underdevelopment, dependence and poverty of the countries that gained independence from colonial rule, which has led to them falling under the influence of multinational corporations and financial institutions.

A perspective supporting colonialism

According to the opposing perspective, colonialism was progressive, as it spread European technology, culture and institutions, with the help of which Europe itself once developed and industrialized. As a result, almost all colonies developed faster than they would have developed independently. The alternative to colonial rule would not have been independent development but anarchy or decline. Through colonialism, colonies gained a larger market for their products than without it. Colonial governments have also been argued to have been more efficient and honest than their predecessors, and the problems of independent colonies have been attributed to postcolonial rulers and elites.

According to the argument of Bruce Gilley, a professor of political science at the University of Portland, colonialism provided prosperity and better governance, and was beneficial to most regions and largely accepted by the indigenous population.[11] Millions of local residents moved from more intensive colonial rule to the colonized areas, sent their children to colonial schools and hospitals, and reported crimes to the colonial police. The colonialists' collaborators far outnumbered their opponents, at least until the end of time. Therefore, colonization succeeded with a small number. The Sultan of Brunei appointed an English traveller as ruler of his chaotic province in 1841. Order and prosperity led the sultan to leave the province under the control of the traveller's family for over a century. Gilley also mentions speeches by Congolese independence leader Patrice Lumumba and Nigerian writer Chinua Achebe on colonial administration - according to Achebe, the British colonies were run expertly, although he did not want to defend colonialism. On the other hand, the idea and struggle against colonialism have, according to Gilley, caused misery and still hinder development. Singapore, Belize and Botswana have built their countries based on

colonial rule and have succeeded. Therefore, Gilley believes that fragile countries should learn from colonial rules.

In a sense, the USA can also be counted among successful colonialists. The most powerful state now. What would it be if development had been left solely to the Indians?

On the other hand, what would have been the religious development and situation in the colonized areas today? Would people still believe the religious teachings of the priests in Africa? Africa is today the most Christian continent. Christianity is spreading in Africa entirely of their own free will.

Leftism

Leftism and woke culture go hand in hand.

Some have said that Christianity and socialism are close to each other because the early church members sold their houses and belongings, and the money was used according to the needs of each member. However, giving money to the church was voluntary. In fact, they are completely opposite. Christianity believes in a saving God, while socialism believes in a developing humanism. Communism, taken further, is based on complete and forced atheism. In Christianity, believers voluntarily shared their own property for the common good, while in communism, the property of others is forcibly distributed for the benefit of the political elite. Under communism, churches were closed and turned into movie theaters or swimming pools. Believers were persecuted, except for a small church group that bowed to the government's program.

The communist ideology was completely anti-Christian, that is, against Christianity. The communists dreamed of a godless world. Communism sought to completely ban Christianity both religiously and culturally, for example, Christmas is celebrated, but in Stalin's Russia Christmas was banned.

The state terror practiced in communist countries was more destructive than in Nazi Germany, for example, and according to conservative estimates, claimed up to a hundred million deaths. The large number is partly explained by the longer duration. National Socialism was in power in Germany for only 12 years and caused the deaths of millions of people. Communism was effective for about 70 years and over a wider area. In terms of terror and death toll, Hitler's sins are enormous, Stalin's are even greater, and the Chinese leaders are apparently even greater. And in China, oppression has not ended yet.

In Russia, communism was born out of the bitterness of the workers' inhumane conditions. Lenin and Stalin wanted to destroy the monarchy of the Romanov family and replace it with the dictatorship of their own party, the so-called proletariat. The communists wanted to ban private property, ban religion and ban a family based on the marriage of a man and a woman. The "new left" that developed in the 1960s is not fundamentally about a humane vision, but about the desire for power of middle-class people, which draws its strength from the failures of the existing system and speaks of lofty-sounding solutions.

The radical left directly applies the theories of Marxism and communism. In Finland, they were once represented by the so-called Taistos, or Stalinists. They uncritically admired the Soviet Union, aware of and unconcerned about many blatant human rights violations. This kind of delusion was surprisingly strong in Finnish cultural life, the media and universities. A few decades ago, leftism was very common among actors, television journalists and other publicly visible people. For example, in Finnish YLE broadcasts, you can still detect influences from the old days. For example, the activities of certain democratic parties are criticized or brought up in a disparaging manner almost daily. Criticizing Israel is also part of the program. When reporting on the war in Gaza, the statements of the Gaza Health Ministry are taken as true, and the figures announced by Israel are often not reported at all. There are a lot of programs and documentaries about sexual minorities. Transsexuality

is presented as if it were completely normal, and warnings about its negative phenomena are somehow wrong. If someone says that there are only two genders, they are considered some kind of conservative idiot. There are also cases where a person who has claimed that a man cannot give birth has been banned from social media services. And in fact, they were wrong, because if a woman changes her gender to a man a week before giving birth, then the person giving birth is indeed a man according to the law.

The truth of the Bible is not acceptable to the left and wokepeople

The revolutionary leftist is disappointed by Jesus' teaching, because He refused revolution, taught to give up demanding one's rights instead of violence, and urged one to suffer persecution. He also redeemed this teaching by His own example.

The environmental activist who considers eating beef an ecological mistake is also forced to condemn Jesus, who ate meat and said that meat is eaten in heaven. The father of the prodigal son celebrates his son's return by slaughtering a fattened calf. In the parable of the wedding of the king's son, "bulls and fattened calves" await us at the banquet in the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 22:4).

The absolutist is disappointed by Jesus, who drank wine and turned 600 liters of water into real wine at the wedding in Cana. Some believers who are holier than Jesus try to explain that Jesus only turned water into grape juice. But it was not grape juice, but good wine, as the Bible says. According to the Bible, the wedding guests specifically distinguished between good and cheap wine. Jesus was not a supporter of prohibition.

A social reform program was not part of Jesus' teaching. Jesus did not even oppose slavery, but He did not support anarchy either, which is why

He can be considered mainly a reactionary bourgeois. Jesus did speak for all those who were discriminated against, but without anarchist solutions.

Jesus spoke of marriage only as between a man and a woman, and therefore it is difficult to get support from Him either for the goals of sexual minorities for weddings in churches or for other teachings of the rainbow people.

Jesus showed respect for women and children, so it is impossible for Him, even though He was a man, to notice any kind of underestimation or hatred towards women or girls. The first witnesses to the resurrection were women, and in many biblical accounts, women appear as heroes.

The closest male followers were twelve, whom Jesus chose as His official messengers, or apostles. Such a choice of a group would make feminist organizations jump on the walls and boycott the entire group in modern times. And so, they boycotted. They boycotted the word of the Bible, not the church. They wanted new activities, rainbow flags, and feminist doctrine in the churches. What kind of team of apostles would be appropriate, according to intersectional feminism theory?

Anti-capitalism and Environmental, Social, and Corporate Governance (ESG)

For reasons that seem more philosophical than practical, the awakened oppose free market capitalism. This hatred of capitalism and free markets is part of what has given rise to environmental, social, and corporate governance (ESG) in the financial sectors. ESG investment firms, banks, and government policies require those they do business with to support environmental causes, reinforce anti-Christian social positions, and maintain LGBT quotas.

Not only are these philosophies unbiblical, but they are also financially dangerous, as seen in the recent collapse of Silicon Valley Bank (SVB). It was only in the aftermath of that bank's collapse that clients learned how

ESG was partly responsible for its demise. Because of the bank's sloppy hiring practices, only one board member had prior investment banking experience. And as the bank was on the verge of collapse, its chief risk officer initiated and led LGBTQ programs instead of fixing the situation. Furthermore, before closing, the bank "dropped an ESG report that outlined the company's focus on climate change."

