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In 2013, 20 US and European campaigners began strategizing ‘achievable goals’ to roll back human rights for sexual and reproductive health in Europe. Documents have recently emerged which reveal a detailed, extremist strategy called *Restoring the Natural Order: an Agenda for Europe*, which seeks to overturn existing laws on basic human rights related to sexuality and reproduction, such as the right to divorce; for a woman to access contraception, assisted reproduction technologies or have an abortion; equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or intersex (LGBTI) persons; or the right to change one’s gender or sex without fear of legal repercussions. The initial group of campaigners has grown to attract over 100 anti-human rights, anti-women’s rights and anti-LGBTI organizations from over 30 European countries and now goes by the name ‘Agenda Europe’. Agenda Europe is a Vatican-inspired, professional advocacy network, whose members meet in secret, and which is directly responsible for implementing a detailed strategy to roll back human rights. The Agenda Europe strategy is producing concrete results, such as the 2016 Polish bill to ban abortion, bans on equal marriage in several Central European countries and over a dozen comparable acts at national level and in European institutions aiming to limit women’s and LGBTI rights. This paper details Agenda Europe’s aims, strategies and key players, to help human rights defenders respond appropriately.

**ABSTRACT**

In 2013, 20 US and European campaigners began strategizing ‘achievable goals’ to roll back human rights for sexual and reproductive health in Europe. Documents have recently emerged which reveal a detailed, extremist strategy called *Restoring the Natural Order: an Agenda for Europe*, which seeks to overturn existing laws on basic human rights related to sexuality and reproduction, such as the right to divorce; for a woman to access contraception, assisted reproduction technologies or have an abortion; equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans or intersex (LGBTI) persons; or the right to change one’s gender or sex without fear of legal repercussions. The initial group of campaigners has grown to attract over 100 anti-human rights, anti-women’s rights and anti-LGBTI organizations from over 30 European countries and now goes by the name ‘Agenda Europe’. Agenda Europe is a Vatican-inspired, professional advocacy network, whose members meet in secret, and which is directly responsible for implementing a detailed strategy to roll back human rights. The Agenda Europe strategy is producing concrete results, such as the 2016 Polish bill to ban abortion, bans on equal marriage in several Central European countries and over a dozen comparable acts at national level and in European institutions aiming to limit women’s and LGBTI rights. This paper details Agenda Europe’s aims, strategies and key players, to help human rights defenders respond appropriately.
In Europe, fundamental human rights have been increasingly under attack in recent years. While the rise of ultra-conservatism has been apparent, precisely how these actors are organising, fundraising and attempting to exert influence has not been clear.

This report provides a fascinating insight into the clandestine workings and deliberate strategy of Europe’s anti-choice movement, which is driven by religious dogma and often has the fingerprints of the Vatican. While compassion is a professed cornerstone of Christianity, it is entirely absent in the outlook of Europe’s anti-choice. This movement would force women to carry unwanted pregnancies, restrict access to contraception, decide who can marry and decide who can call themselves a family. Many will be surprised that they also target divorce and access to IVF treatment. In doing so, they are attempting to foist their personal religious beliefs on others via public policy and law.

Depoliticising these issues and dealing in facts is the most effective way of combatting those attempting to enshrine traditions, culture and religious beliefs that violate human rights into law. Although this report is sobering reading, as President of the European Parliamentary Forum on Population & Development I can assure you that there are parliamentarians throughout the continent and across the political spectrum committed to resisting.

The report is an invaluable resource for them as well as for their political parties, civil society and journalists. Being aware and understanding this ultra-conservative movement is essential for those of us who want to safeguard a modern, inclusive and tolerant Europe.

Hon. Ulrika Karlsson, MP
President,
European Parliamentary Forum on Population & Development
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In 2013, an anonymous blog appeared in the ‘Brussels Bubble’ entitled ‘Agenda Europe’, which covered news and developments in European politics by critiquing legal and political advances in human rights in relation to sexuality and reproduction. Agenda Europe quickly became a go-to point for traditionalist perspectives on sexual and reproductive rights (SRR) and developed a reputation for its vitriolic language. In 2013 and 2014, various speeches from religious advocates herald the blog as a promising new initiative in the movement to preserve religious authority in the battle for sexual and reproductive rights. What is curiously missing, however, is any revelation as to who is behind the blog and what its contributors and benefactors ultimately hope to achieve.

In the summer of 2017, a number of documents eventually made their way to ARTE Television, some of which would appear to be related to Agenda Europe. These documents included programmes for a founding meeting in 2013 which would be called ‘Agenda Europe’ and subsequent annual Agenda Europe ‘Summits’, a social media master list with participants’ names, as well as the common manifesto for the Agenda Europe network, entitled *Restoring the Natural Order: an Agenda for Europe*. These documents reveal the architects of Agenda Europe, its mission and its inner workings.

*Restoring the Natural Order* provides an invaluable insight into the anti-SRR actors’ radical worldview, which would aim to undo decades of progress in human rights. To achieve this, *Restoring the Natural Order* proposes a normative framing against SRR based on the unifying concept of ‘Natural Law’, thus transcending specific, denominational theological considerations of Agenda Europe’s religiously inspired members. *Restoring the Natural Order*, together with the programmes for Agenda Europe’s annual meetings, expose Agenda Europe’s structure featuring a division of labour and specialization among the members. In short, these documents provide the playbook for the anti-SRR movement in Europe, what they hope to accomplish and how Agenda Europe has evolved to become the primary organizing nexus in Europe against human rights in sexuality and reproduction, behind over a dozen recent initiatives to roll back women’s and LGBTI human rights in at national level and through European institutions.

---

1 See the Agenda Europe blog at: https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com.
The idea for Agenda Europe crystallized in January 2013 at a strategic retreat in London which brought together “approximately 20 pro-life leaders and strategic consultants … from North America and Europe to network and discuss two main issues: developing a Christian-inspired European think tank, and developing strategies for the pro-life movement in Europe”.\(^4\) Organized jointly by an Austrian anti-SRR activist Gudrun Kugler\(^5\) and Terrence McKeegan\(^6\) from the USA, the 2013 London retreat was meant to be “… strictly confidential. This programme is not to be forwarded for any reason without permission of organizers.”

In the nascent period of Agenda Europe, Peadar O’Scolai of the Irish organization ‘Family and Life’ chaired a session on ‘Strategic Pro-Life Strategies’ where he asked participants to identify “achievable goals for the pro-life movement”.\(^7\) Kugler chaired another session dedicated to ‘Developing a Pan-European Think Tank Reflecting Christian Values’. She noted that “In Europe there is no Christian-inspired think tank to analyse current trends, draft answers, arguments, alternatives and shape languages. Complicated topics are left to NGOs [non-governmental organizations] or a few legislators to sort them out on their own.”\(^8\) She asked what form such a think tank should take, how it should operate and how it should be financed. The answers to the questions Kugler posed became apparent as a new European anti-SRR infrastructure emerged in 2013.

---

\(^4\) Agenda Europe Programme of Strategic Retreat, London, January 2013.
\(^5\) See Annex 2.
\(^6\) Ibid.
\(^7\) Agenda Europe Programme of Strategic Retreat, London, January 2013.
\(^8\) Ibid.
There are three components to the Agenda Europe infrastructure which emerge from the 2013 strategic retreat: an eponymous information-sharing blog; an annual meeting which organizers label a ‘Summit’; and a common manifesto entitled *Restoring the Natural Order: An Agenda for Europe*. These three components form the foundation of the Christian-inspired think tank Kugler aspired to create.

**AGENDA EUROPE - THE BLOG**

The first component of the Agenda Europe infrastructure to emerge, and for a long time the only visible part of the iceberg, was the Agenda Europe blog. The creators of Agenda Europe (the blog) state that they “have set up this website as a way to promote a society that is based on a consistent understanding of human dignity — a dignity which accrues to all human beings, from the moment of conception until their natural death”. The contributors to the blog remain anonymous and appear to be little more than three individuals. The blog is updated regularly, with new posts appearing several times a week. It demonstrates a Brussels insider’s perspective, as the comments follow political developments in the European Union (EU) institutions closely and demonstrate an understanding of EU decision-making. The tone of the blog is unique, often vitriolic and regularly offensive in its choice of vocabulary and level of personal attacks. With only 1,000 followers for the blog and 294 on Twitter, Agenda Europe remains very much a specialized information-sharing platform for those around the EU institutions proactively working against SRR, and, conversely, the actors monitoring anti-SRR and far-right movements.

---

9 Agenda Europe blog. See [https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com](https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com).

10 See [https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com/about](https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com/about).

11 The three contributors to Agenda Europe Wordpress go by the usernames ‘Admin’, ‘J.C.’ and ‘V.V.’.

12 See [https://humanistfederation.eu/radical-religious-lobbies/agenda-europe](https://humanistfederation.eu/radical-religious-lobbies/agenda-europe).

13 See [https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com/](https://agendaeurope.wordpress.com/) as of 1 September 2017.
AGENDA EUROPE – ANNUAL SUMMITS

The second component is the annual Agenda Europe 'Summit' gathering approximately 100–150 anti-SRR activists from around Europe.14 In 2014, the Summit took place in Fürstenried Castle15 outside Munich, the 2015 Summit was in Dublin, and the 2016 Summit was hosted by the Polish organization Ordo Iuris in Warsaw.16 The Summit programmes follow a set formula where, on the evening of arrival, participants are offered a reception and an inspirational keynote speech — for example, by Jakob Cornides,17 an administrator at the European Commission, or Rocco Buttiglione,18 an Italian politician who was rejected as Italy’s nominee to the European Commission, or Aleksander Stepkowski,19 Poland’s Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs. A celebration of holy mass in the morning is then followed by a two-day workshop with a format that varies from plenary presentations to thematic working groups where “critical strategies will be presented covering areas including surrogacy, religious freedom, euthanasia, marriage, and the rights of the unborn”.20

The programmes of each successive Summit reveal a steady progression of Agenda Europe as an advocacy network. Whereas at the 2013 Strategic Meeting the anti-SRR community was struggling to answer questions such as ‘How can we actually impact culture?’ and ‘What are our greatest challenges?’, the 2014 Summit managed to identify key areas of concern. These key areas included: the need to defend marriage; national lobbying against equality legislation; seeking accreditation with international institutions; and discussing a strategy against surrogacy.
In 2015, Agenda Europe took another further step forward by presenting five distinct thematic strategies, namely:

1) a strategy against euthanasia;
2) a strategy for religious freedom;
3) a strategy for marriage and the family;
4) a strategy opposing anti-discrimination legislation; and
5) a strategy against surrogacy.

