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Europe is currently witnessing the formation of a movement in favour of conservative family values and against tolerance, diversity, and progressive gender politics. In Stuttgart, in particular—but also in Cologne, Leipzig, Munich, and Hanover—advocates of traditional family values, fundamentalist Christians, and members of the so-called old and new Right took to the streets in 2014 to express their anger at plans by the respective state governments to teach tolerance of same-sex couples to school classes. They mobilised thousands of worried parents to join their protest.

The inspiration for these protests comes from France, where several hundred thousand people took to the streets against marriage and adoption laws for same-sex couples, under the slogan »La Manif Pour Tous« (Demo for All). Appalled observers spoke of the »awakening of a reactionary France« (Le Monde) and of a French Tea Party (Deutschlandfunk). Another phenomenon, which is not limited to one country, is the »Marsch für das Leben« (March for Life) by radical abortion opponents, which takes place annually in Berlin and continues to attract greater numbers. The European Citizens’ Initiative, One of Us—a professionally active consortium »for the protection of the human embryo«, which craftily associates its activities with the fear shared by many people concerning the practice of stem cell research—collected almost two million signatures for a corresponding petition.

In addition to similarities in terms of content, the initiatives have other common features: they are extraparliamentary movements from the Right that have opened the debate on terms such as »freedom« and »progress«. They claim to speak for the »silent majority« and portray themselves as unconventional »taboo breakers«—against the political »establishment« and against the »totalitarian control of thought« of a supposed »leftist mainstream« (anti-PC strategy). They make expert use of social media and are capable of simulating mass protests—a strategy adopted from the United States and termed »astro turfing«.

Furthermore, for a considerable time now, these initiatives against the right to abortion, »gender«, and the rights of same-sex couples have not only been embedded in the activities of splinter political parties and civil society groups, but they also now represent a critical mass of representatives in the European Parliament. The European Parliament elections in May 2014 strengthened the so-called parties of fear, which prey on the fear of citizens: fear of the Euro, immigration, criminality, and the demise of the traditional family. These parties include the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), Marine Le Pen’s Front National, the Danish People’s Party (Dansk Folkeparti), and the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD, Alternative for Germany), which was recently elected to the European Parliament with seven representatives. Establishing itself as the »Anti-Euro Party«, AfD honed its family and gender policy-oriented profile in the state elections of Saxony, Thuringia, and Brandenburg. Behind its anti-Euro façade is a party that is bound to the past and is altering the map of positions towards family and gender policy in Germany.

On behalf of the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, the sociologist Andreas Kemper previously described the shift in political programme in the AfD from an »Anti-Euro Party« to an »Anti-Gender Party« in an expert opinion titled »Keimzelle der Nation? Familien- und geschlechterpolitische Positionen der AfD« (Foundation of the Nation? Family and Gender-policy Positions of the AfD) before the start of elections in the European Parliament. He has now published the next instalment of the study, »Keimzelle der Nation—Teil 2« (Foundation of the Nation—Part 2). Andreas Kemper describes the conservative gender and family policy-related networks and movements in the European Union, the controversies in the European Parliament, AfD activities at the EU level and their family and gender-policy drafts for the states of Saxony, Thuringia, and Brandenburg. Kemper portrays a party that operates as a well-networked campaign platform and continues to achieve double-digit election results, despite the reactionary triad of law and order, xenophobia, and an image of the family reminiscent of the 1950s, and he concludes that »The »dare to« approach of the AfD is a recipe for aggressive backwardness!«

Forum Politics and Society
The present study was published following the European Parliament elections that took place at the end of May 2014. It can be seen as a supplement to the expert opinion »Keimzelle der Nation? Familien- und geschlechterpolitische Positionen der AfD und mögliche Verstrickungen mit den radikalen Abtreibungsgegner_innen« (»Foundation of the nation? Family and Gender Policy Positions of the AfD and Possible Involvement with Radical Opponents of Abortion«), which I published for the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in March 2014 (Kemper 2014).

While the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) found itself in a state of consolidation in the run-up to the European election, the party’s entry into the European Parliament (with 7 per cent) and into the Saxony State Parliament (with a surprising 10 per cent) mean that things are now becoming serious for the AfD. They can no longer get away with a four-page manifesto, which—just before a national election—they excused with the justification that they are a new political party.

The European election forced the AfD to attach itself to a particular European parliamentary group and, therefore, to affiliate itself with a certain political orientation. Similarly, it was no longer sufficient for the party to establish itself as an anti-Euro party, as had been the case with the state elections in Saxony, Brandenburg, and Thuringia. Frauke Petry, national spokesperson and state representative for Saxony, announced in an interview with the new Right weekly publication Junge Freiheit that AfD Saxony is not, primarily speaking, an anti-Euro party, but a family-oriented party. She added: family policy is, as we are once again permitted to say today, a question of population policy.

This study focuses on three specific areas of the AfD’s efforts related to gender and family policy. European policy will be considered first. Because the AfD has only just won its first seats in the European Parliament, it is appropriate to analyse the forces that currently intend to shape both gender- and family-oriented policies, with aims that can also be found in the AfD’s political mandate. In the following, an attempt is therefore made to outline the gender-policy network with which the AfD will presumably work.

Because the AfD did not simply appear from nowhere, but in the course of its own process of creation, made use of networks such as the Zivile Koalition e.V. (Civil Coalition), such »involvements« in these networks already exist. Because the AfD’s gender- and family policy-related aims have already been analysed in the previous expert opinion, and these positions were then specified with, for example, the AfD’s state election manifesto for Saxony, the results help shed some light on the network that the AfD may look to associate itself with in the European Parliament.