However, the dangers of ESG go beyond the collapse of a single bank or company. The underlying goal is to use ESG policies to empower ordinary citizens for the causes they have awakened to. For example, during the Covid lockdowns, the bank accounts of those protesting the Canadian government's policies were frozen. Some Christian institutions have already found themselves having to switch banks because their accounts were canceled for unexplained reasons. I believe that in the future, the accounts of companies and churches that do not cooperate with ESG values will be canceled even more. It is possible that ESG agreements will become a "brand or brand" that companies will have to accept if they get contracts and prices that are suitable for their success.

ESG advocates dislike capitalism, claiming that it is systemically racist. If these claims were true, there would be good reasons to look for another system. But these claims are untrue, as author Owen Strachan points out: "While awakened leaders seek to replace free markets with state-controlled systems that produce 'capital' in their view, free markets are in fact a tremendous engine of good for all peoples. While free markets are not unmanipulated, they have fundamentally changed the world and lifted people everywhere from slavery to freedom." He goes on to provide useful statistics and details that explain how racism, like slavery in the United States, hurts capitalism rather than helps it wherever it is or has been practiced.

The Bible directly links work and food: "For even when we were with you, we commanded you, 'If anyone is unwilling to work, neither should

he eat." (2 Thessalonians 3:10). The Bible counsels us to work so that we can receive and give to others: "Let him who stole steal no more; but rather let him do labor, doing with his hands what is good, that he may have something to give to him who needs it." (Eph. 4:28). The New Testament strongly condemns men who do not provide for their families: "But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever." (1 Timothy 5:8). Economic systems that reward hard work with personal ownership of the fruits of that work are to be commended.

Christians who care about those in need should be alert to the anger that capitalism has aroused against the socialist agenda that drives it. While socialism promises to help the poor, it proposes to do so with other people's money and by building a bigger government that ultimately crushes the poor. Socialism has destroyed the people and economy of every country where it has been thoroughly implemented.

Three thinkers, from the 18th and 19th centuries influenced leftist culture.

Karl Marx

Karl Marx was an atheist who hated God and tried to dismantle the foundations of Christianity at every turn. His view was that the world was made up of oppressors and oppressed. This belief led him to write The Communist Manifesto. He spent all his time in museums theorizing because Marxism had never worked in practice. People thought it sounded great, but when they heard what was happening in Russia and China, they jumped away. So they started to believe in critical theory.

Fredrich Nietzsche

In the late 19th century and early 20th century, Fredrich Nietzsche began to write his philosophies. He thought life was absurd. He believed that God was dead and concluded that life was about power. For him, life was just a journey of power. The strong would survive, the weak would not. When you mix Marxism with communism, socialism, and now Nietzsche's critical theory, you get a lot of messy ideas.

Sigmund Freud

Freud was another thought leader at the turn of the 20th century. His theory was that everything is about sex. And his writings influenced the philosophical shift to postmodernism, where all truth is considered relative. As Christians, we believe that the Word of God is absolute truth, so the idea that there is no absolute truth is directly contrary to the biblical worldview.

These thought patterns and ideas began to develop and spread as people discussed them. The young people in the 1960s who embraced these ideologies are now thought to be leaders in our society. Some of them are teachers and professors. Some are leaders of large corporations. And some are teaching our own children. So, these ideas are no longer just ideas, they are now mainstream in our society.

Conclusion

In our day, there is a real need for biblical Christians to be vigilant about worldly philosophies masquerading as truth. I am concerned about the future orthodoxy of Christians who seek influence and ideas from those who are influenced by woke ideas. The actions of churches that exemplify woke and social justice philosophies today reveal that

they are consuming the "philosophy and empty deceit" spoken of in Colossians 2:8: "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the rudiments of the world, and not according to Christ."

Christian leaders today must be prepared to state clearly and unapologetically what the Bible says. They must be willing to call sin what it is, and they must be clear in proclaiming the gospel through Jesus Christ.

Abandonment of Christianity

Of the world's seven billion population, there are currently 2.5 billion Christians. For the first time, the majority of the world's Christians, 599 million, live in Africa. There are a couple of million fewer Christians in Latin America.

Europe has been the most Christian continent in the world for a millennium. According to religious statistics, there are currently 550 million Christians in Europe. The number is decreasing by 4–5 million annually.

A bigger problem than the number of members among the members of European churches is the state of faith of the church members. There are many so-called state churches in Europe whose members have not joined the churches themselves but have been joined as church members as babies. How many would really want to join the church if they had to make the choice as adults? Outside Europe, the situation is different. For example, in Africa, most church members have joined the churches voluntarily.

In Finland and Western Europe, there is an illusion that the number of Christians is decreasing, and that Christianity is old-fashioned.

Globally, there is a completely different perspective. But the number of Christians is declining even more sharply in the Middle East, where only a few percent of the population are Christians. While Christian churches and congregations in Latin America, Asia and Africa have offered people help by creating communities, in the Middle East churches have been squeezed and Christians are widely persecuted. Christians have been taken away by bloody conflicts and waves of emigration.

The growth of Christianity in the global south is faster and stronger than the decline of Christianity in Europe and North America. Christianity is growing, not only because of the high birth rate in sub-Saharan Africa, but also through conversions, especially in Asia. Christians currently make up about 32.3% of the world's population, 67% of whom live in the global south. Both the share of Christians in the world's population and the share of Christians in the global south will grow by 2050. The largest number of Christians will live in Africa and Latin America.

Denial of Christianity

But it is only a matter of time before speaking about the truths of Christianity is banned by law in the Western world.

There is already a court case going on about whether a Christian is allowed to say that homosexuality is a sin or a perversion or not. Of course, many atheists also consider it a perversion, but they will have to keep quiet about their views in the future to avoid punishment for it. Freedom of speech and religion will be restricted in the future, because sexual orientation is considered a more important human rights issue than freedom of religion or speech.

Much evil has been done in the name of Christianity throughout history. During the Roman Empire, laws were passed as early as the 4th century that led to unequal treatment, persecution, and ultimately even

the death penalty for Christians who acted against the teachings of the Catholic Church. For example, converts who went through the biblical baptism of believers received death sentences. In the Middle Ages, the Roman Inquisition imprisoned, tortured, and killed dissenters who opposed the teachings of the established church, whether they were Christians or not.

The Reformers continued to persecute dissenters under the leadership of Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Ulrich Zwingli in the 16th century. The Catholic Church also continued to persecute and kill dissenters. It was not until the late 20th century that those who believed differently from the established church began to be tolerated.

Now, a new kind of liberal phase has emerged under pressure from the secular world. Churches are trying to maintain their position by adapting to changes in society by rejecting their own biblical doctrine. By adopting doctrines that contradict the Bible into the church, it is believed that the church will maintain support among the population and that the church will be more acceptable.

The laws and regulations of society are changed in such a way that freedom of speech and religion are restricted. Christians are no longer allowed to say what they believe. They are not allowed to act according to their faith. Sexual minorities must not be criticized or the way people practice sex must be called perverted or evil. Children must no longer be taught the traditional Christian faith.

Society wants to protect the children of Christians from Christian upbringing, which is already considered by most of the population to be harmful to children and destructive to society. Children must not be frightened by the judgment of hell or by God's anger and punishment. Children must not be blamed and taught that they are sinful, evil people whose actions and thoughts God hates, even though He wants to forgive them in His love and teach them to do good and avoid evil.