The programmes suggest how organizations in Agenda Europe engaged in a division of labour exercise so that each strategy was led by one or two organizations and then presented to the collective. Other subjects discussed in 2015 include a presentation of a ‘UN Resource Guide’ by Sharon Slater of Family Watch International, lessons learned from the Irish marriage referendum and on ‘Planned Parenthood — how to bring the debate to Europe’ (referring to the false allegations circulating in the USA that Planned Parenthood was engaged in the illegal sale of foetal tissue).

By the 2016 Summit, participants had moved to discussing specific pieces of legislation they were hoping to influence or which they had initiated. Examples include the proposed bill in Poland for a complete ban on abortion in 2016 emanating from Ordo Iuris’s Civic Legislation Initiative ‘Universal Protection of Life’, an initiative to ban late abortion presented at the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) from the European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ), as well as several citizens’ initiatives on marriage such as the European Citizens’ Initiative (ECI) ‘Mum, Dad & Kids’ and the Citizens’ Initiative for Constitutional Marriage Protection in Romania.

Participants also strategized on how to influence ongoing legislative developments such as the ratification of the Istanbul Convention, threats from anti-discrimination laws, and raising awareness of the persecution of Christians. While Agenda Europe evolved into an increasingly strategic body with each Summit, a set of common instructions for each gathering was ‘no journalists’ and ‘Chatham House Rules’.

---

21  For example, the strategy against euthanasia was presented by Paul Moynan and Robert Clarke; the strategy on religious freedom by Gudrun Kugler and Luca Volontè; the strategy on marriage and the family by Edit Fridvalsky and Maria Hildingsson; the strategy on anti-discrimination legislation by Sophia Kuby and Adina Portaru; and the strategy against surrogacy by Grégor Puppinck and Leo van Doesburg.

22  See Annex 2.

23  For background on the IPPF’s charge of selling foetal tissue, see Glinza, Jessica. 2015. “Planned Parenthood ends fetal tissue sale: how did we get here.” The Guardian, 15 October 2015.


30  Agenda Europe Summit 2014 programme.
AGENDA EUROPE’S COMMON MANIFESTO: RESTORING THE NATURAL ORDER

The third component of Agenda Europe is the common manifesto around which members coalesce, entitled Restoring the Natural Order: an Agenda for Europe (RTNO or the manifesto). The manifesto is a 134-page, anonymous, undated and unbranded document which provides a detailed legal perspective against SRR, not from a religious perspective, but from a selective understanding of Natural Law.\(^{31}\) It is organized around five main chapters, the first addressing SRR through the specific Agenda Europe reading of Natural Law, followed by three chapters on the main areas of concern, including marriage and the family, the right to life, equality and anti-discrimination, and ends with a detailed strategy to address these. The manifesto’s anonymous author states “With this paper, therefore, our purpose is to offer a coherent overview of life and family issues, explaining how they interrelate and tracing a possible policy agenda to restore a legal order that is consistent with human dignity and Natural Law.”\(^{32}\) As to the status of the manifesto within Agenda Europe, the author states that “…each member organization should adhere to the problem analysis set out in this paper, as well as to the long term targets…. To adhere to this network, it is necessary to adhere to the package of values and policy targets set out in this paper.”\(^{33}\) Events referred to in Restoring the Natural Order suggest it was written in 2014–2015,\(^{34}\) and the language and writing style are similar to articles on the Agenda Europe blog, suggesting a common origin.\(^{35}\)

---

\(^{31}\) Definition of Natural Law: “a system of right or justice held to be common to all humans and derived from nature rather than from the rules of society, or positive law,” according to Encyclopædia Britannica. Agenda Europe members posit that conservative Christian religious positions on sexuality, reproduction and morality are drawn from Natural Law.

\(^{32}\) RTNO, page 7.

\(^{33}\) RTNO, page 116.

\(^{34}\) Reference to the ECI ‘One of Us’ as having been completed and transitioned to a federation on page 117 points to 2014–2015 as the period the document was drafted.

\(^{35}\) The consistent style suggests that it was written by a single person with an understanding of the EU political and legal context. The narrative contains syntax errors which suggest a native German speaker. The writing style is similar to articles on the Agenda Europe blog posted by the user who identifies himself as J.C.\(^{2}\). Comparison of the style and arguments used in RTNO with other published anti-SRR works — for example, Natural and Unnatural Law (2010) by Jakob Cornides (also an Agenda Europe member) — would point to him as the common source for RTNO and many blog posts on the Agenda Europe blog.
Restoring the Natural Order explicitly claims that it is not based on religious belief, but rather on Natural Law, “there is a Natural Law, which human reason can discern and understand, but which human will cannot alter”,36 and further that “it is the task and purpose of all positive legislation to transpose and enforce Natural Law.”37 The main challenge to Natural Law has been the ‘Cultural Revolution’,38 which was “more than anything else, a ‘sexual’ revolution”,39 and specifically that “the sexual act had to be dissociated from its primary purpose, procreation, and from all the responsibilities associated with it: contemporary society wants sex without procreation, and procreation without sex”.40 In addition, “in matters related to life, marriage, and the family, all is interconnected… the ‘Sexual Revolution’ comes as a package”,41 and that “it seems hardly possible to accept one part and reject the rest”.42 Specifically, “whoever finds the use of contraceptives ‘normal’ must also accept homosexuality, and whoever has accepted assisted procreation will find it difficult to argue against abortion”.43

With the understanding of the interconnectedness of the Cultural Revolution, “those wishing to halt the civilizational decline of the West and to overturn the Cultural Revolution must be consistent in their arguments”.44 And the manifesto emphasizes the urgency of overturning the Cultural Revolution: “We have a narrow time window of ten to twenty years left. If we do not use this time window, then the Western civilization, due to having embraced a perverse ideology, may easily have destroyed itself.”45 To save Western civilization from self-destruction, Restoring the Natural Order argues for radical changes in the areas of marriage and family, the protection of life and treatment of equality and non-discrimination.

36 RTNO, page 9.
37 Ibid.
38 By ‘Cultural Revolution’, the author of RTNO refers to the social changes which took place in the post-War era in the Western world resulting in greater women’s rights, such as divorce, contraception, abortion, equal pay and representation in politics.
39 RTNO, page 7.
40 Ibid. 41 Ibid. 42 Ibid. 43 Ibid. 44 Ibid. 45 RTNO, page 8.
MARRIAGE AND FAMILY

On marriage and the family, the manifesto states that “to define family as a married couple and their offspring is the first political priority.” Other definitions which could be inclusive of same-sex couples would “insult and demean all parents who raise children” and make it “impossible to recognize the specific contribution of families to the common good, and impossible to adopt policies that provide targeted support to families”. An expansive definition of the family as recently offered by some courts and, increasingly, in national legislation could be calamitous, as “this seemingly benign idea of extending the concept of family could be the most efficient way of abolishing it”.

In relation to marriage, “the first and primordial step is to recognize its procreative purpose” and that it is an institution “that exists in the interests of children, and, to some degree, in the interests of mothers who raise children”. Marriage (between a man and a woman) is “not just one of many options for two persons who want to found a family, but it is the only option that is morally acceptable”. On divorce, the manifesto finds that there are no international human rights which would oblige countries to allow divorce, and even that “legislation allowing a person to obtain a divorce too easily could be seen as violating the right to marriage”.

On LGBTI rights, the manifesto describes the Yogyakarta Principles (a set of human rights in sexuality and gender identity articulated by human rights experts) as “a pretentious vernacular in referring to non-heterosexual sexuality, the document that seeks to advance legal recognition and privileges for homosexuals”. However, instead of using the standard vernacular in referring to non-heterosexual sexuality, the manifesto recommends usage of the word ‘sodomy’ and further that “when speaking of sodomy, consistently use that term.” The manifesto defines sodomy “as a misuse of the human body and thus a negation of human dignity and devotes a section to "sodomy as a health risk". The manifesto states that “…the dangerous effects of decriminalizing sodomy have been underestimated. This provides strong arguments in favour of working for the re-introduction of laws that repress homosexual activity.”

Restoring the Natural Order places contraception in the section on family and marriage, rather than the right to life, because contraception “does not undermine the right to life, but the dignity of the sexual act, and hence of marriage.” Pointing to ‘social research’ without citing specific authors or studies, the manifesto claims there is a direct link between ‘contraceptive practices’ and extra-marital sexual relations, and this has then led to an increase in unwanted pregnancies and thus in abortions. The manifesto concludes that “the use of artificial contraceptive techniques is therefore by nature an inherently immoral act”. The manifesto considers contraception the tip of the iceberg in the Cultural War, stating that “the acceptance of homosexual, lesbian, and (ultimately) paedophile relationships seems thus a logical consequence of accepting artificial contraception”. Given that contraception can be harmful in so many ways, there are only two circumstances where its use may be morally acceptable, according to the manifesto: the first for “a woman living in a war zone who must fear rape”, and the second, in the case of male or female prostitutes, as prostitution “is in itself a violation of the sexual act and does not become more objectionable if contraceptive practices are used”. Thus Restoring the Natural Order concludes on contraception that “it appears perfectly legitimate for the State to adopt legislation that restricts or prohibits the use of artificial contraceptives”.

