

# **ALIANȚA FAMILIILOR DIN ROMANIA**

## **ALLIANCE OF ROMANIA'S FAMILIES**

Str. Cetatea Ciceiului nr 23, sector 6, Bucuresti

Tel. 0745.783.125 Fax 0318.153.082

[www.protejarea-familiei.com](http://www.protejarea-familiei.com)

[office@alianța-familiilor.ro](mailto:office@alianța-familiilor.ro)

---

January 28, 2014

The European Parliament  
The Registrar/Secretariat  
Rue Wiertz 60  
B-1047 Brussels  
Via facsimile transmission  
32 228 49 395  
Via regular international mail  
Via electronic delivery

Re.: The Lunacek Report  
Draft Report on the EU Roadmap Against Homophobia and Discrimination on  
Grounds of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (2013/2183 INI)

Dear Members of the European Parliament:

Greetings! I am writing on behalf of the Alliance of Romania's Families, a grassroots movement espousing pro-family and pro-life policies and views with a constituency of hundreds of thousands of Romania's families. We take this opportunity to provide input on the Draft Report on the EU Roadmap Against Homophobia and Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, commonly known as the Lunacek Report. We **oppose** the Report as well as the Motion for a European Parliament Resolution requesting the adoption of the Report. We justify our position as follows.

I.

### **UNPERSUASIVE ARGUMENTATION**

We have carefully reviewed the Report and find it woefully lacking in persuasiveness. Essentially, I refer to its methodology and the arguments listed in the Report's Explanatory Statement. **First**, under international law there is no recognized right to nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. Thus, we oppose any attempts to use the Report or the European Parliament as a launching pad for the recognition in international law of a right to nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Nor does international law recognize a distinct human category entitled to special protection or nondiscrimination based on this criteria. **Second**, Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union

which prohibits discrimination based on, among others, sexual orientation, does not encompass the artificially created “gender identity” ground. Nor does it, specifically with respect to sexual orientation, mandate the adoption of the “roadmap” actions listed in the Lunacek Report.

Equally unpersuasive is the argumentation emanating from reports or opinions issued by the European Agency for Fundamental Rights (“FRA”). This Agency is a political arm of the European Union, an ideological instrument, an entity largely divorced from the concerns and interests of the citizens of the European Union. It is an institution which, based on our experience, itself discriminates against citizens or organizations of the Union which oppose the political ideology and human rights doctrines promoted by the FRA. The Agency’s discriminatory actions have discredited it in the eyes of public opinion in Romania and elsewhere. Nevertheless, we understand why the Lunacek Report would seek legitimacy based on the FRA’s reports and opinions. Since its relaunch several years ago, the Agency has been preoccupied, mostly, with promoting the rights of “sexual minorities,” has issued biased reports, and has chastised and marginalized organizations critical of the Agency’s seemingly permanent and almost exclusive obsession with the rights of sexual minorities. It is a disproportionate obsession projecting the impression that the European Union is inhabited almost exclusively by “sexual minorities.” The rest are asking, in dismay, “what about us?”

We further analyzed the results of the May 17, 2013 LGBT Survey published by the FRA. If anything, the Survey conveys the very opposite conclusion of what the Lunacek Report states: by and large, sexual minorities are not the object of discrimination or violence in the European Union. The Lunacek Report’s Explanatory Statement devotes a paragraph to the Survey’s statistical findings. However, statistics do not necessarily reflect causation. The Lunacek Report fails to acknowledge that the overwhelming majority of the acts of violence directed against sexual minorities are carried out by sexual minorities themselves, not by others. In fact, the vast majority of studies devoted to violence against homosexuals conclude, without fail, that the homosexual lifestyle is prone to violence by its very nature. Domestic violence among homosexual couples is significantly higher than in traditional domestic relations. We realize this is an unsettling argument to make against the Lunacek Report, but it must, nevertheless, be made. It restates reality.