Christianity is beginning to be seen as a religion invented by humans based on myths. Reasonable, well-educated, and well-taught people no longer believe the Bible's stories to be true. Even a figurative interpretation will not convince them, and they will continue in the "faith of the fathers." This will also apply to most members of the clergy. The clergy will divide into two groups: the majority will consider the Bible's stories to be ancient people's ideas about divinity, while a very small minority will believe that the Bible is God's revelation to humanity. Society and the world will become secularized, so that the religiously irreligious will become the majority everywhere. Many of them will be purely atheists, but there will also be skeptical agnostics and deists who believe in a higher power. These will not be persecuted and condemned in the same way as believing Christians, who will therefore be martyrs during the congregation.

Liberalization of Church Doctrine

Churches and congregations today want to be different organizations that understand even phenomena condemned by the Bible and seek the approval of the world. The most important task of churches seems to be to seek the acceptance of various minorities. Other religions are also treated with equal acceptance. In many churches, it is believed that it is no longer worthwhile or even right to try to evangelize those who believe differently. It is thought that everyone will be saved by their own faith. Instead, sermons talk about good deeds and nature conservation. Both are important things, but the most important task of churches and congregations is to share the gospel and show sin as sin.

For example, in many congregations, people are considering whether same-sex couples should be ordained or blessed into marriage. Why do the clergy have to think about this when the Bible clearly states that homosexual relationships are acts against the Word of God? This does not mean that homosexuals cannot form relationships that are accepted

by society, but a church that acts according to the Bible cannot and must not bless them. Most bishops of the Lutheran Church of Finland want to change the church's doctrine on marriage so that the marriage and blessing of gay couples becomes official church doctrine. Previously, couples who had divorced from their previous marriage were no longer remarried in the church. Now even priests can be married multiple times.

The Bible says that the pastor of a church must be a man with one wife. Even a small child can tell whether a bachelor, a man who has had several wives, or a woman can be a pastor of a church. But if you have studied theology for many years at university, you no longer know how to answer that. The Catholic Church is an organization led entirely by bachelors, and after many years of secrecy, the terrible result of such activities has been revealed. In the Lutheran Church, most priests are starting to be female. Such activities may earn points from feminists in the name of equality. But what about God? It is not according to the word of the Bible. And this is not an issue of intersectional feminism's equality, but an organizational issue. There are many tasks in the church, but the task of shepherd is reserved for men.

Churches are shy about their own Christian and Biblical truth and religious content and prefer to remain silent about them and instead talk about some things that the public finds good. One can even resent people for whom the message of Christianity is truly important and for whom the Bible is God's revelation to humanity. Many churches will not accept a speaker who condemns gay marriage or female priesthood. If the apostle Paul suddenly appeared in our country, he would not be allowed to speak in many churches. What about Jesus?

If the Bible is not true and a revelation from God, then what is the position of the church? After all, the church exists precisely because of or thanks to the message of the Bible. If the message of the Bible was only intended for ancient times, then the church also belongs to those ancient times. The church would seem to be the last organization that wants to reduce the authority of the Bible and dilute its truth. What will

happen to the Christian churches that have lost their truth? What will be their fate?

Matt. 5 says: "Therefore, whoever breaks one of these least commandments and teaches men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

In theological circles, people do wonder whether the Bible is the inspired word of God for our salvation by the Holy Spirit, or whether it is just texts written by people who lived in different times, which can and even should be read critically now. Sermons are given to reassure churchgoers as if the Bible is still considered true, but it is often just liturgical theater. There are many believers in theological circles and priests, but are they given any more space in the pulpits. Or are those who doubt the Bible taking the church in the direction the public wants?

Conservative members of the church who believe in the Bible are the ones who are the most active in church services. But they are very few. Church leaders are worried about declining incomes, so they are trying to attract new groups of people to the churches with their liberal teachings. They organize rainbow masses; they want to bless gay couples and all sorts of other new things.

Perhaps the idea is that conservative churchgoers are older people anyway. When they leave the books of the living, no one will go to church anymore.

Criticism of "revival" churches typically comes from individuals or groups who feel that certain cultural or political trends are influencing Christian teaching or practice in ways that they find problematic. Below are some of the concerns often cited by critics that have been framed as "bad traits":

Criticism:

Dilution of Biblical Teaching

Criticism: Some argue that churches that embrace "revival" ideologies may prioritize social justice, inclusion, or political correctness over traditional biblical teachings. This is often seen as compromising core doctrines to conform to modern cultural norms.

Example: Avoid difficult biblical truths about sin, repentance, or salvation to avoid offending congregants.

Overemphasis on social justice

Criticism: While caring for the poor and oppressed is in line with Christian values, critics say that an excessive focus on social justice can shift the church's mission from spiritual transformation to political activism.

Example: Churches hosting activist events or pursuing partisan goals but neglecting evangelism and discipleship.

Division and identity politics

Criticism: Some argue that incorporating elements of "woke" ideology, such as critical race theory (CRT), can promote division within churches by emphasizing differences of race, class, or gender over the unity of Christ.

Example: Teaching that divides members into "oppressors" and "oppressed" based on race or socioeconomic status.

Virtue Signaling Over Action

Criticism: Churches embracing "revival" are sometimes accused of performative gestures, such as public statements or social media posts, without substantive action or spiritual foundation.

Example: Publicly emphasizing diversity or progressive values without addressing deeper systemic or spiritual issues.

Compromising moral standards

Criticism: Some fear that "revival" churches may adopt progressive views on issues such as sexuality, gender identity, and marriage that are seen as contrary to traditional biblical teachings.

Example: Supporting same-sex marriage or affirming transgender identity in ways that some believe are contrary to biblical teachings.

Neglect of the Eternal Perspective

Criticism: Overemphasis on social and cultural issues can lead to the church's focus on eternal salvation, repentance, and preparation for life after death being neglected.

Example: Preach primarily about earthly justice rather than heavenly hope.

Alienation of traditional churches

Criticism: Rapid adoption of cultures or progressive values can alienate long-time church members who feel that their beliefs or concerns are being dismissed or labeled as outdated.

Example: Older members leave the church because they feel unwanted or unrepresented.

Political polarization

Criticism: Critics say that "awakened" ideologies can turn churches into political battlegrounds, aligning with parties or ideologies and alienating those with different views.

Example: sermons or church programs that strongly criticize capitalism, support socialism, or otherwise advance political platforms.

Balancing Perspectives

It is worth noting that other Christians see efforts to address racial reconciliation, social justice, and inclusion as deeply gospel-based and necessary to manifest the love of Christ. Criticisms of "awakening" often reflect specific theological or political perspectives rather than general agreement.

Restriction of freedom of speech

Freedom of speech has been considered a particularly important human right in Western countries. Western countries are the only ones in the world that have sufficient freedom of speech and opinion. The rest of the world has either completely or partially restricted freedoms.

Freedom of speech is the right of a citizen to express his or her opinions in public, which is one of the fundamental rights. According to the European Convention on Human Rights, freedom of speech includes the freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas, regardless of territorial boundaries and without interference by public authorities.

Legislation restricts freedom of speech when its use violates another right. For example, freedom of religion.

But is a realistic discussion about immigration, for example, possible if every critical opinion related to it is interpreted as hate speech or racism?

The current woke culture, in which anyone considers anything from board games to ice cream sticks to be racism, has led to the entire concept of racism becoming blurred.