"The acceptance of homosexual, lesbian, and (ultimately) paedophile relationships seems thus a logical consequence of accepting artificial contraception.”

Restoring the Natural Order

46 RTNO, page 27.
47 Ibid. 48 Ibid.
49 For examples of the courts legalizing same-sex marriage: for Austria, see Reuters. 2017. “Austria's supreme court paves way for same-sex marriage from 2019.” Reuters website, 5 December 2017; and for the USA, see BBC. 2015. “US Supreme Court rules gay marriage is legal nationwide.” BBC website, 27 June 2015.
50 For examples of legislatures adopting same-sex marriage laws: for France, see Loi n° 2013-404 du 17 mai 2013 ouvrant le mariage aux couples de personnes de même sexe, JORF n° 0114 du 18 mai 2013, page 8253; and for the United Kingdom, see UK Parliament. 2013. “Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Bill (HC Bill 126), approved by the House of Commons in final reading on 16 July 2013.” Parliament.uk website.
52 RTNO, page 27.
53 RTNO, page 28.
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
56 The Yogyakarta Principles were written by a group of international human rights experts in 2006 to serve as a guide to human rights to outline a set of international principles relating to sexual orientation and gender identity which affirm binding international legal standards. See http://www.yogyakartaprinciples.org.
57 RTNO, page 25.
58 RTNO, page 127.
59 RTNO, page 45.
60 Ibid.
61 RTNO, page 50.
62 RTNO, page 54.
63 Ibid.
64 RTNO, page 55.
65 RTNO, page 56.
66 RTNO, page 57.
67 RTNO, page 59.
THE RIGHT TO LIFE

On the right to life, the manifesto affirms that “there can be no reasonable doubt that life begins at conception. That position is not grounded in ‘religious belief,’ but in reason and science.” In the same chapter, the manifesto clarifies that “…the death penalty is not in and by itself illegitimate” as one of the exemptions to the right to life. On abortion, it “in all cases destroys the life of an innocent and defenceless human being”, and “laws that legalize abortion … stand in clear contradiction to the natural law of morality”. This includes abortion in cases of rape, incest, foetal anomaly or health risk to the mother, as “if interpreted liberally, they de facto come close to allowing abortion ‘on demand’”. The manifesto decries the gradual accretion in international human rights law and treaty obligations on the right to abortion, instead favouring the precautionary principle which “might include constitutional provisions that clearly state a State’s obligation to protect or vindicate the life of unborn children”. Consequently, the manifesto asserts that “...abortion should be prohibited and subject to efficient and dissuasive sanctions, including criminal sanctions, for all persons involved (ie. not only the mother, but also the person performing the abortion)”. Other issues regarding the right to life which are raised include surrogacy, medically assisted procreation, use of embryonic stem cells, euthanasia and organ transplantation. Regarding pre-natal diagnostics, since they “…are hardly ever put to a use that is beneficial to the child that is subject to them... pre-natal diagnostics should be explicitly prohibited”, and since medically assisted reproduction involves the destruction of embryos, “the use of health insurance funds to finance assisted procreation procedures is an absurdity”.

EQUALITY AND ANTI-DISCRIMINATION

Restoring the Natural Order devotes a chapter to equality and anti-discrimination legislation in the fear that it would result in a “dictatorship of the majority”, which clearly is at odds with democratic principles. The manifesto maintains that it is especially important to exempt the private sector from its application, as, for example, in the case of affirmative action, “policies such as gender quotas are revelatory of the fact that ‘anti-discrimination’ has a truly Orwellian character”. The specific challenge of anti-discrimination legislation is that “by prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, the law attempts to exclude all moral judgements from a debate on what is essentially a moral issue”. Specifically, “anti-discrimination legislation, where it exists, is used to inappropriately curtail the freedom of opinion and expression of all those who have moral reservations against sodomy.”

Madrid, Spain - June 06, 2017: A publicity stunt organized by Hazte Oír in the centre of Madrid. The ‘anti-transgender bus’ has written on the side: Boys have penises, girls have vulvas. Say no to gender indoctrination.
AGENDA EUROPE’S STRATEGIES: “WE SHOULD NOT BE AFRAID TO BE UNREALISTIC OR EXTREMIST”

Restoring the Natural Order reflects on the circumstances which allowed the Cultural Revolutionaries to make headway: “the agenda of those lobbies was met either with no resistance at all, or (more frequently) with resistance that merely sought to defend the status quo”.82 This resistance helped mitigate the advances of the SRR protagonists, but not to halt it, and “this put the revolutionaries in a comfortable position: whatever they asked for, they could be sure to obtain at least half of it”.83 Consequently, the manifesto asserts that it is necessary to develop an offensive agenda — “...ie. a list of policy objectives that will hurt our opponents”84 — to halt and roll back the Cultural Revolution. It proclaims that “we should therefore not be afraid to be ‘unrealistic’ or ‘extremist’ in choosing our policy objectives”.85 The manifesto outlines a number of specific ‘unrealistic’ and ‘extremist’ strategies to advance Agenda Europe, and these serve as topics of discussion at the annual Summits.

STRATEGY 1: USE THE WEAPONS OF OUR OPPONENTS AND TURN THEM AGAINST THEM

A first strategy proposed is to “use the weapons of our opponents and turn them against them”.86 This takes several forms. One is to “debunk the opponents’ claim to ‘victim status’”87 — a claim which is attributed to a strategy devised by Kirk and Madsen to advance LGBT rights.88 This effectively took form when Agenda Europe denied the very existence of homophobia in Europe when it criticized a landmark report by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (EU FRA) on homophobia across Europe in 2014. Agenda Europe condemned the report for faulty methodology while promoting the idea that it formed part of the Kirk and Madsen strategy and overall that the EU FRA had wasted tax-payers’ money.89

82 RTNO, page 105.
83 Ibid.
85 RTNO, page 105.
86 RTNO, page 119.
89 See https://www.christianophobie.fr for France; and http://www.osservatoriocristianofobia.it for Italy.
The next stage is for religious people or Christians to position themselves as the new, real victims of the Cultural Revolution. By framing the conflict as one of defenders of faith versus intolerant, cultural revolutionaries, the concept of discrimination and intolerance against Christians, or “Christianophobia”, will blossom and conclusively show “to the audience that our opponents are not victims, but oppressors”. To this end, Kugler established the Observatory on Discrimination and Intolerance against Christians (OIDAC), which produces a regular report of accounts of such discrimination. The definition of discrimination against Christians is wide, ranging from physical and verbal violence against Christians, to calling into question the historical privileges of the Catholic Church or the democratic expression of anti-clerical views. Agenda Europe members consider a Christian who is not legally permitted to derogate from legislation on equality, hate speech or provision of health care a victim of discrimination. This is unsurprising, as “the kinds of laws that end up violating the rights of religious people are often pushed for by one of the three following groups: radical feminists, radical homosexual groups, and radical secularists.” In short, the very progress of SRR would constitute a form of discrimination against religious people. Agenda Europe dedicated a half-day discussion of its 2016 Summit to strategize on leveraging the persecution of Christians to advance an anti-SRR agenda.
“At times, we might, like our opponents, frame our issues in terms of ‘rights’,” states the manifesto. The second strategy is what the progressive community has labelled the ‘colonization of human rights’ — namely, the contortion of religiously-inspired positions on sexuality and reproduction to artificially resemble classical human rights language. This reflects a trend observed in the Holy See’s evolving use of SRR language at the United Nations (UN), where there has been “a general shift away from doctrinal arguments towards the use of more secular rhetoric, using sophisticated technical evidence and strategic interpretations of international human rights standards in order to communicate its position. However, the doctrinal underpinnings of the Holy See’s position have not been abandoned, rather, the Holy See has selectively appropriated accepted UN language to bolster its own influence.”

Examples offered include the “right of fathers to prevent the abortion of their children; the right of parents to be the first educators of their children; the right of children to receive correct information, not propaganda on sodomy”. At times, it can take the form of an existing human right and applying it in new contexts. For example, this would entail advocating for freedom of conscience to apply in reproductive health, specifically as regards to abortion and contraception, allowing SRR-related professionals a legal right to deny SRR care. Indeed, according to the manifesto, “‘conscience clauses’ should be considered a minimal human rights standard”.

An important aspect of this strategy is redefining human rights language and terminology. Here, the manifesto recommends that “it is much better for us to use all those words, including... ‘reproductive rights’, but at the same time making clear what meaning those words have for us. If that is done consistently, we might even succeed in ‘contaminating’ (or in fact, rectifying) the vocabulary that our opponents have crafted.” As such, the manifesto includes a table with a list of 14 ‘ambiguous words’ where one columns includes “what our opponents mean by it” and another entitled “what it really means”.

Further, the manifesto encourages creating an alternative meaning for established human rights and having these appear in academic works so as to influence academic debate. This reflects Agenda Europe’s operationalization into specific policy-influencing strategies of what the Holy See hierarchy had previously claimed in its Lexicon on the Family.

“‘Conscience clauses’ should be considered a minimal human rights standard.”

Restoring the Natural Order
PARIS, FRANCE - OCT. 5, 2014: A placard against IVF for LGBTQ is held during an anti-gay rights protest in Paris.

