

## **The Istanbul Convention and the European Framework National Statute for the Promotion of Tolerance**

Below is a brief on two pieces of potential legislation coming our way from Europe. Enjoy. (You won't).

As an added bonus, Appendix B, at the end of the post, is a brief description of the bureaucratic structure of the European Union (EU).

### **The Istanbul Convention.**

The [Istanbul Convention](#) is essentially a further deepening of VAWG policies. It does not explicitly make anti-feminism illegal (for that, see the second part of this post) but it does make many aspects of feminism obligatory in law. It is a collection of guidelines complete with taxpayer-funded compliance inspectors which embodies radical feminist ideals, and will infringe on, if not remove entirely, many of the individual human rights of male European citizens. Bluntly put, it is anti-male fascism.

The Istanbul Convention is a product of the Council of Europe (which is *not* the same as the EU, see Appendix B below). Council of Europe "Conventions", as they call their proclamations, do not become law in member States unless and until they are ratified by the individual Nation State in question. As of March 2016, the Istanbul Convention has been ratified by 21 of the 47 CoE member states.

The UK has *not* ratified the Istanbul Convention - yet. The Equalities and Human Rights Commission explicitly lamented this fact in their December 2015 "Is Britain Fairer" report. But it looks like we are close to ratifying it, as the following Parliamentary question implies.

Asked on: 05 June 2015 by Kevin Brennan (MP for Cardiff West)

*To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for what reasons the UK has not ratified the 2011 Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (aka The Istanbul Convention).*

Answered by: Karen Bradley (MP for Staffordshire Moorlands)

Answered on: 10 June 2015

*The UK already complies with the vast majority of the articles to the convention including the criminalisation of forced marriage which was one of the pre-requisites of ratification as required by Article 37. Primary legislation will be needed to comply with the remaining extra-territorial jurisdiction provisions in Article 44 of the Convention before it can be ratified. The UK Government is liaising with the devolved administrations about ratification, including any further legislative steps that may be necessary.*

I take this to mean that it must come before the UK parliament before it can be ratified - though this may be under the aegis of a very restricted set of issues which are deemed to require legislative change. In this context note that the parliamentary answer is misleading. The Istanbul Convention would oblige the UK to adopt policies far beyond just those in Article 44. The bad news is that it seems that ratification is still on the agenda. Some extracts from the Convention are as follows...

### **Purpose**

*"Protect women against all forms of violence, and prevent, prosecute and eliminate violence against women and domestic violence";*

*" 'women' includes girls under the age of 18";*

*"Recognising that women and girls are exposed to a higher risk of gender-based violence than men";*

*"Recognising, with grave concern, that women and girls are often exposed to serious forms of violence such as domestic violence, sexual harassment, rape.... and genital mutilation, which constitute a serious violation of the human rights of women and girls and a major obstacle to the achievement of equality between women and men."*

*"Recognising that violence against women is a manifestation of historically unequal power relations between women and men, which have led to domination over, and discrimination against, women by men and to the prevention of the full advancement of women."*

*"Recognising the structural nature of violence against women as gender-based violence, and that violence against women is one of the crucial social mechanisms by which women are forced into a subordinate position compared with men."*

You get the picture. I'm not going to repeat for the billionth time the obvious rejoinders to the above statements. Note the withholding of concern for boys, of however tender an age.

To qualify as "domestic violence" the perpetrator is not required to have cohabited with the victim at any time.

### **What about men?**

Don't worry, gentlemen, you've not been forgotten...

*"Parties shall take the necessary measures to encourage all members of society, especially men and boys, to contribute actively to preventing all forms of violence covered by the scope of this Convention (i.e., against females)."*

### **Obligatory brainwashing**

*"Parties shall take, where appropriate, the necessary steps to include teaching material on issues such as equality between women and men....gender-based violence against women....in formal curricula and at all levels of education."*

*"Parties shall take the necessary steps to promote (these) principles....in informal educational facilities, as well as in sports, cultural and leisure facilities and the media."*

There will be no escape from the propaganda, constantly reinforcing the message that men are dangerous.

### **Discrimination is not discrimination**

*"Special measures that are necessary to prevent and protect women from gender-based violence shall not be considered discrimination under the terms of this Convention."*

This gives carte blanche for the pre-emptive arrests of men just in case they might have been thinking of doing something. The "special measures" are not defined. So, it could mean anything that someone, somewhere deems "necessary".....to prevent something they've just made up.

## **Not just about violence**

*"Contribute to the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women and promote substantive equality between women and men, including by empowering women."*

*"Parties shall take the necessary measures to promote programmes and activities for the empowerment of women."*

Under the aegis of protection, the Convention smuggles in the whole gamut of "substantive equality" - which is code for affirmative action (or preferential treatment - of which more below).