Freedom of speech is one of the most important principles of a democratic society, which should apply not only to positive, harmless and indifferent information and ideas, but also to offensive, shocking and worrying information and ideas.

Opinion trials lead to self-censorship

A free and functioning democracy requires that even difficult issues can be discussed openly and honestly. In recent years, there have been numerous widely reported trials in which people are in the dock on the basis of opinions critical of immigration, for example. These trials are likely to lead to an atmosphere of self-censorship, in which instead of solving problems, they are kept silent about them.

Incitement against a national group

It is speech or writing that is intended to denigrate or intimidate a national group or to incite violent or discriminatory action against a national group. In this context, a national group usually refers to a national group defined by race, ethnic background, nationality, religion, sexual orientation or disability.

The legal status of incitement against a national group varies from country to country, as it is often seen as being at odds with freedom of speech. On the other hand, defamation also bypasses the laws defining freedom of speech in most countries.

But what is a national group? For example, Finland is nominally a Christian country. Thus, Christians do not constitute a limited group. They and their faith can be freely insulted. However, there is a very small

minority of convinced Christians. However, the judiciary does not consider them as a separate national group. But if you say or write something about Islam that is offensive to Muslims, you are guilty of incitement against a national group, because they constitute a small minority. Even if what you say is completely historically true.

When a Danish cartoonist drew a caricature of the Prophet Muhammad that offended Muslims, the Finnish Prime Minister rushed to apologize to the Muslims of the world. Why? Was he somehow involved in the project? Did the Finnish state have anything to do with it? But when an art exhibition organized in Finland and supported by society featured a work of art in which a pig was on the cross instead of Jesus, no one from the state leadership apologized to believers. Pig Messiah is an artwork by artist Harro Koskinen that depicts a pig crucified like Jesus. When MP Päivi Räsänen wrote to church representatives after they participated in the Pride parade that homosexuality is not pride but shame, the state prosecutor filed charges against her and the case is still pending in court. But Christians are free to be insulted, no one is filing charges or apologizing.

Criticism

The relationship between Woke ideology and freedom of speech is controversial and widely discussed. Those who argue that "woke ideology" can hinder free speech often point to the following themes:

Social consequences and cancel culture

Critics argue that individuals who express views that are contrary to "woke" norms or values can face serious social or professional consequences, often referred to as cancel culture. This can include public shaming, losing a job, or having a social platform dismantled. While these

actions do not restrict speech, they can prevent people from sharing their opinions for fear of backlash.

Self-censorship

Some argue that the fear of being labeled racist, sexist, or otherwise "problematic" can lead to widespread self-censorship. This reluctance to speak freely is seen as a barrier to open debate, as individuals may avoid engaging in meaningful conversations or discussing controversial topics.

Overreach in Institutional Settings

In some educational or corporate settings, critics argue that mandatory diversity training, speech codes, or other measures based on "woke" principles can pressure individuals to conform to certain views. This can be seen as restricting freedom of expression or forcing ideological conformity.

Redefining harmful speech

Critics argue that redefining certain types of speech as inherently harmful or violent (e.g., "words of violence") can lead to attempts to suppress speech that others find offensive. This reframing can limit the ability to express controversial or unpopular opinions.

Private social media platform removal and censorship

When social media platforms or other private entities ban users or restrict content that goes against "woke" values, some argue that this restricts free speech in practice, even if not through government action.

Anti-Semitism

Somehow, anti-Semitism has also increased during the wake culture. The same group of people who participate in wake events also participate in anti-Semitic demonstrations. Hatred towards Israel has increased, especially for defending Arab attacks.

Some people think that when Israel does something, all Jews in the world are responsible for it. Every Jew, no matter where in Europe, America or elsewhere. They suddenly become the bearers of responsibility for Israel's actions in the world. As if Israel's violent actions were a bad racial trait of Jews.

What many like to call just "anti-Zionism", i.e. opposition to the state of Israel, often hides good old-fashioned anti-Semitism beneath the surface. This is evident, for example, in the fact that, for example, a demonstration that claims to be opposed to Israel's settlement policy, traditional images appear, such as caricatures of squinty-eyed, hookednosed and money-hungry Jews.

We Christians should remember that Jesus is also a Jew. There have never been similar images of Jesus. Images of Jesus always have a European face.

Events in the Middle East often lead to growing threats, especially against Jewish communities living in Europe.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague has also joined the anti-Israeli actors when it announced that it would indict Israel for alleged war crimes in the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem. Israel has denied both the crimes and the ICC's jurisdiction, and the US has also criticized the ICC's decision as completely political.

Gaza

On the morning of October 7, 2023, Hamas gunmen stormed across the Gaza border into Israel and killed more than 1,200 people. Hamas also fired thousands of rockets. Among the dead were children, the elderly and 364 young people at a music festival. Hamas took more than 250 Israelis hostage in Gaza. There is also evidence of rape and sexual violence during Hamas attacks.

Hamas became the sole ruling party in Gaza after violently ousting its political rival Fatah in 2007. It has an armed wing and was believed to have 30,000 fighters before the war. Hamas wants to create an Islamic state in place of Israel. It rejects Israel's right to exist and is committed to its destruction. Hamas justified its attack as a response to Israeli crimes against Palestinians.

Hamas has fired thousands of rockets over the years and carried out other deadly attacks. Israel has repeatedly attacked Hamas with air strikes and sent troops into Gaza in 2008 and 2014. Israel, the United States, the European Union and the United Kingdom, among others, consider Hamas, or in some cases its armed wing, a terrorist group. Iran, on the other hand, supports Hamas with funding, arms and training.

Israel immediately launched a massive airstrike campaign against targets in Gaza in response to the Hamas attack. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Israel's goal was to destroy Hamas and return the

hostages. Israel also launched a ground offensive three weeks later. It has also bombarded Gaza from the sea.

According to the Hamas-run Health Ministry, tens of thousands of Palestinians have been killed and injured in Israeli attacks since the war began. Israel says at least 230 of its soldiers have been killed in Gaza. Residential buildings and other buildings in Gaza have suffered extensive damage and destruction.

As a result of the war, hundreds of thousands of people have taken to the streets around the world to protest the war in Gaza and demand an end to Israel's offensive. The protests have been very strongly directed against the state of Israel and Jews. Not just Israelis, but Jews all over the world. Israel has been accused of genocide. The demonstrations have demanded a Jewish-free area "From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free." In other words, the area from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea would be completely free of Jews. So, we are demanding a Jewish-free area, or "Jugend Frei" as the Nazis called it. It is a demand for a Palestinian state that would extend from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. This would mean the abolition of the Jewish state. This slogan has been shouted at anti-Israel demonstrations before. There are participants in the demonstrations who are genuinely concerned about the civilians in the Gaza Strip. But there are also participants who have always opposed the existence of the State of Israel, anti-Zionists and anti-Semites. They have now gained more enthusiasm to protest. And more demonstrators by their side.

But was Hamas's attack on Israel designed for this kind of opinion manipulation? Many civilians have indeed died in the war, but does Hamas care? By forcing Israel into a defensive war and hiding behind the backs of civilians, many civilian casualties are being caused. If Israel stops fighting and Hamas survives this, one can be sure that new similar attacks will be coming. And even if it does not, the anti-Zionist ideology will remain in the region and new fighters will be growing.