In this regard, we reference a **September 2013 Report from the Urban Institute** in the United States which concluded that gay youths are 148% more likely to be physically abused in relationships by people they are dating than their heterosexual counterparts. The Report anonymously surveyed 5,647 youths from 10 schools in New York State, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Approximately six percent of the respondents identified themselves as homosexual, bisexual, questioning, or other sexual identities aside from heterosexual or transgender. 43 percent of the respondents reported having been victims of physical dating violence, compared to 29 percent among heterosexual youth. 59 percent reported emotional abuse, compared to 46 percent of heterosexual youth. 37 percent reported digital abuse and harassment, compared to 26 percent of heterosexual youth, and 23 percent reported sexual coercion, compared to 12 percent of heterosexual youth. Transgendered students fared even worse. Of the transgendered students surveyed, 89 percent reported physical dating violence; 61 percent said they were sexually

coerced; 59 percent had been emotionally victimized; and 56 percent reported digital abuse and harassment. [Reference: Meredith Dank, et al., *Dating Violence Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth*, In Press: *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center, <http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412892-Dating-Violence-Experiences-of-Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-and-Transgender-Youth.pdf>]

We also reference a **2012 Report by the gay-friendly Williams Institute of California**, published in *The Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, and titled “*Bisexual Women, Gay Men, Report Increased Intimate Partner Violence*.” It concluded that “bisexual women and gay men face elevated risks of intimate partner violence.” The Report was compiled by Naomi G. Goldberg, MPP and Ilan H. Meyer, PhD, Senior Scholar for Public Policy at the Williams Institute. The authors reported that: (1) bisexual women had elevated risks of experiencing intimate partner violence compared with heterosexual women, lesbians and women who have sex with women over the course of their lives or in the past year. (2) gay men had elevated risks of experiencing intimate partner violence compared with heterosexual and bisexual men, and men who have sex with men but do not identify as gay or bisexual. Notably, almost all (97%) of the annual incidents of intimate partner violence incidents occurring to male victims involved a male intimate partner. The researchers’ findings were based on a 2007-2008 sample of the California Health Interview Survey. The authors compared patterns of intimate partner violence among four groups: heterosexual men and women, bisexual men and women, gay men and lesbians, and men and women who have had sex with members of the same sex but are not identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual. The report defined “partner violence” as physical and verbal abuse, or threats of physical abuse, by a current or former wife, husband, boyfriend, girlfriend or someone else an individual has lived with or dated. [The Williams Institute Report can be found here: <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/research/violence-crime/goldberg-meyer-ipv-2012/>]

## II.

### **THE REPORT INSTITUTIONALIZES THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION**

We further advise against the adoption of the Report because it contributes to the institutionalizing of the sexual revolution. The sexual revolution we are currently witnessing is not different from prior revolutions. It seeks to demolish the old regime and impose a new one. We do not believe it is the proper role and competence of the European Parliament to institutionalize in the European Union a sexual revolution. In vogue for the last several decades, the sexual revolution has, with the aid of permissive states and international organizations and governments, deconstructed the very moral foundations of European civilization, European values, and Europe’s social institutions.

No facet of societal existence has been left untouched by the sexual revolution. The impact has been devastating everywhere. The fundamental rights of citizens have had to yield to the newer and more radical agenda of sexual minorities. The family as a social institution has been on the decline. Cohabitation is largely displacing and replacing the natural family and marriage, and

out-of-wedlock child birth is on the upswing. Almost half of the European Union's children are born to single young women. The sexual revolution has bred irresponsibility, the abandonment of prudence, risky behaviors, and the unweaving of societal cohesion. The social costs imposed by the sexual revolution have skyrocketed and have strained public spending. Weak families mean more public spending to cope with the social costs of nontraditional forms of association and cohabitation. We recommend, in this regard, a recent piece published in the New York Times on January 25, 2014 by the prestigious editorialist Ross Douthat *More Imperfect Unions* [[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/opinion/sunday/douthat-more-imperfect-unions.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/26/opinion/sunday/douthat-more-imperfect-unions.html?_r=0)]

Furthermore, the wide array of “family forms” the Lunacek Report promotes in the name of “equality” will only contribute to the further, and possibly irreversible, decline of the family. To quote Professor David Popeone “[W]e should disavow the notion that mommies can make good daddies, just as we should the popular notion that daddies can make good mommies. The two sexes are different to the core and each is necessary – culturally and biologically – for the optimal development of a human being.”