## **Enforcement**

*"In order to ensure effective implementation of its provisions by the Parties, this Convention establishes a specific monitoring mechanism."*

*"Parties shall undertake to collect disaggregated relevant statistical data at regular intervals on cases of all forms of violence covered by the scope of this Convention."*

There's no obligation to collect data on violence against men or boys, though.

This is particularly chilling. An organisation known as [GREVIO](#) already exists within the Council of Europe. They are the modern-day witch-finder generals tasked with enforcement. They will work with local feminist groups to ensure that "progress" against the Convention's objectives are being made, putting the squeeze on politicians if they are not complying.

## **Give us the money**

Feminist legislation always has a key clause ensuring they get more public money pouring into their coffers,

*"Parties shall allocate appropriate financial and human resources for the adequate implementation of integrated policies, measures and programmes to prevent and combat all forms of violence covered by the scope of this Convention, including those carried out by non-governmental organisations and civil society."*

## **Women are the primary victims of war**

*"Recognising the ongoing human rights violations during armed conflicts that affect the civilian population, especially women in the form of widespread or systematic rape and sexual violence and the potential for increased gender-based violence both during and after conflicts."*

There *are* conflicts in which widespread raping of women takes place. In such places there is invariably also [widespread raping of men](#). Just saying. And then there are the combatants, but obviously they don't matter.

## **Women are above the law?**

*"'Violence against women' is understood as a violation of human rights and a form of discrimination against women and shall mean all acts of gender-based violence that result in, or are likely to result in, physical, sexual, psychological or economic harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, **whether occurring in public or in private life.**"*

*"Parties shall refrain from engaging in any act of violence against women and ensure that **state authorities, officials, agents, institutions and other actors acting on behalf of the state** act in conformity with this obligation."*

Staggeringly this appears to mean that a female criminal cannot be forcibly arrested - because the policeman sent to arrest her is an agent of the state, and so is not excluded from the prohibition against using force on a woman. They haven't thought this through, have they?

### **Women soldiers....must not be subject to violence...?**

*"This Convention shall apply in times of peace and in situations of armed conflict."*

The same observation again, even more so.

And so to the second piece of Euro-nonsense potentially coming out way.....

### **European Framework National Statute for the Promotion of Tolerance**

Tolerance is to be enforced under [this Model Statute](#) by specifying explicitly what will not be tolerated (see Appendix A for the use of the word "tolerance" in this perverse fashion). The purpose of this Model Statute includes taking "*concrete action to combat intolerance, in particular with a view to eliminating racism, colour bias, ethnic discrimination, religious intolerance, totalitarian ideologies, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, **anti-feminism** and homophobia*" (my emphasis). The Model Statute has not so far been accepted by the EU, it is only a proposal by an independent body.

This proposal to make anti-feminism explicitly illegal comes to you from The European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation (ECTR). The ECTR is a non-governmental organization, not the EU. In June 2015, Tony Blair was appointed Chairman of the ECTR. The aim of the ECTR is to get this Statute adopted by the EU. To this end, in 2013, the draft Statute was presented to the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs of the European Parliament.

The issues raised by the Statute are topical in view of the European migrant crisis. It is not clear to me whether the migrant crisis will help get adoption of the Statute by the EU bogged down further, or act as an impetus to its adoption. One hopes the former.

Some definitions within the Statute are relevant,

*"Group' means: a number of people joined by racial or cultural roots, ethnic origin or descent, religious affiliation or linguistic links, gender identity or sexual orientation, or any other characteristics of a similar nature."*

*"Group libel' means: defamatory comments made in public and aimed against a group as defined in paragraph (a) – or members thereof – with a view to inciting to violence, slandering the group, **holding it to ridicule** or subjecting it to false charges."* (My emphasis).

The explicit identification of "anti-feminism" as an instance of intolerance, according to the Statute, together with the above definitions, implies that holding feminism to ridicule would be illegal under this Statute. Moreover, such acts,

*"...will be regarded as criminal offences punishable as aggravated crimes."*

But the most chilling part of this Statute is in Section 7 which states that,

*"Juveniles convicted of committing crimes listed above will be required to undergo a rehabilitation programme designed to instill in them a culture of tolerance."*

The Statute notes that,

*"Tolerance does not denote acceptance of such practices as female circumcision.....or any form of exploitation or domination of women"*

By omission we are to understand that male circumcision is just fine, and so is "any form of exploitation or domination of men", apparently. So - trafficking men for slave labour? No problem. It continues,