The demand for the establishment of two states

When we take a stand on the issue of Jerusalem, we Christians must be aware that according to the Bible, Jerusalem will be a touchstone for us. The tribe of Judah living there is under God's special protection, as a chosen people. Not because they are particularly good and kind, but because it is simply God's choice. God has chosen his side and we, Christians and Christian congregations, must do the same. Furthermore, we should remember that Jesus will return to the Mount of Olives, which is in East Jerusalem. And according to the book of Zechariah, He will return specifically to Jewish East Jerusalem.

The demand for the division of Jerusalem and for Israel to return to the 1967 borders is an impossible demand for Israel. According to it, Israel would have to withdraw from the borders it captured in the 1967 war. The demand would mean, among other things, dividing Jerusalem in two and for Israel to return to borders that it could not possibly defend and that were the result of the Arab war of aggression against Israel in 1948, and which previously constantly attracted Arab countries to repeated attacks on the country.

What steps will anti-Semitism take in the coming years? The demand for the division of Israel into two separate states will likely continue. Demands will be made, especially by the UN. In the UN, the majority is on the side of the Palestinians, and Christian countries almost always abstain.

The second demand concerns Jerusalem and its division as the capital of the planned future state of Israel and Palestine. It is completely irrational to believe that dividing Israel into two states could bring peace to the Middle East. However, there is no evidence of this, on the contrary. Israel's benevolent surrender of the Gaza Strip to the Palestinians did not lead to peace but to the continuous firing of rockets from Gaza into Israel.

Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas has said that "in the final solution, we will not see a single Israeli, civilian or military, in our own land". This is a Palestinian apartheid policy that is not opposed or protested anywhere.

In order to promote the establishment of two states, many states have now recognized the state of Palestine. A state that has never existed and does not control any territory. A very good reward for terrorist activity.

Churches' anti-Israelism

Many large churches and their aid organizations are also strongly involved in anti-Israel activities, and their activities are guided by the World Council of Churches (WCC), whose statements and actions in favor of the boycott movement against Israel have received worldwide support.

It is very exceptional that the WCC, for example, demands that the EU impose economic sanctions against a state. However, the WCC has been active in the conflict between Israel and Palestine. Over the years, the WCC has taken a strong stance on the conflict in question, often criticizing Israel.

Israel is forced to defend the existence of its state both in the UN and its subordinate organizations and in various international courts. Many European countries are often actively involved in these anti-Israel political activities.

It is extraordinary that anti-Semitism can unite the goals and activities of churches and Islamic states and organizations. Similarly, woke people are particularly in agreement with the churches on this issue.

There have been many clashes and protests between students at US universities since the start of the Gaza war. Hundreds of faculty members have also been involved in the clashes.

In November, hundreds of thousands of people took part in pro-Palestinian demonstrations in London. According to local police, there were around 300,000 demonstrators, but organizers said the number was as high as 800,000. London police said they had arrested 126 protesters in the area, while nine police officers were injured.

Climate activist Greta Thunberg has shown her support for the Palestinian resistance at several demonstrations. Thunberg's statements angered German climate activists in Amsterdam, with one of them rushing onto the stage and grabbing Thunberg's microphone.

Propaganda

Misinformation about the Gaza war quickly spread on social media. By early November, media intelligence service Cyabra had seen at least 40,000 bots or users sharing clearly false and damaging information online since the start of the war. Hamas had quickly used Twitter premium accounts to spread propaganda videos after the war. Some of the images shared on social media were allegedly from older conflicts or video games. The attack on Al-Ahli Arab Hospital received a large amount of false information, as the events, cause and consequences of the attack were completely unclear after the attack.

The false doctrines of the educational system

The school system is particularly under attack. Students are taught complete lies in the name of equal sexuality. All Christianity has been eliminated from schools, but gay organizations are allowed to introduce their own lies into educational materials. For example, Finnish schools have textbooks that state that there are more than two genders. That is a complete lie and unnecessarily confuses the understanding of a small child. What kind of authorities allow such an action?

A classical music concert was banned in one school because it contains references to the values of European Christianity. Of course, that is a dangerous thing. When the same bans are applied to religious references from other cultures, we are in the midst of a terrible avalanche of racism and discrimination. Or is the intention to ban only things related to Christianity?

A student was awarded 1,500 euros in compensation for suffering because he had to listen to a performance related to Christianity at a school event. Well, that is of course not a large sum for such enormous

suffering. At the same time, the court ordered a girl who was raped as a child to pay 1,200 euros in compensation for her suffering.

The guidelines of the National Board of Education describe how the provisions of the Finnish Constitution on freedom of religion and conscience are considered in education for beliefs and teaching of beliefs, as well as in the organization of religious events and celebrations common to all. Religious events must be organized separately from other activities and alternative activities must be offered. The school year also includes traditional, common celebrations for all. They are part of the activities and teaching in which pupils and students must participate. The celebrations may include some elements referring to religion, which are traditions related to Finnish culture.

Gender-aware education and teaching in schools

Gender diversity includes the idea that genders are equal and that there are more than two. The starting point of gender-aware education and teaching is to recognize everyone as an individual and as themselves. Many parents of students do not want their children to have to listen to completely false nonsense. However, it is teaching according to the woke culture. In some schools, teachers have even claimed that participation in teaching is mandatory. Some of the teachers are strongly committed to the woke culture. They are apparently the ones who have been brainwashed on the subject at their universities.

Gender should not be assumed, boys and girls should not be talked about

In the school's operating culture, it is important to talk about schoolchildren, children, young people and students. Grouping students into girls and boys includes a pre-assumption of gender. Therefore, the words girl or boy should not be used. They should be abandoned.

In gender-aware teaching, students are not socialized into a specific gender based on, for example, interests, appearance or name.

Gender-aware education and teaching involves recognizing the individuality and personality of students. It is important that the school does not maintain gender-based divisions.

In one school, physical education classes were combined so that boys and girls played sports together. The experiment failed because, for example, in a running race, the girls were badly outshone by the boys. They no longer enjoy sports in the same way as before.

What is wrong with being a girl or a boy?

For example, why were the pictures of a girl and a boy removed from a road sign warning about children? Instead, pictures of characters from which no gender can be inferred were put. What is wrong with calling a boy a boy and a girl a girl. There is probably a student in the school who does not know what gender he is, but should the vast majority change their ways because of a few students? The truth is, however, that there are only two genders. Male and female. There can be girly boys or boyish girls. Or there can be boys who would like to be girls or girls who would like to be boys.

Why are experts from gay organizations brought into schools to lecture and lie to children about something that is not true? They are people whose understanding of sexuality is either disturbed or they care about an extremely small minority at the expense of the vast majority.

A teacher should therefore not assume, for example, that a student named Peter is a boy. Peter may feel a bit girly today, so the teacher should just call him a student so as not to offend in any way.

According to the current law, every person has the right to determine their own gender by simply reporting it to the authorities. When a child

is born, the obstetrician at the maternity hospital determines the baby's so-called legal gender, and this is done specifically based on external characteristics. Then the person's own experience may conflict with the assigned gender, i.e., if they were assigned a boy at the maternity hospital and then later feel like a woman, there will be a conflict with this assigned gender.

The right to freedom of religion in schools

In situations, only negative freedom of religion, i.e. the freedom to remain separate from religion, is easily considered. This excludes teachers who want to hold religious opening ceremonies, for example, but cannot because the principal has decided otherwise to simplify the matter. This can happen because, due to all religious events, the school must organize an alternative and equal opportunity for those students whose guardians do not want their children to participate in religious opening ceremonies. Of course, the practical organization of the event creates additional work for the school management, so the easiest thing to do is not to hold religious wake-ups.