### III.

#### **THE REPORT INSTITUTIONALIZES DISCRIMINATION AND BIAS AGAINST OTHERS**

The Lunacek Report promotes a selfish vision. It emphasizes nondiscrimination for an artificially constructed social group to the detriment of the fundamental rights of the vast majority of the European Union's citizens. It elevates nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation to a privileged status. In our view, this is unacceptable.

Nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation is a relatively recent construct. However, in countries around the world where it has been implemented the consequences for the rights of the vast majority of citizens have been identical. Long standing fundamental rights and liberties have been displaced to accommodate the new wave of artificially constructed rights to nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation. In Canada it has become a crime to speak out against homosexuality. Civil servants have been fined or dismissed from work for failing to comply with government imposed rules and regulations related to sexual minorities. Ministers of the Gospel have been fined or have had their media programs blocked by the government for having preached against sexual sin. In Sweden pastors have been arrested for having done the same. In the UK pastors have also been arrested for quoting Bible verses which speak against sexual sin. In the United States people have lost their jobs for speaking against homosexuality, or have had their businesses sued or closed down because of their insistence on the Biblical teachings on sexuality. In these and other countries freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, freedom of expression, and free speech have been severely restricted to impose nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation.

The people of Romania do not desire this outcome in their country. For nearly half a century they

have been subjected to communist tyranny and a totalitarian revolution. They have been subjected to coercive indoctrination. Frankly, they have had enough. They do not need a European Union who attempts to deprive them of their hard won freedom of expression, speech, and religious liberty. For nearly half a century they have been deprived of freedom of expression, free speech, and religious liberty. They are not in need of a supranational institution to lecture them on what is right and wrong, acceptable or unacceptable, and what the moral foundations of their society should be. We view the Lunacek Report as an unwarranted and illegitimate intrusion on the basic rights and freedoms of the people of Romania. We feel comfortable adding that in this regard we speak for millions of like minded citizens throughout the European Union.

#### IV.

#### **THE REPORT INSTITUTIONALIZES AN ARTIFICIAL SOCIAL CATEGORY**

Finally, the Lunacek Report institutionalizes an artificial social category. Sexual orientation and gender identity are social constructs defined by individual choices and social indoctrination. In recent decades homosexuality has become somewhat of a fad. Evolutionary biology has long demonstrated that homosexuality cannot be explained biologically. It is not an innate aspect of human expression, but a choice with mostly grave and life lasting consequences. Homosexuality and sexual orientation become entrenched in an individual's brain and psyche to various degrees over time. They are affected and determined by choices regarding fantasy life, responses to social and environmental factors in childhood and adolescence, seduction of children by adults, the degree to which one acts on impulses, and the degree of self-motivation to change. We base this averment on, among others, the conclusions of Edward Stein, a professor of law and philosophy and the author of The Mismeasure of Desire: The Science, Theory, and Ethics of Sexual Orientation [New York: Oxford University Press, 1999] His main thesis for the etiology of homosexuality is choice, a personal choice, often incremental or indirect, but based on choice nevertheless. Homosexual attractions reflect a desire for a form of behavior that is structurally deviant from the innate norm. They are impulse-related compulsions, not natural affections. Same-sex unions are predominantly based on sexual desire. Such desire alone cannot form the basis of legitimate and society sanctioned unions. As Alexander Pruss, Professor of Philosophy at Baylor University in Texas recently stated: "(W)e cannot (...) simply assume that people are always right about what they desire sexually." [Alexander Pruss, One Body: An Essay in Christian Sexual Ethics, p. 54, University of Notre Dame Press, 2013]