*"Members of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups are entitled to a special protection, additional to the general protection that has to be provided by the Government to every person within the State.....The special protection afforded to members of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups may imply a **preferential treatment**. Strictly speaking, this preferential treatment goes beyond mere respect and acceptance lying at the root of tolerance. Still, the present provision is justified by the linkage between historical intolerance and vulnerability."*

Obviously we know who would be interpreted as a "vulnerable and disadvantaged group", don't we? So this is a proposal to enshrine in EU law a "preferential treatment" of women which "goes beyond mere respect". What do they want, worship? One woman's "preferential treatment" is another man's discrimination. Even if the "men-have-oppressed-women-for-centuries" thing were true (it isn't) the justification of prejudice now to compensate for prejudice yesterday is ethically illiterate.

Like the Istanbul Convention, propaganda will be enforced. Section 8 states that,

*"The government shall ensure that schools, from the primary level upwards, will introduce courses encouraging students to accept diversity and promoting a climate of tolerance as regards the qualities and cultures of others."*

Section 9 states that,

*"The government shall ensure that public broadcasting television and radio stations will devote a prescribed percentage of their programme to promoting a climate of tolerance."*

*"The production of books, plays, newspapers reports, magazine articles, films and television programmes – promoting a climate of tolerance – will be encouraged and, where necessary, subsidized by the Government."*

Vote Brexit. It's not enough, but it's something.

### **Appendix A: Repressive Tolerance.**

When is tolerance intolerance? When is it Repressive Tolerance. [Repressive Tolerance](#) was a concept developed by Herbert Marcuse in the 1960s, as part of what is sometimes known as the Frankfurt School. Repressive Tolerance is a Marxist strategy in which "tolerance" (niceness) is used as a lever to subversively achieve the true aim - which is intolerance towards, and ultimately the subjugation of, those excluded from being explicitly named as a tolerated in-group. The whole of the Equalities Industry / Identity Politics / Social Justice / Progressivism / Feminist axis can be seen as an application of this strategy - Cultural Marxism. It is social engineering (revolution) by stealth. People think they are voting for niceness, they are actually voting for Marxist totalitarianism.

## Appendix B: Structure of the EU

**European Council** (President Donald Tusk): Members are the Heads of State of the 28 EU member states, plus the President of the European Commission. It is not one of the EU's legislating institutions, so does not negotiate or adopt EU laws. It sets the strategic political direction. In my words: it's a forum for the Big Wigs to feel that they are in charge without actually doing any work - because in truth they are not in charge.

**European Commission** is the executive arm of the EU. It is supposed to be politically independent. (Current head Jean-Claude Juncker). Like our Civil Service the European Commission is unelected and responsible for implementing the decisions of the European Parliament and the Council of the EU. But it differs from our Civil Service in that it is also responsible for drawing up proposals for new European legislation. Quite how this is compatible with political independence beats me. It provides a fine vehicle for circumventing democracy.

**Council of the European Union:** Together with the European Parliament, the Council of the EU is the main decision-making body of the EU. Members are government Ministers from each of the 28 member states, with authority to commit their national governments. The Council of the EU, together with the European Parliament, negotiates and adopts EU laws based on proposals from the European Commission.

**European Parliament:** 751 MEPs, the only directly elected body of the EU. Roles: Passing EU laws (together with the Council of the EU); Deciding on international agreements; Deciding on enlargements; Asking the European Commission to propose legislation.

As if the documents reviewed above were not enough, here's further evidence of the EU stance on "equality". There is a video on the [main EU web site](#), "*Gender Equality: How to speed up the glacial pace of progress*". The plight of women is presented to us in this video in these words: "*they suffer sexual harassment; they are raped, they are trafficked, they are tortured. They are denied access to education and they are not told that they can have both a successful family and professional life.*" As a description of the lot of European women this is somewhat inaccurate, I think you'll agree. The video references to the World Economic Forum's annual [global gender gap reports](#). We are told, "*when it comes to health and education there is almost parity*". Do note that "almost parity" is the term used when males suffer major disadvantage. Simply put, these preposterous reports redefine male disadvantage as equality. The video then morphs to female disadvantage in the workplace and in politics. They are, of course, talking about women in senior power positions. In other words, the standard, profoundly dishonest, feminist line.

The "**Council of Europe**" is not an EU body at all. It has 47 member states - far more than the EU. The Council of Europe is a regional intergovernmental organisation whose stated goal is to promote human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in its 47 member states. The organisation is separate from the 28-nation European Union, though sometimes confused with it, in part because they share the European flag. Unlike the European Union, the Council of Europe cannot make binding laws, but it can enforce existing laws.