STRATEGY 3: MALIGN OPPONENTS AND NON-CONDUCTIVE INSTITUTIONS

“Violence is intrinsic in our opponents’ agenda”106 states Restoring the Natural Order. These opponents are identified as the abortion lobby, the lesbian and gay lobby, the radical feminist lobby and militant atheists.107 In the chapter on “the need to understand, and learn from, our opponents”108 the manifesto explains how the Cultural Revolutionaries engage in a set of insidious strategies which include: forestalling rational debate, propaganda and intimidation, as well as physical violence and bullying opponents into submission. Indeed, it asserts that “the use of intimidation and outright physical violence play an important role in the promotion of abortion as well as of the gay agenda”.109 For this reason, it is important to proactively strive to defund the “abortion and gay lobbies”.110

Regarding engagement with supranational institutions, the manifesto urges caution, as the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) and the EU FRA are “controlled by persons who strongly sympathize with the Cultural Revolution”.111 Thus, in relation to strategic litigation the advice is to “only bring cases where we have, on the basis of prior case law, a solid expectation of making our point of view prevail”.112 Instead, Agenda Europe should proactively attempt to “identify erroneous decisions and statements and criticize them publicly; identify and publicize the systemic shortcomings of those institutions (e.g. their recruitment, their self-reference and lack of openness, their lack of transparency); call into question the legitimacy of statements and decisions that are not in line with Natural Law.”113 However, some institutions may be so hopelessly lost to the Cultural Revolution, such as the EU FRA, that “one might ask whether it would not be better to simply dismantle the Institutions concerned”.114

---

106 RTNO, page 114.
107 RTNO, page 107, on the “Brussels turf”, they are identified as: International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), European Parliamentary Forum on Population and Development (EPF), Deutsche Stiftung Weltbevölkerung (DSW), Marie Stopes International (MSI), International Lesbian and Gay Association-Europe (ILGA-Europe), European Women’s Lobby (EWL) and European Humanist Federation (EHF).
108 RTNO, page 106.
110 RTNO, pages 125 (ILGA) and 129 (IPPF).
111 RTNO, page 120. | 112 RTNO, page 120. | 113 RTNO, page 121. | 114 Ibid.
Network-building is an important strategy for Agenda Europe. The manifesto notes that “our adversaries act globally, having set up closely knit networks of non-governmental organizations, politicians, and similar public servants. To be successful in our fight, we need to set up a similar network.” Creating such a network would have several potential advantages. One of them would be “to be recognized and respected as an interlocutor at international and UN level”. At the 2014 Agenda Europe Summit, Kugler and Paul Coleman of the Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) International led a session entitled ‘Marching through the International Institutions’, based on their work The Global Human Rights Landscape on how NGOs can “enter the international and supranational institutions”. Kugler and Coleman emphasize that organizations should become accredited in all relevant institutions. The members then update each other on where things stand at the UN Human Rights Council, the EU FRA, the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), and Grégor Puppinck of the ECLI provides a briefing on third-party interventions before the ECHR and the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and the procedure for nominating judges. A result of successful networking would be infiltrating key institutions and the manifesto recommends that Agenda Europe strive to “bring in the right people into the right institutions” and this can start by “drawing up a list of key positions that will become vacant”, including key UN personnel, such as in Treaty Monitoring Bodies, Special Rapporteurs and judges on the ECJ and ECHR as well as in the EU institutions.

Another benefit of networking would be to enhance the potential for fundraising. Noting that the EU provides significant funding to civil society that act EU-wide, the manifesto observes that “...it certainly would be possible also for us to benefit from them, if we meet the conditions. This would increase our budget and, at the same time, diminish that of our opponents.” In this respect, the anti-SRR actors are already making good progress, as “in the aftermath of the European Citizens’ Initiative ONE OF US, there is now a momentum towards a European Federation of pro-life organizations”, and there “could be similar federations to specifically deal with other issues set out in this paper, such as marriage and family, religious freedom, etc...”
WHO IS BEHIND AGENDA EUROPE?

IDENTIFYING THE KEY PLAYERS

“Agenda Europe is the only European network dedicated to bringing the main European NGOs together to design a common strategy to advance an authentic human rights agenda. Since its establishment, it has grown to include the key pro-life and pro-family leaders in every European country”, according to the Agenda Europe organizers of the 2015 Dublin Summit. The documents reveal that Agenda Europe is composed of approximately 100–150 individuals from at least 50 conservative European NGOs working against various aspects of SRR which they themselves sub-divide as ‘pro-life’ (anti-choice) and pro-family (anti-LGBT) organizations, spanning over 30 European countries. Several categories of players emerge: the organizers, the insiders, the luminaries, the implementers and the possible financiers.

Vatican surrogates catalysed the Christian, anti-SRR community in Europe and leveraged Catholic institutions to create a space where Agenda Europe members could discreetly convene and strategize, away from public scrutiny, but under the helpful gaze of the Holy See.

125 Agenda Europe 2015 Summit programme.
THE ORGANIZERS: VATICAN SURROGATES

Agenda Europe is a European civil society movement which convenes actors from all Christian denominations. While the majority are Catholic, the main traditionalist Protestants and Orthodox representatives are also fully involved. Nonetheless, Catholic actors and institutions with direct links to the Vatican hierarchy are the central organizers in Agenda Europe. The Holy See has traditionally led the resistance to the advance of SRR in a range of settings, including at the UN. First, the two individuals who convened the 2013 Strategic Meeting, Gudrun Kugler and Terrence McKeegan, are both Catholic political activists. For example, Kugler is a visiting lecturer at the Vatican-created International Theological Institute (ITI) and has carried out a number of functions for the Holy See. McKeegan, the co-convener, has a long pedigree in anti-SRR organizations and, most importantly, served as Legal Adviser for the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the UN. Thus, the two original conveners of the meeting to launch Agenda Europe have close professional connections with the Holy See hierarchy. Other leaders in Agenda Europe with similar connections are Grégor Puppinck of the ECLJ, who regularly represents the Holy See on various Council of Europe bodies, and Luca Volonté, who received overt support from the Holy See in his bid to be elected Chair of the European Peoples’ Party (EPP) group in the PACE in 2010.

Next, Catholic institutions rolled out the red carpet for Agenda Europe Summits. For example, the ITI was thanked for its cooperation in organizing the 2013 meeting in London, and the second meeting in Munich took place in Fürstenried Castle, a property which serves as a spiritual retreat for the Catholic Bishopric of Munich. In addition, several prominent Catholic clergy representatives graced Agenda Europe Summits with their presence. In short, Vatican surrogates catalysed the Christian, anti-SRR community in Europe and leveraged Catholic institutions to create a space where Agenda Europe members could discreetly convene and strategize, away from public scrutiny, but under the helpful gaze of the Holy See.

---

126 For example, Protestant representatives include Leo Van Doesburg of the ECPM, and Orthodox representatives include Alexey Komov. See Annex 2.


128 Pope John Paul II founded the ITI in 1996. It describes itself as ecclesiastical, private and Roman Catholic. See https://iti.ac.at.

129 See Kugler’s CV: https://iti.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/user_upload/Academic-Life/Academic.CV_KUGLER_Gudrun_Web.pdf.

130 See Annex 2.


134 Agenda Europe 2013 Strategic Meeting programme.

135 See https://www.erzbistum-muenchen.de/Ordinariat/Ressort-5-Bildung/Exerzitienhaus-Schloss-Fuerstenried.

136 Such as Fr Tadej Strehovec of the Slovenian Bishops’ Conference on ‘What can we learn from the Slovenian Referendum on Protection of Marriage?’ at the 2016 Summit; H.E. the Most Rev. Charles John Brown, the Apostolic Nuncio to Ireland, at the 2015 Agenda Europe Summit; and Mgr Gintas Grusas of Lithuania at the 2016 Summit.
THE INSIDERS: POLITICAL LEADERS AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

The Vatican has formulated clear guidelines for how it expects Catholic politicians to act in public life on matters related to Church teachings in its ‘Doctrinal Note on some questions regarding The Participation of Catholics in Political Life’.137 Agenda Europe serves as a nexus for a number of these politicians and illustrates the access to decision-making that anti-SRR movements have achieved in national parliaments, governments and European institutions. At a ministerial level, Agenda Europe was able to attract personalities from Poland such as the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Konrad Szymanski,138 who spoke at the 2016 Summit, and the Polish Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs in 2016, Aleksander Stepkowski,139 who was also President of Ordo Iuris and a regular participant in Agenda Europe Summits.140

A number of politicians appear as members of Agenda Europe, among them anti-SRR political leaders such as Senator Ronan Mullen141 from Ireland, Luca Volonté142 of Italy and Zeljka Markić, founder of the Croatian political party HRAST. Volonté was the President of the largest political party in the PACE, the EPP.143 From inside the European Parliament, Paul Moynan,144 a political advisor to the European Conservatives and Reformist Party (ECR),145 attended several Summits. Leo van Doesburg, Director of European Affairs of the European Christian Political Movement (ECPM),146 a European political party with a network of national political parties across 20 European countries, was also a regular Agenda Europe participant. Senator Mullen and Markić’s party HRAST are themselves affiliated with the ECPM.147 From the European institutions, Jakob Cornides,148 an official at the Directorate-General for Trade at the European Commission, features as a speaker at the 2014 Agenda Europe Summit. Finally, Jan Figeľ,149 former EU Commissioner and currently EU Special Envoy for Freedom of Religion or Belief, was a guest speaker at the 2016 Summit.150

In sum, Agenda Europe included political representatives, at times the leadership, of a range of political parties which spanned the centre-right of the political spectrum, ranging from the EPP to the ECR and the ECPM. Altogether, Agenda Europe cultivated a network of dedicated followers inside a range of national parliaments, the PACE, the European Parliament (EP), individual political parties and the European Commission.

Agenda Europe cultivated a network of dedicated followers inside a range of national parliaments, the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, individual political parties and the European Commission.