Furthermore, sexual orientation is an invention, a linguistic construct, a worldview, a paradigm divorced from the universal experience of humanity. Ancient societies and, until recently, modern societies alike, viewed homosexuality as a form of deviant sexual conduct, a departure from natural human sexuality, in the same category with incest and pedophilia. The classical world did not even have a word for "homosexuality," this term having come into existence and use for the first time in the United Kingdom in the late Nineteenth Century to describe sexual acts between persons of the same sex. In fact, sober linguists speak of a "gay invention," meaning that the sexual revolution has invented the existence of a separate class of human beings known today as "sexual minorities." [We recommend, in this respect, RV Young's *The Gay*

*Invention*, published in Touchstone Magazine : <http://www.touchstonemag.com/archives/article.php?id=18-10-036-f#ixzz2rT5JSupk>] Here are the concluding remarks of Dr. Young, an expert in classical languages and literature:

The words in which we express our ideas have consequences. To insist that words be used rationally and consistently is a first small step toward recovering moral reason. We should, therefore, refuse to accept “gender” as a relativistic substitute for the fundamental difference indicated by “sex,” while the latter term is expropriated to mean any kind of physical coupling. Above all, we should not acquiesce in the labels “heterosexual” and “homosexual,” when we are referring to men and women.

To concede the validity of such linguistic novelties is to allow the ideologues of the sexual revolution to control the terms of the debate. “Male” and “female,” “masculine” and “feminine,” designate normative components of actual human nature: anatomical, physiological, affective, and rational.

“Homosexuality” is now used to suggest that numerous urges and actions that deviate from these norms hold equivalent status as an element of human nature, but the peculiar use of a natural organ or faculty does not change its nature. A man can walk around on his hands, but that does not turn hands into feet; and society ought not to be obliged to redesign sidewalks and staircases to accommodate compulsive “handwalkers” (manambulants?), even if they are born with the inclination.

No really existing class of persons of a specific, distinct nature corresponds to the word “homosexual” in the way that men and women are distinct, complementary kinds of human being. **A claim for specific “homosexual rights” is, therefore, frivolous, and the word is merely an ideological construct aimed at undermining the sexual norms inscribed in human nature.**

“Gender identity,” too, is an ideological construct of the “gender” revolution. It designs confusion in the minds of the young related to sexual identity. We are on the brink of a new age, one of profound confusion regarding human sexuality. More and more young adolescents cannot affirm with confidence their sexual identity, as men, women, heterosexual, homosexual, intersex, queer, asexual, or what have you. This is tragic. The Lunacek Report goes a long way in legitimizing and institutionalizing sexual confusion. We are unable to acquiesce and must oppose this attempt for the sake of the young and of our children, and for the sake of their welfare and wellbeing.

Sexual confusion is no laughing matter. To take a recent example, the degree of sexual confusion on American campuses is alarming. Though a minority among the young might consider this “cool,” **no reasonable person could agree that sexual confusion is desirable.** Sexual confusion and disorientation is not a “cool” thing, but something to be of concern to every governing body, including the European Parliament. On January 9, 2013 the **New York Times** published a long narrative on the sexual confusion which pervades America’s campuses. Its title

Page 7

is suggestive: *Generation LGBTQIA*, and it is a must read for every person that intends to vote on the Lunacek Report. [The article can be found here: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/10/fashion/generation-lgbtqia.html?pagewanted=all>]

V.

**CONCLUSION**

In summary, we must oppose the Lunacek Report. We are grateful for the opportunity to submit our comments. We trust they will be found persuasive and will be taken into account when the final vote is taken. Please file our plea among the official papers of the European Parliament and disseminate a copy to all members well in advance of the plenary vote.

Very truly yours,



Peter Costea, PhD, President  
Alliance of Romania's Families