

Uncovering the Liberal Agenda of the European Parliament: the Culture of Death and Systematic Intolerance of Christianity

To paraphrase Solzhenitsyn in the Gulag Archipelago, anyone who here expects a political exposé should stop reading immediately and search elsewhere. Moral matters are fundamental because “the line dividing good and evil cuts through the heart of every human being.”¹ Indeed this is as true now as it was yesterday and as it has always been.

Well meaning philosophers have attempted to wipe the concept of truth from the intellectual dictionary. If all is subjective then there can be no fundamentalism, no fascism or communism, no *metanarratives* with their inherent violence. While this idea of post-modern deconstructionism credited to Jacques Derrida certainly has its utopic appeal, objectivity and truth cannot be disputed. Derrida died in October 2004 and this cannot be denied as an objective truth. And I hardly doubt that even he will be able to dispute that in his current state.

Truth is the key to all genuine intellectual inquiry, and truth must be underpinned by morality. Morality is bred in part by responsibility and a true knowledge of the common good. The common good embraces the sum total of those conditions of social living whereby men are enabled to achieve their own integral perfection more fully and more easily.² The chief end of law is to serve the common good.³

Now the reader may be asking at this point where such high philosophy would have a place in a discussion about the European Parliament. The answer is quite simple. There are 732 members of the European Parliament and all of them believe they are right on life and family issues. A pro-life politician does not believe that in his work he is committing an evil by taking away a woman’s right to use her body as she pleases. At the same time, the pro-choice politician thinks he is doing well by giving people individual

rights. He never stops to think about the baby that was just aborted a few minutes ago or of the family and how it is being slowly dismantled by his ideologies. How could he consider such things? Life is too busy for such introspection and it is already far too depressing to add discussions about personal responsibility and the common good into his life.

And so this is our starting point; that the divergence in the Parliament between liberals and conservatives is steeped in the debate over the common good. Conservatives are correct in believing that the common good affects the rights of all people. Its simple physics: every action has a reaction. If one chooses to have an abortion, the baby is affected and as is the society which loses one of its future members. When laws regarding the definition of family are liberalized, the traditional concept of family which had been held undefiled since before the time Christ walked the earth is eroded, as are the values, morals and benefits that come along with the traditional model.

In essence, the key flaw of the so-called liberal Parliamentarian is that he is obsessed with individual rights. His intentions are undoubtedly good but the ideology he takes he mistakes for being part of the natural law. To best explain this we must turn yet again to Solzhenitsyn:

The trouble lies in the way classic evildoers are pictured. They recognize themselves as evildoers, and they know their souls are black... But no; that's not the way it is! To do evil, a human being must first believe that what he's doing is good, or else that it's a well considered act in conformity with the natural law... Ideology- that is what gives evildoing its long-sought justification and gives the evildoer the necessary steadfastness and determination. This is the social theory which helps to make his acts seem good instead of bad in his own and other's eyes, so that he won't hear reproaches and curses but will receive praise and honors.⁴

It is only from this starting point that we can begin to understand the actions of the European Parliament in the manner it has legislated on issues involving life and

family. Let us now turn to a sampling of the more serious efforts of the Parliament in their attempts at social engineering:

(1) Abortion Resolutions of the European Parliament

The plain meaning of the *Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community* [hereafter also referred to as the *Rome Treaty*] and the *Treaty of the European Union* [hereafter the *Maastricht Treaty*], coupled with other persuasive texts interpreting the aforementioned treaties, clearly suggest the intention of the framers of the European Union legislative body to proscribe the promulgation of statutes or policies which go beyond merely complementing national policies of Member States.

Article 2 of the *Maastricht Treaty* states: “The objectives of the Union shall be achieved as provided in this Treaty and in accordance with the conditions and the timetable set therein while respecting the principle of subsidiarity as defined in article 5 of the Treaty establishing the European Community.” Article 5 defines subsidiarity in the following terms: “In areas which do not fall within its exclusive competence, the Community shall take action, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, only if and insofar as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States and can therefore, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved by the Community.” The Union is charged with the task of not going beyond the limits of the powers conferred upon it by said treaty.