139 See Annex 2.
140 According to Agenda Europe draft programmes 2015–2016.
141 See Annex 2.1 142 Ibid.
143 See Annex 2.
144 European Conservatives and Reformist Group (ECR): http://ecrgroup.eu.
147 See Annex 2.1
148 Ibid.
149 Agenda Europe 2016 Summit programme.
THE LUMINARIES: ANTI-SRR TRANSNATIONAL THOUGHT AND STRATEGY LEADERS

Every community has prominent members who generate much of the original thinking for their movement: these are the luminaries. Luminaries are often those actors who operate transnationally and develop thematic strategies for national implementers to take, adapt and domesticate to their national contexts. The Agenda Europe Summits attracted such anti-SRR luminaries to mobilize the community on their specific area of expertise. In addition to those who developed the five strategies (on euthanasia, religious freedom, marriage/family, anti-discrimination and surrogacy) presented at the 2015 Summit,151 other luminaries included Kugler, who brought her expertise in leveraging discrimination against Christians to meet an anti-SRR objective, and Kuby who brought her legal and policy expertise of EU public affairs.

Sophia Kuby’s mother, Gabrielle Kuby, the person who discovered the global threat that was ‘gender ideology’152 was also a key luminary who participated in the Summits. Puppink contributed his expertise on legal mobilization — specifically, on abortion and surrogacy — Leo van Doesburg of the ECPM covered network-building among Christian political parties, while Maria Hildingsson153 of the European Federation of Catholic Family Associations (FAFCE)154 addressed the legal procedures on conscientious objection aimed at Sweden.155 Some provided briefings to national actors on how to implement European campaigns in a national context — for example, by representatives of ADF and Ordo Iuris against the ratification of the Istanbul Convention. Luca Volonté of the Fondazione Nuova Terra (FNT) contributed his expertise on religious freedom initiatives at the PACE, and Ignacio Arsuaga of Hazte Oir on crowdfunding for socially conservative issues.156 The above are all listed as having participated as speakers or resources persons in at least three Agenda Europe meetings.157

Because the anti-SRR community in the United States has several decades more experience than its European counterparts, US luminaries also frequented Agenda Europe Summits. These include Brian Brown158 of the National Organization for Marriage (NOM), Lila Rose159 of Live Action, Marie Smith160 of Priests for Life and Sharon Slater161 of Family Watch International.

THE IMPLEMENTERS: NATIONAL ROLL-OUT OF THE AGENDA EUROPE’S MANIFESTO

Agenda Europe Summits gather a veritable ‘who’s who’ of the anti-choice and anti-LGBT national movements around Europe. While the luminaries have etched out the overall thematic strategies for the region, the national implementers take, adapt and run with these strategies in a manner which is adapted to their context, taking into account the political opportunities in each country. These include the anti-LGBT leaders such as: Ludovine de la Rochère162 of the French homophobic marches of 2013; Zeljka Markic, the architect of the 2013 Croatian traditional marriage referendum; and Bogdan Stanciu of Provita Romania163 on the Citizens’ Initiative on Traditional Marriage. Among the anti-choice leaders are the drafters of the 2016 abortion ban in Poland (Ordo Iuris) and catalysts of the 2013 abortion restrictions in Spain (Hazte Oir), who shared their respective experiences at the annual Summits. Others shared their modern, innovative approaches, such as Emile Duport164 of the French organization Les Survivants.165 Through its ‘Act-Up’-inspired shock tactics, Les Survivants claims that everyone in French society shares a collective trauma of potentially having been the one in every five pregnancies which ends in abortion. This organisation even developed a Pokemon app where the aim of the game is to save the Pikachu from abortionists.166

Agenda Europe Summits show how these national actors update each other on developments of mutual interest in their respective national settings and share experience and know-how transnationally. Moreover, these settings fostered the development of transnational initiatives which required cross-border collaboration, such as an ECI on the protection of marriage ‘Mum, Dad & Kids’ (see 7.1).

---

162 See Annex 2.
164 See Annex 2.
LIKELY FINANCIERS: ARISTOCRATS, BILLIONAIRES AND OLIGARCHS, CORRUPT POLITICIANS AND CLIMATE CHANGE DENIERS

The organizers of the strategic retreat in London in 2013 posed a question as to how Agenda Europe's activities would be funded. While there is no clear answer as to who has provided funding, examining the programmes and the participants can provide some leads. Some participants would appear to have no other purpose except for their connections to potential sources of funding.

First, several participants at the London meeting merit attention for their well-attested connections to conservative donors. These are Vincente Segu, Archduke Imre of Hapsburg-Lorraine and Oliver Hylton, Vincente Segu, who heads the Mexican anti-SRR organization Incluyendo Mexico, is well connected with the Mexican billionaire Patrick Slim Domit, a funder of the anti-abortion movement in Mexico and globally and the son of one of the world’s richest men, Carlos Slim. Archduke Imre and his wife, Archduchess Kathleen, representing the Hapsburg-Lorraine family (the former imperial family of Austria), have extended their patronage to a range of anti-SRR initiatives.

A third person present at the London meeting was Oliver Hylton. Hylton was the asset manager for a UK Conservative party donor, Sir Michael Hintze, himself known for his financial support to a climate-change denying think tank and is a donor to the ECPM.

Another participant of interest at the 2014 Summit, Alexey Komov, representing the Russian Orthodox Church, is also a programme officer at the Saint Basil the Great Charitable Foundation in Russia, a foundation that supports socially conservative causes set up by far-right Russian oligarch Konstatin Malofeev. Komov is responsible for international projects at the Foundation. Finally, there is Luca Volonté, former Italian MP and also founder of the Fondazione Novae Terrae (FNT). The FNT supported anti-SRR initiatives, including some arising from within Agenda Europe, such as the ECI ‘Mum, Dad & Kids’ (see section 7.1.1). From the founding of FNT until 2016, the only source of funding appears to be €3 million, likely earned through illicit means, and originating from payments by actors on behalf of the Government of Azerbaijan to secure favourable outcomes on human rights votes in the PACE. In 2017, Luca Volonté was facing corruption charges in Italy and an investigation at the PACE.

Overall, potential donors to the overall Agenda Europe programme appear to include a colourful cast comprising an anti-abortion Mexican billionaire, European aristocracy, a British climate-change denying billionaire, a far-right Russian oligarch and a corrupt Italian politician in the pay of Azerbaijan. In sum, the personal wealth of these Agenda Europe participants is US$5.3 billion for Patrick Slim, between US$63 million and US$207 million for the Hapsburg-Lorraine family, US$2.1 billion for Sir Michael Hintze and US$225 million for Konstatin Malofeev.

Potential donors to the overall Agenda Europe programme appear to include a colourful cast comprising an anti-abortion Mexican billionaire, European aristocracy, a British climate-change denying billionaire, a far-right Russian oligarch and a corrupt Italian politician in the pay of Azerbaijan.

171 ECPM annual report to the European Parliament 2014: see page 7 referring to a €10,000 donation from Sir Michael Hintze. 
172 See Annex 2. I Ibid. I Ibid. 
173 Ibid. 
174 Ibid.
175 Ibid.
FIGURE 1. OVERVIEW OF AGENDA EUROPE KEY PLAYERS
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Demonstration against the Istanbul Convention in Zagreb, Croatia in 2017.
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ROLLING OUT THE AGENDA EUROPE STRATEGY

Restoring the Natural Order concludes with an ambitious 10-page action list with long-, medium- and short-term targets in the areas of marriage and the family, life, and equality and anti-discrimination laws.\(^{181}\) Table 1 provides an overview of Agenda Europe’s policy ‘to-do’ list, including laws to repeal or prohibit certain rights and other laws to adopt to restore the natural order, as well as non-legislative actions.

Restoring the Natural Order concludes with an ambitious 10-page action list with long-, medium- and short-term targets in the areas of marriage and the family, life, and equality and anti-discrimination laws.

\(^{181}\) RTNO, pages 125–134.
TABLE 1. AGENDA EUROPE’S POLICY ‘TO-DO’ LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laws to repeal/Issues to prohibit</th>
<th>Laws to adopt</th>
<th>Non-legislative actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01. Repeal laws on same-sex partnerships and civil partnerships</td>
<td>04. Anti-sodomy laws</td>
<td>09. Defund the LGBT and abortion lobbies and end funding for abortion in Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02. Repeal all laws allowing divorce</td>
<td>05. Laws that make divorce more difficult</td>
<td>10. Revise sex education classes to reflect Natural Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03. Repeal all laws which allow gay adoption</td>
<td>06. Ensure marriage is treated more favourably (tax and social laws)</td>
<td>11. Support resolutions against surrogacy in the EP and PACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Prohibit sale of all pharmaceutical contraceptives</td>
<td>17. Conscience clauses for all doctors and pharmacists (to provide a legal right to deny care)</td>
<td>12. Emphasize the ‘choice’ aspect of sodomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Prohibit contracts involving provision of abortion, contraceptives and sterilization</td>
<td>18. Abortion bans in all jurisdictions, including in international law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Prohibit ante-natal diagnostics</td>
<td>19. International convention prohibiting all use of human stem cells</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Abolition of all equality legislation at national level</td>
<td>27. Communicate legal uncertainty and administrative burdens caused by antidiscrimination laws</td>
<td>29. Criticize the case made by supporters of anti-discrimination laws (for example, ILGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Prevent adoption of the 5th equal treatment directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Restoring the Natural Order** is not merely an aspirational to-do list, but very much a living action plan which Agenda Europe members have actively pursued at the EU and PACE and in various national settings. Below are some examples of how Agenda Europe members have taken forward the objectives laid out in the manifesto, including both coordinated European-level actions and national member-led initiatives.

---


183 See ILGA-Europe’s key demands for ensuring the enjoyment of the right to health and access to health without discrimination, [https://www.ilga-europe.org/resources/policy-papers/ilga-europes-key-demandsensuring-enjoyment-right-health-and-access-health](https://www.ilga-europe.org/resources/policy-papers/ilga-europes-key-demandsensuring-enjoyment-right-health-and-access-health)
CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION FOR THE ‘TRADITIONAL FAMILY’

The area where Agenda Europe has arguably been most successful has been in marriage and family — namely, in halting expanding marriage rights to same-sex couples. The preferred method has been to enlist citizens launch initiatives, such as formal petitions, that urge public bodies to act by holding referenda or engage in other official procedures.