This violates equal and uniform treatment for students whose parents would like to exercise positive religious freedom and allow their children to participate in religious wake-ups.

The emphasis on negative religious freedom, especially in schools, has become a social phenomenon. Simply put, the phenomenon is specifically against Christianity. A few years ago, there was a case where a teacher had talked about the meaning of Epiphany at a wake-up call after the Christmas holidays and mentioned the word God and had been interviewed by the principal.

Criticism

Schools are one of the places where the woke phenomenon has sparked a lot of discussion, especially regarding how values and ideologies should be taught and dealt with by young people. In Finland, the discussion about woke culture in schools has aroused different opinions, and its impact on the school world can be manifested in the following ways, for example:

Curriculum content

Woke culture can influence the curriculum in such a way that schools deal with diversity, gender equality, environmental issues and non-discrimination more extensively than before. This is seen, for example, in increased attention to different family and cultural backgrounds, diversity of gender and sexual orientation, and climate education.

School values education

Many schools strive to teach young people empathy and appreciation for diversity. This can be seen, for example, in discussions about racism, gender roles or social justice. The question of to what extent schools should actively influence children's worldview and values is a subject of criticism.

Controversy and debate

To some, the issues surrounding woke thinking may seem like important steps towards equality, while to others they may seem like excessive political correctness. There has been debate about whether some of these themes are too complex or ideological to be addressed in

a school setting. For example, addressing gender diversity in lessons has been the subject of debate and opposition in some countries.

Pupils and parents' views

Parents and pupils' opinions vary widely. In some cases, parents have felt that their values are not respected, while for others, the woke approach brings the desired equality and equality.

Practical examples

Cultural celebrations: Some schools have discussed, for example, how traditional celebrations (such as Christmas or Easter) should be celebrated in a way that does not discriminate against different religions or minorities.

Learning materials: Old learning materials have been updated to reflect current society and promote diversity.

Language use: Schools may be directed to use more inclusive language, such as gender-neutral terms.

How does this affect Finland?

Although Finland is known for its equality and education system, there is a debate about how and to what extent these themes should be emphasized. For some, woke culture offers a way to promote a more just society, while others see it as an excessive ideological influence.

Woke culture in schools in the United States

In schools in the United States, "woke culture" is manifested in several ways, especially in curricula and educational practices:

History and social studies education:

Many schools are striving to include a broader and more diverse perspective on issues such as race, gender, and sexuality in their teaching.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) has sparked heated debate. CRT is not actually part of the curriculum in most schools, but some opponents argue that it influences how history and social issues are addressed.

Gender and sexual education:

Some schools teach about gender and sexuality diversity, including support for the rights of the LGBTQ+ community.

This has caused resistance in conservative circles, who feel that such teaching may conflict with traditional values.

Social justice and school policies:

Many schools emphasize inclusivity and strive to prevent discrimination, for example by creating safe spaces for diverse students.

Teachers may be provided with training in unconscious bias and promoting equality.

Critics

Critics worry that this could lead to ideological indoctrination or unnecessary politicization of students. They also argue that this could crowd out more traditional perspectives or values.

Debate and polarization

"Woke culture" in schools has become a controversial topic, especially in a political climate where the right and left interpret the issue very differently. Some states, such as Florida and Texas, have enacted laws that restrict the discussion of certain topics in schools.

The concept of justice

What is justice in the Bible?

Biblical or divine justice is a concept that man is unlikely to fully understand. God's justice stems from His eternal perspective and infinite wisdom, and it combines mercy, responsibility, and fairness. As the supreme sovereign, God has the authority to establish laws that all creation must obey. The Lord leads and extends love, but He demands accountability and obedience to the commandments that He has written on stone, made known through the prophets, spoken through His Son, and written on our hearts (Hebrews 10:16).

God allows freedom of choice, but He has made it known that each person's choice has spiritual and eternal consequences.

Biblical justice is primarily concerned with the spiritual realm. Social justice is concerned with the physical realm. Through biblical justice, God offers salvation, forgiveness, and redemption, not so that we can escape an earthly criminal court, but so that we will not be condemned in His heavenly court. The primary focus of divine justice then has to do with matters of heaven and hell.

The focus of biblical justice is not to see humanity make things right in their culture; it is about putting people right with God (Romans 5). However, biblical justice plays a significant role on earth because the Bible contains divine commands for Christians to extend kindness, live blameless lives, and love our neighbor as ourselves.

In the spiritual realm, there are eternal consequences for those who choose not to follow these instructions. God loves.

Interestingly, God does not view His law as a collection of independent statutes, but rather as one law, one statute, with one reward and one punishment. People either obey God's law (commandments) perfectly and in doing so are declared innocent, or if we have broken even one law, we are held guilty of breaking all of them. The innocent is granted eternal life in heaven, the guilty go to hell.

The standard seems harsh; however, God made a remarkable provision to demonstrate the extent of His mercy and love. About 2,000 years ago, God sent His Son Jesus to earth to live, die, rise again, and provide atonement for all who confess their sins to Him.

Jesus offers hope to the guilty, those who sin. Jesus is our Advocate (1 John 2:1) and declares the charges that were once condemned but are now dismissed in God's court. The means of forgiveness, redemption, and deliverance may seem strange to some, but humans are not in a good position to question God's way.

What is racial justice?

Racial justice is an ideal that advocates that people of all races should be treated fairly and not punished or given fewer opportunities in life

because of the color of their skin. Racial justice advocates equal opportunities and outcomes for equal effort.

Identifying the root causes of racial inequality is difficult but essential in addressing issues of racial justice. For example, studies show that black people in America are more likely to be incarcerated than white people. Is this because of the color of their skin, or are other factors at play?

What is racial injustice?

Racial injustice is a broad term and system that tolerates and perpetuates racial injustice. Often, this inequality is fueled by policies and cultural practices that are deeply rooted in prejudice.

Social justice warriors are divided on how to combat racial injustice. Many Christians respond by offering reasoned and comprehensive recommendations. Others target specific inequalities, such as homeownership. Some advocate peaceful means, while others argue that the time has come to forcefully implement change.

Racial injustice is a form of evil, and evil rarely retreats without a fight. However, a combative response to address inequality can be seen as an even worse situation and threat. For example, the riots associated with Black Lives Matter have not promoted the desired social change.

The largely nonviolent response of black Christians led by Martin Luther King Jr., although slower, is seen by many as more effective in achieving the desired results.

What is a social justice movement?

In its best sense, a "social justice movement" is an attempt to ensure that laws and systems do not show bias against an individual based on their gender or race. The term has expanded in recent years to encompass

ideas of equity, redress, and the enactment of laws that ensure equal opportunities for individuals regardless of lifestyle choices or views that undermine the fundamental principles for which a group or nation fought and died and is held dear.

Christians see racism as evil and believe that the ideal of equality is noble, but it assumes that striving for equality benefits everyone — especially the vulnerable. Therefore, initiatives in the name of social justice that negatively impact vulnerable groups or undermine the historically valued values and principles of a group or nation should not be seen as promoting social justice.

A person with the aforementioned conditional view of social justice believes that sex offenders should not be given equal opportunities to teach children, transgender athletes should not compete on the same fields as female athletes, a male rapist who identifies as female should not be allowed to serve his sentence in a women's prison, and evangelical churches are free to exclude from consideration the hiring of preachers whose beliefs conflict with biblical values. Conditional equality ensures that vulnerable and timeless values are protected.

What did Jesus Christ say about racism?