Title XIII, Article 152 of the *Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community* explicitly excepts from its competency legislation which deals with public health: “1. Community action, **which shall complement national policies**, shall be directed towards improving public health, preventing human illness and disease, and

obviating sources of danger to human health.” Further, “2. The Community **shall encourage cooperation** between the Member States in the areas referred to in this Article and if necessary, lend support to their action. Member States shall, in liaison with the Commission, **coordinate among themselves** their policies and programmes in the areas referred to in paragraph 1. The Commission may, in close contact with the Member States, take any useful initiative **to promote such coordination.**”

Section 3 of Article 152 states: “The Community and the Member States shall **foster cooperation with the third countries** and the competent international organizations in the sphere of public health.” Section 5 states; “**Community action in the field of public health shall fully respect the responsibilities of the Member States for the organization and delivery of health services and medical care. In particular, measures referred to in paragraph 4(a) shall not affect national provisions on the donation or medical use of organs and blood.**”

In no uncertain terms, both the *Rome* and *Maastricht* treaties establish the incompetence of the European Parliament to enact legislation in the area of public health, including the area of reproductive health. Precisely stated, the European Parliament is in no way empowered to enact legislation in the area of reproductive health that would supercede the current law of Member States.

Ireland has set forth an even more stringent prophylactic measure to ensure that its Constitutional proscription of abortion not be affected by EU legislation. Protocol No. 17, annexed to the *Maastricht Treaty* and signed of February 7, 1992, states: “nothing in the *Treaty on the European Union*, or in the Treaties establishing the European Communities, or in the Treaties or Acts modifying or supplementing those Treaties, shall

affect the application in Ireland of Article 40.3.3. of the Constitution of Ireland.” That Constitutional provision states: “The State acknowledges the right to life of the unborn and, with due regard to the equal right to life of the mother, guarantees in its laws to respect, and, as far as practicable, by its laws to defend and vindicate that right.” Malta annexed a similar protocol to its accession treaty.

However, there is a constant danger of spill over into the legislation of moral and cultural issues that stem indirectly from the completion of the internal market in the Union. The European Parliament has already tested its competency in the area of reproductive health in a resolution it passed on March 9, 1999 that supports legalization of abortion across Europe in certain circumstances such as rape and endangerment of the mother’s health.⁵ The underlying reasoning behind the resolution is that “it must be the women herself who takes the final decision.”⁶ The resolution also came out in favor of abortions carried out in a medically safe way and provisions for psychological and social support afterwards.

Through this resolution and proposed regulations such as the Sandbaek proposal (C5-0114/02) and the Van Lancker Report (A5-0223/2002), the strategy of certain NGO’s and a segment of the Parliament has become clear. Highly publicized comments such as those by Mr. Nielson before the European Parliament and the UN: “We are strongly engaged in this area and the relationship between poverty, conflict, AIDS and gender equality is so strong that we have absolutely no doubt in our mind as to the need to react strongly and immediately to the threat coming to the US administration in this field. I announced in the UN in New York in January that Europe is able and willing to fill the decency gap and we will do that,”⁷ have been an embarrassment diplomatically as well as

a complete overstatement in EU competency. Such a statement also ignores the provisions of Articles 36, 56 and 66 that allow a Member State the freedom to legislate in moral and philosophical matters that fundamentally affect its society; as well as circumscribing Article 152 of the *Treaty of Rome* and the principle of subsidiarity.

The Van Lanker Report, adopted by European Parliament in July 2002, and the Sandbaek Report adopted by the European Parliament in February 2003, provides legislative and budgetary support for the agendas of promoting abortions in the third world, harmonization of abortion laws throughout Europe, and accessibility of abortion to all European Union Member States. The reports put a direct focus on individual sexual and reproductive rights, shattering an integrated vision of the dignity of the person and a proper definition of the common good.

Among many other dubious articles, the Van Lanker Report states:

"2. [Parliament] recommends the governments of the Member States and the candidate countries to develop a high quality national policy on sexual and reproductive health, in cooperation with plural civil society organizations, providing comprehensive information concerning effective and responsible methods of family planning, and ensuring equal access to all forms of high quality contraceptive methods as well as fertility awareness methods;"

"4. [Parliament] urges the governments of the Member States and the candidate countries to strive to provide contraceptives ...;"

"11. [Parliament] calls upon the governments of the Member States and the candidate countries to provide specialized sexual and reproductive health services;"

"12. [Parliament] recommends that, in order to safeguard women's reproductive health and rights, abortion should be made legal, safe and accessible to all;"

(2) Resolution on Women and Fundamentalism. Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities. Adopted 13 March 2002 with 242 votes for, 240 against and 40 abstentions.

This resolution of 23 May 2001 was no doubt a product of playing on the emotions of the September 11th attacks earlier that year in the United States. In such a document composed months after the worst terror attack in American history and dealing with the topic of religious fundamentalism, one would think that the centre piece of the resolution would be in regards to efforts to curtail radical Islam. However, remarks in the 12 page document regarding fundamental Islam are few and cursory. What is present is a full scale attack on Christianity, particularly against Pentecostals, Evangelicals and Roman Catholics.