Agenda Europe national members employed such citizen engagement approaches to halt progress in the field of equal marriage in Croatia, Slovenia, Slovakia and, most recently, Romania. Starting in 2013, the Croatian NGO In the Name of the Family (U ime obitelji)\(^{184}\) collected 700,000 signatures by May 2014 to call for a national referendum to amend the Constitution to define marriage as a union between a man and a woman. The referendum easily passed, with 66% of the electorate in favour.\(^{185}\) Shortly thereafter, Agenda Europe members in Slovenia attempted a similar approach to halt a parliamentary initiative in 2015 to expand the definition of marriage. With 64% of voters in favour of rejecting the proposal, Agenda Europe members successfully stopped a progressive law on the subject for two years.\(^{186}\) That same year, Agenda Europe members in Slovakia tried to replicate the success of their Balkan neighbours in a referendum calling for a traditional definition of marriage in the Constitution. However, with only 21% of the electorate casting a vote, the referendum failed.\(^{187}\) In 2016, the Romanian members followed suit and managed to collect 3 million signatures to call for a constitutional referendum on a traditional definition of marriage.\(^{188}\) A referendum was planned for 2018.\(^{189}\)

At EU level, Agenda Europe provided a fertile setting for coordination among members. An example is the work on the ECI on traditional marriage which became ‘Mum, Dad & Kids’.\(^{190}\) At the 2014 Summit, Luca Volonté presented his idea for a “pro-family initiative in Europe”.\(^{191}\) Later in 2014, on Volonté’s invitation, a sub-group of Agenda Europe members met and noted “During our last meeting in Milan on our European Initiative (ECI) to promote Family (also through the principle of subsidiarity), we carried on with the juridical evaluations of the text and started thinking about best organizational opportunities.”\(^{192}\) The members then divided up the tasks among them to launch the ECI. First, in terms of funding, “the budget plan was approved (100,000 Euro). Novae Terrae Foundation will cover these costs.”\(^{193}\) After funding comes finding consensus among the members, setting deadlines and ensuring that the initiative is legally sound, “so we have to be serious and respect dates, suggestions and reflections... Send Jacob Cornides and Javier Borrego194 only new and short amendments for the juridical document by 31 December 2014.”\(^{195}\) Finally, they discussed further identifying national focal points and distributed roles among themselves, as well as key other aspects to launch the ECI in December 2015. Despite this organization, the ECI failed to gather the requisite number of signatures by the legal deadline.\(^{196}\)

In summary, Agenda Europe members managed to stop the progress of LGBT rights in Croatia (2013) and Slovenia (2015). Their initiatives failed in Slovakia (2015) and at EU level (2017), while it is ongoing in Romania.\(^{197}\) During the same timeframe, the following countries have achieved progress in same-sex marriage: France and the UK in 2013, Ireland and Luxembourg in 2015, and Austria, Finland, Germany and Malta in 2017.\(^{198}\)

---

184 See [http://uimeobitelji.net](http://uimeobitelji.net).


191 Agenda Europe 2014 Summit programme.

192 ECI 11-12 Dec: Mum, Dad & Kids summing letter.

193 Ibid.

194 Javier Borrego is a former judge at the ECHR and Research Fellow at the ECLJ. See [https://eclj.org/writers/javier-borrego](https://eclj.org/writers/javier-borrego).

195 ECI 11-12 Dec: Mum, Dad & Kids summing letter.


197 Note that not all anti-LGBT initiatives in Europe can be attributed to Agenda Europe members.

198 See [https://www.ilga-europe.org/rainboweurope](https://www.ilga-europe.org/rainboweurope).
ROLLING BACK ABORTION RIGHTS IS HARDER THAN EXPECTED

Agenda Europe has been ambitious, but not successful, in advancing its objectives under the banner of ‘life’, principally to undermine the legal right to abortion and to stigmatize it. The most spectacular measures were the initiatives of Agenda Europe members Hazte Oir for the proposed abortion restrictions in Spain in 2013–2014 and Ordo Iuris for the draft abortion ban in Poland in 2016. Following mass protests in each country, the respective governments realized that the measures went too far and withdrew the bills. However, Agenda Europe scored intermediate victories, as the Spanish government tightened its abortion law to require minors to obtain parental consent, and, as of March 2018, the Polish government is considering restricting abortion in cases of foetal anomaly.

Another failed attempt, this time to stigmatize abortion by focusing on funding, was the ECI entitled ‘One of Us’. Launched in 2013, it aimed to stop all EU funding for activities involving the destruction of human embryos, including in stem-cell research and maternal health in developing countries (as it could include abortion). Coordinated by Puppinck, ‘One of Us’ involved most Agenda Europe national members and was among the more successful ECIs, succeeding in collecting over 1 million signatures. However, given the initiative’s fundamentally flawed legal reasoning, the European Commission unambiguously rejected the ECI in May 2014.

Yet another attempt to stigmatize abortion funding and actors associated with abortion services took place in 2015. Planned at the Agenda Europe 2015 Summit, where Kuby of ADF raised the question of how to bring the Planned Parenthood scandal in the USA to Europe, ADF and allied anti-SRR MEPs forcefully interrupted a meeting organized by the International Planned Parenthood Federation European Network (IPPF EN) in the EP in September 2015, bringing the same false allegations circulating in the United States regarding the illegal sale of foetal tissue. The following month, ADF organized an event entitled ‘You Can’t Put a Price on a Baby’s Heart: The Sale of Baby Organs’ featuring Lila Rose of Live Action as a keynote speaker and leading the Twitter campaign #DefundIPPF.

Bridging Agenda Europe’s objectives of undermining abortion rights and asserting a legal right for Christians to derogate from legislation based on their religious beliefs, Agenda Europe members have focused on conscientious objection in reproductive health in Sweden as their primary target. Starting in 2015, FACCE launched a collective complaint under the European Social Charter (ESC) against Sweden for failing to allow conscientious objection in the field of reproductive health. The ESC thoroughly rejected FACCE’s assertion that this was a form of discrimination. Separately, in Sweden, Scandinavian Human Rights Lawyers (SHRL) took the case of a Swedish midwife through the Swedish legal system, claiming she had been the victim of discrimination because, as a Christian, she refused to participate in abortion and, therefore, could not get hired as a midwife. When SHRL exhausted legal avenues in Sweden in 2017, ADF announced it would take the case to the ECHR. Another case concerns a family doctor in Norway who refuses to prescribe contraception, claiming a conflict with her religious convictions. The case is going through the Norwegian legal system with ADF guidance.

Notwithstanding how the drastic abortion restrictions attempted in Spain and Poland ultimately failed spectacularly, Agenda Europe members achieved intermediate restrictions. Attempts to cut EU Official Development Assistance to abortion also failed and never attracted the public attention they did in the United States. Finally, litigating abortion restrictions through conscience clauses is only beginning, but has already registered early failures in national and European settings.

---

212 The European Social Charter is a Council of Europe treaty that guarantees fundamental social and economic rights as a counterpart to the European Convention on Human Rights, which refers to civil and political rights. https://www.coe.int/en/web/turin-european-social-charter.
DO CHRISTIANS HAVE A LEGAL RIGHT TO FOMENT HATE?

The focus of Agenda Europe in the area of discrimination has been to push for the recognition of an expansive definition of religious discrimination and intolerance, against Christians specifically, with a view to leveraging this recognition to advance anti-SRR objectives by seeking a legal right to derogate from equality legislation. This activity has targeted the PACE and the EU with varying degrees of success.

Between 2011 and 2013, Luca Volonté tabled three initiatives at the PACE on discrimination against Christians\textsuperscript{218} using the same expansive definition of discrimination and intolerance as the OIDAC (see section 5.1). While Volonté’s election defeat in 2013 forced him to leave the PACE, his work was taken up by his close ally, Valeriu Ghiletchi, MP from Moldova.\textsuperscript{219} Ghiletchi kept the torch alive by tabling the same initiative in 2015, which resulted in PACE Resolution 2036 (2015) on tackling intolerance and discrimination in Europe with a special focus on Christians.\textsuperscript{220} According to progressive actors, the original wording included several problematic paragraphs regarding equality legislation, conscientious objection and the rights of young people to sex education, to the extent that it would have violated recent ECJ rulings.\textsuperscript{221} Even though Ghiletchi’s initiative was eventually adopted in January 2015, progressive PACE members successfully introduced several amendments which neutralized the problematic wording.\textsuperscript{222}

Agenda Europe members were more successful at the EP in both anchoring their understanding of discrimination against Christians and achieving another stated objective, that of “placing the right people in the right places”. Starting with an event organized by ADF at the EP in February 2016 on the persecution of Christians by ISIS,\textsuperscript{223} the EP adopted a Resolution in February calling for the creation of a new position of a ‘permanent Special Representative for Freedom of Religion and Belief’.\textsuperscript{224} The Resolution was discussed at a meeting of the EPP in March, where the leadership approved the suggestion of Jan Figel to fill the new position.\textsuperscript{225} He was then announced in May 2016 as the new Special Envoy for this position on a visit to the Vatican by the heads of three EU institutions.\textsuperscript{226} Figel is part of the Agenda Europe network, having participated in its Summits and in One of Us Federation meetings in Paris in 2016. Currently, he is situated in the European Commission’s Development Commissioner’s Directorate,\textsuperscript{227} which oversees development funding, including for SRR in developing countries.