Racism is not found in the New Testament. The biblical view is that there is one race, humans, and many ethnic groups. The Bible clearly states that God loves everyone (John 3:16) and that Jesus came (and died) for everyone (John 1:12). Christians should therefore extend God's love and goodness to all and, as Jesus said, love your neighbor as yourself (Mark 12:31).

Conclusion

Woke theology has corrupted many terms and causes. Equality is a good thing in principle, but it can have harmful effects on vulnerable parties and cherished beliefs. Righting social injustices should be a concern of the church, but focusing on social issues must not hijack the rightful spiritual priority of issues of sin and faith.

Wokeism negatively impacts religion and culture. It seeks to limit dialogue, scorn dissent, marginalize traditional values, and redefine key terms. Social justice is best achieved when sin is addressed, the Bible is our guide, and sacrificial love is extended to all.

Social Justice

Every Bible-believing Christian wants justice for the oppressed (Deuteronomy 24:14–21, Micah 6:8). But today's social justice movement is more about the argument that groups of people, unlike individuals, have not received justice over time and should therefore be treated differently today—even if there are no immediate instances of injustice in the individual's life.

Furthermore, some of the categories commonly invoked as a need for social justice come from entire or sub-segments of LGBT identities, effectively equating different beliefs about same-sex marriage or transgender inclusion with racism or discrimination based on other immutable characteristics, such as ethnicity. There is a real push going on within today's social justice movement that is undermining the basic definitions of man and woman and the institution of marriage. Many on the social justice agenda have openly stated goals to destroy the nuclear family and advance the LGBT agenda.

One example is the Black Lives Matter leaders who came to the fore after the death of George Floyd. Not only did these leaders seek to destroy the family, but they also openly shared their Marxist ideals. It is

deeply troubling that Christians who are prone to wakefulness do not see through the anti-Christian goals that are on display.

Another concern with the social justice movement is the way it combines helping the marginalized with sharing the gospel. Serving the community is valuable, and there is value in reaching out to people who are oppressed or marginalized in the community. But we must not equate this type of caring with sharing the gospel.

The wake gospel is another gospel, not the gospel of the New Testament. Instead of leading unsaved people to Christ, it leads people to social causes, some of which are unbiblical. There are church buildings with Black Lives Matter signs and rainbow flags, but those same churches are not sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ and calling sinners to repentance. Paul's warning in Galatians 1:6 comes to mind: "I marvel that you are so quickly deserting him who called you to the grace of Christ, to another gospel."

The gospel, as defined in the Bible, is the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ for our sins (1 Cor. 15:1–5). It is the satisfaction of God's justice in the person of Christ, who pays for our sins, and it is the best news we can give to anyone who is unsaved. We must not diminish the gospel itself by focusing on all social issues or injustice.

Social justice, like the "social gospel" of the previous generation, is a repackaging of liberal theology presented as a substitute for the great commission (Matt. 28:19–20).

The church of Jesus Christ faces an unprecedented challenge: the collision of it with a new sexual ethic, revelation, and revolution.

But the Bible is clear on this. In Genesis 1, God created human life in His own image and called them male and female. In Genesis 2, He

ordained marriage. In the New Testament, Jesus referred to both of these chapters, as He said: "Have you not read that He who created them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh" (Matthew 19:4–5). Romans 1:24-28 condemn homosexuality in the clearest way. In 1 Corinthians 6:9, Paul includes such acts in his list of sins. Furthermore, the Bible teaches that true conversion results in turning away from sin. "He who says, 'I know him,' and does not keep his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoever keeps his word, in him truly is the love of God perfected. By this we know that we are in him" (1 John 2:4-5).

Yet Christians who profess to believe and preach the Bible struggle to take a clear stand on these issues.

Christians must study and gain firm conviction about what the Bible says on these matters. It is not unkind to speak the truth to a world in need of a Savior.

The New Testament clearly states the intrinsic value and spiritual worth of women. Both men and women are created in the image of God (Genesis 1:27), and both are equal in Christ through salvation: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female. "You are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28).

But the New Testament also makes it clear that God gave men and women different roles in marriage (1 Peter 3:7) and in the church. As for the church, the Bible gives direct instructions in both 1 Timothy 2:12 and 1 Corinthians 14:35: "Let a woman learn in silence, with all submission. But I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over her husband, but to be in silence." "And if they learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for women to speak in the church."

These views are not new and have been with biblical Christians since the first century. In recent years, however, wokeism or woke-leaning Christians have used the term equal to describe a position that demands that men and women not only have equal value but also have equal or interchangeable roles in all settings, including the home and church.

This equal position has laid the groundwork for wake pastors, whose prior theological convictions were correct, to place women in pastoral positions of ministry.

Throughout the New Testament, we see women participating in meaningful ministry roles in the church.

Racism is an ugly sin. Genesis 1:27 tells us that God created every person in His image and Acts 17:25–26 affirms that we all have equal value in His eyes. We are all the same race—a fallen human race in need of a Savior (Romans 3:23–26). We all come to God the same way—through Christ.

Critical Race Theory (CRT) has been the subject of heated debate. However, CRT's premise is that "the concept of race has been constructed to benefit whites at the expense of people of color." The result of this approach is that "Even if a white person has never had genuinely racist thoughts or has repented of his past racism, he is still a racist, a white supremacist, because he is white and belongs to the majority."

This philosophy distorts the meaning of racism and redefines it as a sin of the heart resulting from skin color. Furthermore, this philosophy makes reconciliation with other believers and unity within the church impossible because it implies that members of a white church are always guilty of racism, let alone the fact that non-white members cannot be guilty of racism. This is not only ridiculous, but also actually sinister. It

tears actual sin from its moral definition and makes it responsible for all of society's ills.

A few years ago, a pastor prayed at Baylor University's commencement exercises and condemned "a planet with too many white men like me behind the wheel." This type of virtue signaling is becoming more common even in evangelical circles.

No one, especially a Christian, should think of anyone as lesser or more hopeless because of their ethnicity, skin color, or background. And no one, especially a Christian—should assume to know the condition of another's heart based on the color of their skin.

Intersectionalism

The idea of intersectionality is something like a CRT-based point system where you get more points for the greater number of minority groups you belong to. For example, according to the chart, a straight white man would be considered to belong to three groups without oppression (straight, white, and male), while a lesbian African American woman would be considered a highly oppressed person who belongs to three groups that experience oppression.

In the ideological social justice worldview, authority is not given by wisdom, age, status, or experience, it is the status of victim. Claims of oppression and victimization based on subjective "lived experience" are to be believed without question. The more victim boxes you can check, the greater the moral authority.

Regarding victimization, the Bible tells us that God personally cares about the oppressed (Psalm 9:9, 146:7). Jesus himself was "oppressed and afflicted" (Isaiah 53:7). In the Old Testament, God gave Israel laws that forbade the exploitation of vulnerable people, such as strangers, widows,

orphans, and the poor (Exodus 22:21–27). The Old Testament counsels, "Learn to do good; seek justice; relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow" (Isaiah 1:17). Similarly, the New Testament commands Christians to care for those in need, especially "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction" (James 1:27). In our fallen world, there are real victims. There are countless hearts broken by sin (our own or others') and suffering who need God's love. Biblical Christians want to relieve their suffering. This relief does not come from false philosophies of sacrifice, but from the forgiveness offered through the grace of the glorious gospel of Christ and the precious promises of His Word. To those who are in bondage to sin, Christ promises, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). To those who know Christ, He promises overcoming power in a world filled with trouble: "These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world" (John 16:33).