Such statements include:

“17. [Parliament] urges the Commission to ensure that in negotiations for accession, cooperation or association agreements the Community ‘acquis’ in the field of women’s rights is given priority over any other incompatible appeal to customary law, religious beliefs or cultural traditions;”

Precisely stated, what is insinuated here is that in regards to accession talks for new Members States (and this included Slovakia at the time this resolution was passed) or even cooperation with EU Member States by non-Member States, that as a condition of acceptance of EU privileges, these countries would have to hold the rights of women as defined by the Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities over all other cultural and religious rights. In other words, countries like Poland, Malta and Slovakia which have deep Catholic roots would have to agree as a condition of Membership that women cannot be discriminated against in regards to holding religious office. Cultural and religious beliefs held by Member States in regards to abortion, which is deemed a

fundamental right by the Committee and European Parliament (as will be discussed later) would also have to give way to the rights of women as defined by the committee. And what is more, what is strongly inferred is that as a condition of membership or association to the European Union, governments would have to curtail the rights of religious denominations which held views regarding those things which the committee held as women's rights; for example the right to hold religious office or the right to abortion and contraception.

“23. [Parliament] rejects all religious fundamentalism, Christian, Jewish or Muslim, as being contrary to human dignity.”

Apparently, the only form of fundamentalism which is acceptable to the Parliament is that of radical secularism and radical feminism. The resolution stops short of defining its interpretation of human dignity in article 23 of the resolution but it certainly has little resemblance to the definition given by the Holy See which believes that our dignity is inherent because it stems from our being created in God's image, it is a dignity which is solemn to all forms of life. The view of the Holy See however violates this radical secular perspective by invoking the name of God—although how it is possible to even begin a discussion about human dignity without referring to God is beyond me, as well as being overly protective of human life, as we shall see in articles 22 and 24:

“22. [Parliament] considers the separation of church and state to be the most acceptable form of government in a democratic society;

24. [Parliament] calls on religious leaders to promote equal rights for women, including the right to control their own bodies and the right to decide when to have families of their own;”

The wording of article 24 makes it clear that this is speaking of the right to abortion. Its views on human dignity are further degraded in its insistence that the right to

have children when one wants them makes a child a property right and not an individual in his own right.

Well at the very least the European Parliament would not ask leaders of Christian denominations to change their views on things which find their root in history and Scripture! Well think again, article 25 says otherwise:

“25. Expresses support for the difficult situations of lesbians who suffer from fundamentalism, and calls on religious leaders, including the Romanian Patriarch and the Pope, to change their attitudes towards these women”

And if one was in the least bit confused after all of this as to the agenda of the Parliament, in their very definition of religious fundamentalism, they find its roots in American Christian Evangelicals in the 1920’s who the Parliament argues put “extreme obedience to dogma...above the law of the state and human rights.”⁸

Further:

“14. [Parliament] condemns religious leaders who make use of belief-systems with the aim of excluding women or preaching their inferiority to men;”

Such a condemnation is wide reaching, as the belief against women priests or pastors is a commonly held belief by Catholics and other Christians and finds roots in the Biblical letters of St. Paul.

(3) Rocco Buttiglione Confirmation Affair

Perhaps the best and most publicized news showing the power of liberalism in the European Parliament has been the recent resignation of Rocco Buttiglione from candidacy for the position of Justice Commissioner for the European Commission. Buttiglione resigned the day of the vote for European Commission by the European Parliament after threats by the liberal segment of the European Parliament to vote down

the entire Commission based on orthodox Christian statements made by Mr. Buttiglione during his confirmation hearings. The extent of Mr. Buttiglione's statements was that he felt, according to his faith, that homosexuality was a sin and that a child was better off with a mother and a father. He said also in the confirmation hearings that neither of these views would effect his position on the Commission as neither single motherhood nor homosexuality was a crime.

I knew from the moment it happened that this would be big news; to my knowledge never before had my office been contacted by an American news agency for statements regarding something that had happened in the European Parliament. And that is saying a lot considering some of the things that are said in the parliament that miraculously go unnoticed, such as 2002 statements in open parliament by several MEP's that Europe should go to war against the United States for the insult of not signing onto the International Criminal Court Rome Statute.

My comments to the reporter that day are the ones I continue to hold to today, that in the confirmation hearings there was an agenda set, and the questions were prepared to pick out Mr. Buttiglione's controversial points. As an honest man he would have to say that according to his faith and his beliefs, homosexuality is a sin and he believed the family is a nuclear family and both parents should be involved in the upbringing of children.