Overall, while Agenda Europe members have been particularly persistent in seeking specific recognition of discrimination against Christians, this has only met with limited success. In both the EU and PACE, any progress can largely be attributed to current events related to the crimes perpetrated by ISIS against civilian populations in the Middle East rather than a recognition by either institution of the phenomenon as purported by Agenda Europe members.

\textsuperscript{218} Violence against Christians, Motion for a resolution, Doc. 12542, 17 March 2011; Safeguarding human rights in relation to religion and belief, and protecting religious communities from violence, Resolution 1928 (2013); and Violence against the Christian community in northern Nigeria, Written declaration No. 531, Doc. 13013, 6 February 2013.
\textsuperscript{219} See Annex 2.
\textsuperscript{220} See specifically paragraph 6.2.3 of the final text: http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/xref/xref-xml2htmlen.asp?fileid=21549&lang=en.
\textsuperscript{221} See ‘Never again’, ADF International’s campaign against genocide of Christians and other religious minorities in the Middle East: https://adfinternational.org/regions/europe/campaigns/genocide.
\textsuperscript{222} European Parliament Resolution of 4 February 2016 on the systematic mass murder of religious minorities by so-called IS/IS/ISIS (2016/2529(RSP)).
As encouraged in *Restoring the Natural Order*, Agenda Europe members have also made progress in influencing academic discussion and seeking accreditation with international institutions. For example, Puppinck has written several articles which have been published in academic journals.228 However, as Zacharenko notes, “Anti-choice publications...are not widely accepted by the academic community as they are... based on poor methodology.”229 Regarding accreditation with international institutions, several Agenda Europe members have registered with the EU FRA230 and, in some cases, gaining positions of influence on the Fundamental Rights Platform’s Advisory Panel.231 In addition, Hazte Oir and Ordo Iuris have both recently acquired UN ECOSOC status.232 In terms of placing the right people in the right place, in addition to placing Figel in the European Commission, Agenda Europe registered a minor victory in having Puppinck appointed to the OSCE Panel of Experts on Freedom of Religion or Belief and an Expert to the Council of Europe in 2016.233

### Academic publications

### UN ECOSOC Status

### Legal advocacy infrastructure with new offices in Brussels, Geneva and Strasbourg

### Strategy to tarnish the reputation of opponents

In terms of network-building, Agenda Europe has made some progress. After the conclusion of the ECI process, the French Jérôme Lejeune Foundation234 took over One of Us and transformed it into a ‘pro-life’ federation registered as a non-profit organization in Belgium.235 An update on the One of Us Federation was presented at the 2016 Summit, where it would appear that it has become the main vehicle for Agenda Europe’s members’ activities against abortion.236 In terms of strategic litigation, the most noteworthy achievement by Agenda Europe members is the expansion of an anti-SRR litigation infrastructure, with ADF International offices opening up in Brussels (March 2015) to engage with EU institutions, Geneva (September 2015) to be present at the UN Human Rights Council, and Strasbourg (February 2016) to engage with the ECHR and the Council of Europe.237

While building up their own network and infrastructure, Agenda Europe members simultaneously attempted to tarnish the reputation of the main actors of the Cultural Revolution. In addition to targeting IPPF (see 7.2), Agenda Europe also targeted its national members with a campaign against the Spanish IPPF member to strip it of its public utility status.238 Agenda Europe had its sights on ILGA-Europe, which became the victim of a harassment campaign about the source of its funding and accusations that it is a ‘fake’ NGO because it depends on public funding.239 This is in addition to the Agenda Europe blog regularly targeting progressive leaders active in European institutions.240

---


229 Zacharenko (2016).

230 As of 31 July 2017, the following Agenda Europe members were members of the EU FRA’s Fundamental Rights Platform: Citizen Go, FAFCE, U ime Obitelj, Ordo Iuris, OIDAC and SHRL. See http://fra.europa.eu/en/cooperation/civil-society/about-frp/organisations.


235 See the registration of the One of Us Federation: https://oneofus.eu/about-us/transparency.

236 See https://oneofus.eu.

237 See https://adfinternational.org/about-us/who-we-are/history.

238 See the campaign by Abogados Cristianos against the FPFE’s public utility status: https://www.abogadoscristianos.es/la-fpfe-noesutil.


ASSESSMENT OF AGENDA EUROPE’S ADVOCACY REPertoire

With over four years of strategic organizing, it is possible to make an initial assessment of Agenda Europe’s advocacy repertoire. The degree of success is mixed. Agenda Europe has been more successful in halting progress in equal marriage, but mainly in countries where homophobic attitudes were more prevalent.241 In relation to abortion rights, Agenda Europe has been noticeably less successful, and the signs are that it is likely to be similarly unsuccessful in terms of discrimination. Table 2 provides an overview of 10 anti-SRR initiatives in eight countries and four pan-European institutions which can be attributed to Agenda Europe members.242

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Agenda Europe member</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Traditional marriage petition and referendum</td>
<td>In the Name of the Family (U ime obitelji)</td>
<td>Petition successful: 700,000 signatures collected Referendum successful: 66% in favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Petition and referendum to halt same-sex marriage</td>
<td>Children at stake</td>
<td>Petition successful Referendum successful: 64% in favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Traditional marriage referendum</td>
<td>Slovenian Bishops’ Conference</td>
<td>Failed: electoral threshold not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–2017</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Traditional marriage petition and referendum</td>
<td>Coalition for the Family</td>
<td>Petition successful: 3 million signatures collected Referendum pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

241 See Homonegativity in Eastern Europe at http://www.europenowjournal.org/2017/07/05/homonegativityin-eastern-europe/.

242 These initiatives can be attributed to Agenda Europe, as they feature on the Summit programme and Agenda Europe members were the main protagonists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Agenda Europe member</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Citizens’ Initiative (ECI) ‘One of Us’</td>
<td>ECLJ and others</td>
<td>Failed: rejected by the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Draft abortion restrictions</td>
<td>Hazte Oir</td>
<td>Failed: withdrawn in September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But minors require parental consent for abortion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Sweden, ESC</td>
<td>Collective complaint against Sweden for conscientious objection in reproductive health</td>
<td>FAFCE</td>
<td>Failed: ESC rejected all claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Draft abortion ban and jail time for women</td>
<td>Ordo Iuris</td>
<td>Failed: rejected in Parliament in October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government considering restricting abortion in case of foetal anomaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Late-term abortion and neonatal infanticide</td>
<td>ECLJ</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Violence against Christians</td>
<td>Volonté, ECLJ</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>Creation of EU Special Envoy on Religious Discrimination and Intolerance</td>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Successful: measure adopted and post filled by an Agenda Europe member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Tackling intolerance and discrimination in Europe with a special focus on Christians</td>
<td>Ghiletchi, ECLJ</td>
<td>Failed: motion neutralized by progressive amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Sweden, ECHR</td>
<td>Case alleging discrimination against Christians related to conscientious objection in reproductive health</td>
<td>SHRL, ADF</td>
<td>Sweden: Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECHR: Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Case alleging discrimination against Christians related to conscientious objection in reproductive health</td>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 2018</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Croatia, Poland</td>
<td>Campaigns against the adoption of the Istanbul Convention</td>
<td>ADF &amp; national partners</td>
<td>Bulgaria - successful / Croatia - ongoing / Poland - failed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONCLUSIONS

The new information about Agenda Europe sheds much-needed light on the recent attempts to regress on human rights in sexuality and reproduction in Europe. This allows progressive actors to learn several important lessons about the movement’s organization, strengths and weaknesses.

A VATICAN-INSPIRED, PROFESSIONAL ADVOCACY NETWORK

The first lesson is that the anti-SRR movement is strategically organized transnationally in the European region. This transnational organization is led by the Vatican and has managed to forge consensus among all conservative, traditionalist Christian actors across Europe, spanning all denominations. In some cases, their respective denominational differences are substantial, yet their unity against the Cultural Revolution prevails. Kuhar and Paternotte describe how the Vatican thinkers theorized the concept of ‘gender ideology’ as a catch-all for social innovations which went against Church teachings and how it has been used as a mobilizing force at national level across Europe. Agenda Europe would appear to be the locus where European anti-SRR advocates strategize on the national roll-out of the anti-gender mobilizations into policy outcomes in family and marriage, life and religious freedom/anti-discrimination.

Placed in context, Agenda Europe occupies a specific place in the galaxy of anti-SRR coordination platforms. Agenda Europe is the European gravitational centre of the global anti-SRR community represented within the World Congress of Families (WCF), where several Agenda Europe members are present, and the Political Network of Values (PNV), which convenes global political influencers. Orbiting around Agenda Europe are the national-level implementers, themselves clustered according to affinity, such as on abortion within the One of Us Federation, among traditionalist Christian political parties in ECPM and potentially others around the traditional family.

246 See http://www.worldcongressoffamilies.org/directors.php; several Agenda Europe participants are listed on the WCF Board of Directors.
A COMMON EXTREMIST AGENDA

A second lesson is that of unity around a precise policy agenda of how Agenda Europe wishes to change the legal and societal status quo in ways which stand in stark contrast to fundamental European rights enshrined in EU law and jurisprudence of the ECHR. This common vision is articulated in *Restoring the Natural Order*; it is expansive and reactionary, as it seeks to undo decades of human rights advances, ranging from making contraception and abortion illegal to recriminalizing same-sex relations. As Agenda Europe correctly asserts, this is the first time that there is a clear and detailed plan to overturn the advances of the Cultural Revolution. This plan is much more detailed than any anti-SRR material publicly available thus far, with precise short-, medium- and long-term objectives regarding family and marriage, protection of life and equality and non-discrimination legislation in specific European institutional settings.