Resist bad development

Oppose new ideologies that are clearly against the word of the Bible and the truth. Also oppose doctrines that are against biology. For example, sex education in schools, which tells children that there are more than two genders. What can you do to prevent things from getting worse? Here are some suggestions:

Vote for parties that oppose the craziest bills.

Vote for a candidate who opposes the craziest bills.

Avoid participating in any kind of pride events. Homosexuality is not a point of pride for a believer in the word of the Bible.

Do not go to stores that have rainbow flags in their windows. Most merchants must put flags in their windows to avoid cancellation.

Do not go to movies that have gay content.

Do not buy products that are advertised in a woke spirit, for example, in an advertisement that shows homosexual activity. Boycott.

Do not use the services of such businesses, such as cafes, etc., if you know that the businesses apply the most blatant woke doctrines in their operations.

Leave the church if it acts contrary to the Bible, for example, blessing gay couples for marriage or having female priests. Some say that it is not worth leaving such a church, but to be involved and bring the truth to light. But the Bible's instruction is that you should not join in activities that are contrary to the word of the Bible. (2 Cor. 6:) "And what agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God, as God has said: "I will dwell in them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they will be my people." Therefore: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will take you unto myself, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

Speak boldly of your own position on the matter. Silence is a very bad thing. In Germany, when the Nazis began their terrorism, the public was silent and watched the development of things from the sidelines.

Speak boldly of what the Bible says on the matter. For example, concerning sex and homosexuality. (Rom. 1:24) "Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, to dishonor their own bodies, who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile lusts: for their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature; Likewise, also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men, working that which is shameful, and receiving in themselves the due recompense of their sensuality. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting."

Stand by your own principles. You have a right to them.

Speak truthfully to your children, even if your speech deviates from what your children are taught at school. If a teacher does not agree with the truth you are teaching your child, give feedback directly to the teacher.

Speak and write truthfully on social media platforms, even if you receive strong criticism for your opinions.

Finally

Woke culture. Don't eat that, because the world is going to be destroyed. Have as much free sex as possible when you're young and with different people. Change your gender every year. You don't know how many genders there are. Conservatives are the far right or even Nazis to you. White, normal people are privileged. They can be discriminated against and ignored because of that. Their speeches should not be taken seriously. There are no mothers, there are only birthers. There are no fathers, there is only a procreator. We are trying to erase genders. We only fall in love with people, it doesn't matter whether the target is a man or a woman or something else. Children are taught detailed porn in schools and gay porn. When people are hired, the discriminated against are chosen instead of the most qualified. Talking about immigration policy is racism. The list is endless.

Political correctness and forbidden words have also become visible in the world. When everything is racism, soon nothing will be racism. The heated racism debate has one, damaging effect. It undermines efforts for everyday equality and quiet anti-discrimination work.

Now we just need to be able to understand what the privilege of a typical man is. In Finland for instance, unlike women, men are subject to, among other things, compulsory military service, higher suicide rates, a greater risk of marginalization, a lower level of education and earlier mortality. Is it really the case that a Finnish man is more privileged than a Finnish woman?

Thus, woke should not mean demonizing a specific group of people – not even white straight men. That is precisely the kind of racism that tolerance is far from. Those who know history also understand that black and white divisions between groups of people can lead to unimaginable horrors, as the totalitarian states of the 20th century and the Second World War showed, for example.

Woke is a small-scale extremist ideology that is given disproportionate visibility and influence. It is particularly influential in universities, putting ideology before facts. It is related to previous revolutions in history, but now it is a revolution of those in power against ordinary people.

The freedom to practice religion is positive religious freedom; the freedom not to participate in religious practice is negative religious freedom. The state should treat all views equally.

Religious freedom is not self-evident anymore. Now there is a danger that a negative interpretation of religious freedom will take precedence over a positive interpretation. This has sometimes been seen, for example, in the debate about schools and daycare centers.

Woke ideology sparks fierce debate. Supporters say it promotes equality and justice. Critics warn of its negative effects and unintended consequences.

As we live in a world increasingly shaped by ideological fervor, let us remember the value of nuance, empathy, and open dialogue. Real progress is not built on rigid dogmas or the silencing of dissent, but on the messy, human process of understanding. If we are to move forward as a society, we must resist the allure of moral ideas and embrace the courage to question and disagree. Grow together. Only then can we build a culture that is not only just but also sustainably humane.

Woke may sound like seeking justice and caring for the weak and oppressed, something the Bible calls us to do (Isa. 1:17, Micah 6:8). However, woke often involves theories and ideologies that are contradictory to the Bible or even hostile to it. Many well-meaning Christians want to be loving and accepting. They succumb to cultural pressure to conform to woke ideology. They likely don't know its unbiblical tendencies.

The 21st-century American church has both passively and actively incorporated the woke ideology into its institutions and practices. Some Christians have begun to apologize and repent for their whiteness. Often these actions are preceded by the suggestion that we should change the gospel to conform to the woke ideology so that our brothers and sisters of color will be comfortable in the church. The gospel says that all have sinned, and everyone can be fully redeemed through the work of Christ. The different view of sin and redemption in the woke undermines the gospel. The woke is a completely different system than Christianity. It is, in effect, a "different gospel."

Woke ideology turns people against each other. It judges individuals by their skin color and social status, not by their character or God's view of them.

The woke phenomenon raises key questions about social justice and values. But its extreme implementation polarizes society and suppresses open debate. Promoting diversity and equality should be based on mutual understanding, open dialogue and respect, not on forced consensus or the use of stigmatization. The debate should be conducted in a way that encourages constructive dialogue, not inciting discord. The future demands we defend free speech. It also calls for balance between differing views. Only then can we build a society where all feel heard and valued.

Sources

- 1. Matheis, Frank: Outrage Channeled in Verse. Living Blues, August 2018, 49, nr 4.
- 2. Romano, Aja: A history of 'wokeness' Vox. 9.10.2020.
- 3. Mikä ihmeen intersektionaalinen feminismi? Kalevi Sorsa -säätiö.
- 4. Jussi Lehmusvesi: Maustetytöt pääsi lopulta Emma-ehdokkaaksi. Helsingin Sanomat, 13.12.2019
- 5. Ending Radical And Wasteful Government DEI Programs And Preferencing The White House. 21.1.2025.
- 6.Vilma Mustonen: Kehoaktivistit ja somevaikuttajat kiistelevät kehopositiivisuuden merkityksestä sosiaalisessa mediassa. 4.10.2020. Haaga-Helia ammattikorkeakoulu.
- 7. Michael S. Roth: Don't Dismiss 'Safe Spaces' The New York Times. 29.8.2019.
- 8. Bartholomew, James: Easy virtue The Spectator. 18.4.2015.

- 9. Smith, Robert (2021). "Black Lives Matter". Encyclopedia of African American Politics, Third Edition. New York
- 10. Smartt, Nicole: Sexual Harassment in The Workplace In A #MeToo World Forbes. 20.12.2017
- 11. Kolonialismin parempi puoli on tulenarka aihe: siirtomaa-järjestelmää puolustanut tieteellinen artikkeli poistettiin väkivallan pelossa Helsingin Sanomat. 27.2.2018.

Bible passages Finnish Church Bible 1933/38

Author

Timo Vilo is a Master of Science in Engineering and has worked as a management consultant for several Finnish companies for many years. Timo Vilo is also a writer and a historian and Bible scholar with a particular interest in Jewish history and anti-Semitism.