While it is greatly admirable that Mr. Buttiglione stepped down for his faith in such a memorable and honorable shame, I cannot help but think what a shame he did not stay on. This sentiment is held by no small minority of MEP's as well, by whose independent calculations we have come to the conclusion that Mr. Buttiglione would

have survived the vote and that the conservative element in the Parliament is stronger than has been given credit for.

A Tale of Two Cities: Here Comes Our Knight in Shining Armor

In all of the classic movies, whenever an antagonist is having his way, doing whatever to whomever whenever he pleases, you know just over the horizon the protagonist, the proverbial knight in shining armor, will be on his way. Life rarely ever plays out this way of course. Even in the lament psalms of David he prays to God why the wicked grow like grass and prosper. This article has detailed the European Parliament's own lamentable and sordid tale of liberal anti-life politics. And so one is left to ask, where is our knight in shining armor?

The fact is we could not see our knight in the horizon because he had a little further to come than most heroes's to save the day. For the truth of the matter is that our knight, while the Parliamentary protagonist was already legislating with impunity, was still under the iron fist of communism. 1989 is long behind us now and the European Union as of May became 25 Members strong, taking in a large portion of central and Eastern Europe. It is, I argue, from among these nations collectively, that we will see the liberal reign of the Parliament come to an end.

And the fight has already begun with all of the contentiousness of the very same type of classical movie I mention above. On the morning of July 27, the people of Brussels woke up to read in their local newspaper, that the new chairperson of the Committee of Women's Rights and Gender Equality was none other than Slovakia's own Eva Zaborska. Ms. Zaborska shared the distinction with only one other person of being appointed by vote as chairperson in Brussels that week rather than in Strasbourg the week

earlier. The reason for this was that the same tactics that were successfully utilized against Rocco Buttiglione failed against Ms. Zaborska. The press, using many quotes from Socialist and Green politicians lambasted Ms. Zaborska for comments she had made previously regarding homosexuality as a vice and that homosexuals should not be allowed to teach in school. Ms. Zaborska, despite this, won her nomination with a sizable majority with the socialists in the Committee abstaining from voting out of protest.

Malta and Poland have also made their presence felt in the European Union. Malta, in protocol 7 of its accession treaty used almost identical language as was used by Ireland in its Protocol regarding its refusal to allow any EU treaty or judgment of the European Court of Justice to legalize abortion in Malta. Furthermore, the Prosecutor's office of Malta deemed that any of its citizens who procured legal abortions in other Member States would still be prosecuted upon return to Malta. This statement caused much grinding of teeth in halls of the European Council and Parliament as such prosecution would be willfully contrary to the European Court's decision in Case C-159/90, *Society for the Protection of Unborn Children (Ireland) Ltd. v. Grogan and Others*, 3 C.M.L.R. 849 (1991). Malta proved that it would not be intimidated on such a culturally and morally important issue, showing that they would rather risk losing membership to the Union than give up their sovereignty on this issue.

Poland, who only 5 years ago as an EU candidate country was blackmailed by EU Member States at Beijing +5 in New York, has also been hard at work on the moral front lines. The government of Poland, while negotiating according to their constitution and 1993 legislation proscribing abortion regarding the use of the term 'reproductive rights' at Beijing+5 in New York, were severely reprimanded by EU Member States for not

towing the EU party line in support of the undefined term. Led by the chairman of the European Parliament's Women's Rights Committee from Sweden, the Polish delegation was told that its refusal to accept the EU definition, or lack thereof, of the term 'reproductive rights' would result in Poland's expulsion from candidacy in the enlargement process proposed in the Nice Treaty. Notes from the meeting also allege that Poland should be cautious in how it proceeds lest she find herself "isolated" and listed "among such countries as Iran, Sudan, Syria [and] Algeria."⁹ The threats and breach of diplomatic protocol were met with an angry letter denouncing the actions of the EU delegation at Beijing+5 signed by 32 MEP's and insisting that the EU delegation had no authority to conduct themselves in this manner.¹⁰ Poland at that time did not back down, and nor has it since on issues of life and family.

Both Poland and Malta, following the lead of Slovakia at the November 2004 European Council meeting regarding definition and implantation of the Hague Programme, adamantly refused to add language to the document which would allow for recognition of gay marriages in other EU States in their countries. Slovakia's Interior Minister Vladimir Palko saw the issue of EU harmonization of this particular area of family law as blatantly contrary to the well tried and recognized EU principles of subsidiarity and national sovereignty.