The manifesto outlines the steps which led to a rapid professionalization of the anti-SRR movement. This professionalization is manifest in several areas — namely, obtaining accreditation from international bodies; developing legal and policy expertise to participate in and, at times, initiate litigation and legislation, often by using participatory democracy tools such as citizens' initiatives and petition processes; and, finally, publishing in academic literature. As evidenced by the activities of Agenda Europe members, the manifesto is being proactively and, in some cases, successfully implemented. What look like separate initiatives on apparently unrelated issues such as abortion, same-sex marriage, gender, comprehensive sexuality education, access to contraception, implementation of the Istanbul Convention, and protection of Christians are all interrelated and constitute part of the same *Restoring the Natural Order* plan.

---

248 See Article 2 (on values); Articles 2 and 3 (equality between men and women and non-discrimination) of the Treaty on European Union (TEU); articles 8 and 153 (on equality between men and women); Articles 10 and 19 (on non-discrimination) and Articles 6, 9 and 168 (on health) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and Articles 21 (non–discrimination), 23 (equality between women and men) and 35 (health care) or the Charter on Fundamental Rights. EU Treaties consolidated: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C:2016:202:FULL&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:C:2016:202:FULL&from=EN).

SECRECY AND ANONYMITY

Consciously or subconsciously, Agenda Europe has already made significant concessions to the world of the Cultural Revolution. Most importantly, Agenda Europe members have conceded that their essentially religiously inspired view of the world does not hold traction with either the general public or the political class; they have, therefore, been forced to secularize their argumentation to make it more palatable for public consumption. With this realization, Agenda Europe meets in secret, keeps its anonymous manifesto from public view and administers stern instructions to members not to communicate about the gatherings or the common agenda.

Recognizing their ‘extremist’ and ‘unrealistic’ ambitions, Agenda Europe actors have been forced to seek the support of a cast of shady supporters whose actions are anathema to the pluralist democracies of modern Europe and whose support, like Agenda Europe itself, is purposefully hidden. When the real nature of Agenda Europe members becomes publicly known — for example, through press coverage exposing how Volonté’s corruption at the PACE in favour of Azerbaijan bankrolled homophobic initiatives, how Hazte Oir’s transphobic initiative resulted in a hacking of its internal servers250 or how Ordo Iuris is the modern-day manifestation of a colourful, far-right, Brazilian, ultra-Catholic movement at times described as “cult-like”251 — Agenda Europe is exposed for the marginal, ‘extremist’ and ‘unrealistic’ movement that it genuinely is.

A LAST EMBATTLED OUTCRY

Despite the progress made recently by Agenda Europe actors, there are several key structural weaknesses in the anti-SRR organizing structures. While Agenda Europe presents an internally coherent plan against recent and foreseeable progress on human rights in sexuality and reproduction, it is at the same time an inherently reactive movement which even describes itself as ‘extremist’ and ‘unrealistic’. Agenda Europe has made progress in, first, developing a modern advocacy infrastructure in Europe and, second, launching policy initiatives. However, these initiatives have rarely been successful. All of their abortion-related initiatives have failed; regarding traditional marriage, they have succeeded in halting progress, perhaps temporarily, in countries where equal marriage was only beginning to enter the political arena. Altogether, despite a finesse in recent organizing, Agenda Europe represents the last embattled reactionary hold-outs of a society that is moving forward to a place they will hardly recognize.

The most generous assessment one can make of Agenda Europe is that, at least, its ideas will not go down without a fight. Progressive actors should take heed that this fight is engaged and that social progress is not necessarily inevitable. The next phases of this fight are likely to be in the Austrian Parliament, where Agenda Europe organizer Gudrun Kugler was elected in September 2017, and in the European judicial and quasi-judicial adjudicatory mechanisms, as ADF deploys its new European litigation infrastructure. Looking ahead, an understanding of Agenda Europe, its reactionary agenda and how it has implemented it thus far should allow progressive actors to make further progress consolidating human rights in sexuality and reproduction.
## ANNEX

### ANNEX 1: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Alliance Defending Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHR</td>
<td>European Court of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECI</td>
<td>European Citizens’ Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECJ</td>
<td>European Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLJ</td>
<td>European Centre for Law and Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECPM</td>
<td>European Christian Political Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECR</td>
<td>European Conservatives and Reformist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPP</td>
<td>European Peoples’ Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU FRA</td>
<td>European Union Fundamental Rights Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAFCE</td>
<td>Fédération des Associations Familiales Catholiques en Europe (Federation of Catholic Family Associations in Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNT</td>
<td>Fondazione Novae Terrae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPF</td>
<td>International Planned Parenthood Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>International Theological Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans-sexual, inter-sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIDAC</td>
<td>Observatory on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordo Iuris</td>
<td>Instytut na rzecz Kultury Prawnej Ordo Iuris (Ordo Iuris Institute for Legal Culture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRL</td>
<td>Scandinavian Human Rights Lawyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRR</td>
<td>Sexual and reproductive rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTNO</td>
<td>Restoring the Natural Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>Unione dei Democratici Cristiani e di Centro (Union of Christian Democrats and of the Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>World Congress of Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2: OVERVIEW OF PERSONALITIES FEATURING IN AGENDA EUROPE

Ignacio Arsuaga: President and founder of the Spanish anti-SRR organization Hazte Oir and the global social mobilization platform Citizen Go and a Board Member of the WCF. 252

Rocco Buttiglione: An Italian politician from the centrist, Catholic Unione dei Democratici Cristiani e di Centro (UDC) political party affiliated with the EPP, he was rejected as Italy’s nominee to the European Commission in 2004, as his conservative religious views on social issues were deemed incompatible with the office he was seeking. 253

Brian Brown: President of the National Organization for Marriage and a Board Member of Citizen Go, has been involved in numerous US and global anti-SRR organizations. 254

Robert Clark: Director of European Advocacy for ADF International in Vienna, Austria. 255

Paul Coleman: Executive Director of ADF International at its headquarters in Vienna. 256

Jakob Cornides: An administrator at the European Commission for DG Trade as well as legal counsel at the Polish organization Ordo Iuris and author of several anti-SRR publications. See references. 257

Ludovine de La Rochère: President of the French anti-equal-marriage movement La Manif Pour Tous, former Head of Communications at the Fondation Jérôme Lejeune and former Director of the Information and Communications Department of the French Conference of Catholic Bishops. 258

Emile Duport: Founder and President of Les Survivant and, founder/creator of communications agency Newsoul as well as French anti-abortion web platforms such as www.afterbaiz.com and www.simoneveil.com. 259

Jan Figel: The European Commission's Special Representative for Freedom of Religion and Belief, who was European Commissioner for Education, Culture, Youth from 2004 to 2009. 260

Edit Fridvalsky: Director of the Hungarian Human Dignity Center and official representative of the ECI ‘Mum, Dad & Kids’. 261

Varleriu Ghiletchi: Member of the Parliament of Moldova and delegate to the PACE affiliated with the EPP. 262

Maria Hildingsson: Secretary-General of the FAFCE. 263

Alexey Komov: External Relations Representative of the Russian Orthodox Church, Representative of the World Congress of Families to Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States, President of the Analytical Centre ‘Family Policy in the Russian Federation’, Member of the Patriarchal Committee on the Family, Motherhood and Childhood, Board Member of Citizen GO, Board Member of the WCF and Responsible for international projects at the Saint Basil the Great Charitable Foundation. 264

---

255 See https://adfinternational.org/detailspages/biography-details/robert-clarke.
256 See https://adfinternational.org/detailspages/biography-details/paul-coleman.
258 See https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ludovine_de_La_Roch%C3%A8re; and http://www.liberation.fr/societe/2013/06/10/ludovine-de-la-rochere-elle-ne-barjotte-pas_909683.
262 See http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/AssemblyList/MP-Details-EN.asp?MemberID=4055; and https://valeriughiletchi.md.

Sophia Kuby: Responsible for EU advocacy for ADF International in Belgium, founder of European Dignity Watch and daughter of Gabrielle Kuby (see above).

Gudrun Kugler: Elected as a Member of Parliament in Austria in September 2017 for the conservative Austrian People’s Party (ÖVP), Kugler previously founded the OIDAC and the World Youth Alliance-Europe. She studied and later became a faculty member at the ITI in Vienna. She and her husband created Kairos Consulting, which has worked for several Catholic and anti-SRR causes.

Zejlka Markic: Member of the Organizing Committee of the Civic Initiative ‘In the Name of the Family’, which resulted in the referendum on traditional marriage. She is the first President of the conservative Croatian political party Hrast and the Vice-President of the anti-SRR Voice of Parents Association, Grozd.

Gudrun Kugler:

Terrence McKeegan: Legal Adviser for the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the UN; had previous roles with ADF, ECLJ and the Center for Family and Human Rights (C-FAM).

Paul Moynan: Previously the EU representative of the Christian Action Research & Education (CARE) and currently employed as a staff member of the ECR group.

Ronan Mullen: An independent Senator in Ireland who has been a delegate to the PACE. Also a member of ECPM and a vocal anti-SRR voice both in Ireland and the PACE.

Grégor Puppinck: Director-General of the ECLJ and legal focal point for the ECI ‘One of Us’.

Lila Rose: A US anti-abortion activist and founder of Live Action which produced undercover videos of Planned Parenthood.

Sharon Slater: Co-founder of the US anti-SRR group Family Watch International.

Marie Smith: A US anti-SRR activist who has been involved in a number of anti-SRR organizations and initiatives, including the Parliamentary Network on Critical Issues (see www.pncius.org) and Priests for Life. She is the spouse of US Member of Congress Chris Smith, himself a leading anti-SRR voice in the US Congress.

Aleksander Stepkowski: President of Ordo Iuris and Professor at Warsaw University’s Faculty of Law and Administration who served as Poland’s Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs from November 2015 to August 2016.

Leo van Doesburg: Director for European Affairs for the ECPM.

Luca Volonté: A former Italian parliamentarian from the UDC political party. During his time as an MP he was appointed to the PACE, where he served in the EPP and was elected EPP President. He is also the founder of the Fondazione Novae Terrae.
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