Conclusion

What is perhaps most shocking in the entire drama of the European Union is that for years blatant social engineering has been taking place without the general knowledge of the European population. I often wondered how the people of Europe did not know or care what was really going on behind closed doors. Their morals and rights were being

changed without their knowledge through programmes intended for redesigning national cultural mores into one super-national secularist view.

The culture war began without us, before we were ready, but now we have mobilized and are fighting for what is right and for what justice demands. And I do believe that as our numbers grow and knowledge of the subversive efforts of the European Parliament are made common knowledge, we will prevail and we must prevail, as we owe it to future generations and to the unborn.

¹ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, The Gulag Archipelago: 1918-1956, Ed. Edward Ericson, Jr., Perennial Classics, 2002, 75.

² Pope John XXIII, Pacem in Terris, April, 1963, paragraph 58.

³ Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, II-I, Q. 90, article 1.

⁴ Solzhenitsyn, 77.

⁵ See: European Parliament, Resolution on the report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the state of women's health in the European Community, 1999 O.J. (C 175) 68.

⁶ id. at 70.

⁷ This statement was of course in reference to President Bush's executive order of January 22, 2001 restoring President Reagan's 1984 Mexico City Policy requiring NGO's agreeing as a condition of their receipt of Federal funds that such organizations would neither perform nor actively promote abortion as a method of family planning in other nations. Pres. Bush's executive order brought back into line the United State's foreign policy in this matter with its internal policy, where U.S. tax money through its Medicare program would only be used for abortions in cases of serious risk of maternal mortality and other emergency situations. The U.S. House of Representative's backed President Bush's denial of funds to overseas groups that promote abortion legalization by voting down H.R. Bill # 1646 which would have had the effect of overturning the Bush executive order. The Democratic Party has publicly stated through its Relations Committee that the policy of the United States Federal government has since 1973, with the amendments made to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, held to this policy of not funding overseas abortions. The relations committee further stated that in the last year of the Clinton government, FY2001, appropriations in foreign aid were kept from allocation until February 15, 2001, allowing the new President to put in place any restrictions or conditions on the family planning program. (*Democratic Office Foreign Policy Briefs-January 2001*, Relations Committee Democratic Office, Congressman Tom Lantos, Ranking Member.) Finally, support from the third branch of the U.S. federal government, the judiciary, came in 2001, when a federal district court granted summary judgment against various family planning groups who brought suit against the Bush administration for the Mexico City executive order for lack of standing before the court. *Center for Reproductive Law and Public Policy v. Bush*, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10903 (SD N.Y.).

In the fiscal year of 2001, federal appropriations for population assistance increased by US\$50 million, from US\$375.5 million to US\$425 million. As such, it is difficult to understand Mr. Nielson's further comments before the European Parliament: "The Commission needs more information on the impact of the recent United States decision on reproductive health programming in poor countries and on

the organizations which will be most affected. Early indications suggest that the cuts may reduce support to sexual and reproductive health programmes in many countries. Ultimately that can only lead to more unwanted pregnancies, more abortions and maternal deaths, more cases of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), more poverty and misery. The Commission shares the views of the Presidency and Member State Ministers on this subject and has no reservation in meeting, any shortfalls in such a vital area. To that end the Commission is preparing a proposal for a Community reproductive rights programme.” *Response to Written Question E-0431/01 by Bastiaan Belder (EDD) to the Commission. Letter of 26 January 2001 from Minister Herfkens of the Netherlands to the Commissioner Nielson with a Request for Funding for Development Programmes Concerned with Abortion.* February 16, 2001. The decision of a sovereign nation to allocate funding to primary health care needs such as the provision of micronutrients and promotion of abstinence from programs based on the moral consciousness of that nation is a far cry from leaving a gap in decency. In addition, a US\$50 million increase in funding for third world population assistance for primary health care needs is hardly a shortfall.

⁸ European Parliament, Resolution on Women and Fundamentalism, Draft Number (2000/2174(INI)), adopted 13 March 2002.

⁹ Such threats seem to have been common place among the EU Member States as former EU Commission President Roman Prodi threatened Ireland in regards to signing onto Nice, recognizing that their initial denial of the Nice Treaty by referendum was due to a fear of legalization of abortion in Ireland. Mr. Prodi stated that he could not “predict what political price, if any, Ireland would pay for failing to ratify the treaty.” Dennis Staunton, *Prodi Warns on Second Rejection of Nice Treaty*, The Irish Times, June 5, 2002, p. 10)

¹⁰ Report to the Declaration of the National Council of the Slovak Republic on the Sovereignty of the Member States of the European Union in the Cultural and Ethical Issues, KDH 2002.