In the following text, I refer to the AfD’s gender and family policies as »familialism«, which refers to a political demand that presupposes a strictly standardised image of a »functioning family« as the »foundation of the nation«. In terms of its ideology, this general principle can be traced back to the German philosopher Fichte’s works Foundations of Natural Right (Grundlage des Naturrechts, 1796) and The System of Ethics (Das System der Sittenlehre, 1798) (Schaeffer-Hegel 1996: 134ff.).

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Christina Schildmann and Sebastian Scheele, without whom the second part of this study in its current form would not have been possible, and to Neil Datta, Regina Frey and Karin Heisecke for the exciting exchange of ideas on content.
PARLIAMENTARY AND INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP WORK IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT ON POSITIONS RELATED TO GENDER AND FAMILY POLICY
2.1 GENDER-CONSERVATIVE NETWORKS AND MOVEMENTS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION DURING THE PREVIOUS LEGISLATIVE PERIOD

The underlying research efforts for this expert opinion account for four directions of anti-feminist backlash that, in spite of differing motivations and stakeholders, are connected with one another. First are the Roman Catholic stakeholders. Indeed, the Vatican has called for a new evangelisation in countries considered to have already been evangelised. The large-scale, anti-feminist/homophobic demonstrations that took place in Spain and France saw the involvement of both Roman Catholic stakeholders and right-wing groups, whose policy stances are argued in both population policy and anti-Islamic terms. It is interesting to note that this movement also gained the support of stakeholders from Russia, with legislation against »homosexual propaganda« having been enacted under Putin. At least in terms of the initial approaches, Islamic organisations have also taken part in anti-feminist / heterosexist protest movements. A fourth source of this gender-conservative backlash is the masculinist, right-wing male movement, which is driven by a modern form of anti-feminism that does not seek to argue along gender-conservative familialist lines, but views men as victims of an omnipresent »state feminism«.

2.1.1 New Roman Catholic Evangelisation

The French political scientist Jean Yves Camus stated the following in relation to the topic of new evangelisation in connection with the mass protests against all partnerships enjoying equal rights:

Since the dawn of »new evangelisation« which was started under Pope John Paul II at the beginning of his pontificate, many Catholics in France have become convinced of the need to become active outside of the church. And that they, as Pope John Paul II said, should not be afraid to disseminate the message of Catholicism in politics. Catholic family organisations and associations across dioceses have played a very central role in mobilising forces against the concept of »marriage for all«. And this has also seen the emergence of something not witnessed in 30 years: Bishops—and very significant ones at that—Monseigneur Vingtous Trois, the Archbishop of Paris, and Monseigneur Barbarin, the Archbishop of Lyon, took to the streets personally to provide support to those out demonstrating. (quoted in Woller 2014)

In June 2010, Pope Benedict XVI also established the Pontifical Council for Promoting New Evangelisation, to drive forward the process of new evangelisation more efficiently. In addition, the Vatican rehabilitated missionary orders—such as the Legion of Christ and its apostolic movement Regnum Christi. Especially in European countries that have been shaped by Roman Catholicism, there have been various large-scale demonstrations in recent years, which have been predominantly driven by gender-conservative demands.

In December 2008, there was a protest march in Madrid against same-sex marriage, which was legalised in Spain in 2005 in the face of extensive protest by the Catholic Church and the conservative opposition party PP. The number of Catholic protesters involved in these demonstrations was in the six-figure range. Pope Benedict XVI greeted the demonstrators with a message that was projected to them via large viewing screens. In the context of these demonstrations, the bishops of Bilbao and Madrid criticised both same-sex marriage and abortion (Spiegel Online 2008).

In October 2009, there was a large-scale demonstration in Madrid with over one million participants—under the slogan of »Every Life Counts«—where the focus was on preventing the liberalisation of abortion laws. Once again, there were calls by the Catholic Church—among other settings, during church services—and by the conservative opposition party PP to instigate demonstrations (Spiegel Online 2009).

A few years later, there were similar mass protests in France. These large-scale protests were characterised by a previously unseen element: because verbal aggression was no longer sufficient, violent confrontation on the part of some demonstrators could be witnessed.

According to police estimates, 300,000 people took part in a demonstration in Paris on 23 March 2013 against the planned liberalisation of marriage laws (so-called Marriage for All laws), which were meant to give the possibility of marriage—including the right of adoption—to gay and lesbian couples. According to police statements, this led to violent clashes on the streets that were started by right-wing extremist circles, with 290 protesters being arrested. It was the French organisation Demo for All that had called for the protests to take place. Political parties were also involved in the demonstrations—among others, the right-wing extremist party Front National and the conservative opposition party UMP. A very Catholic protest group was also formed in a subsequent demonstration (taz 2013).

These demonstrations also continued in France in 2014. Parallel to the call to the Demo for All, 80,000 people in Paris and 20,000 people in Lyon took to the streets against Marriage for All. This demonstration distanced itself from the previously held » Le Jour de colère« (Day of Rage), which saw the participation of right-wing and extreme right groups, among others the Catholic association Civitas, which is closely associated with the Pius Brotherhood, and Béatrice Bourges’ Le Printemps Français.
Both a Civitas representative and Béatrice Bourges spoke in Cologne a few weeks later during a demonstration against so-called premature sexualisation in schools, which was organised by the German association Besorgte Eltern NRW (Worried parents of North Rhine-Westphalia). The focus of the demonstration was on bringing the protests from France to other countries.

2.1.2 American Activities in Europe

In recent years, movements and organisations have sprung up in both in Latin America and the United States (US), which continue to gain influence in Europe.

Mexico is home to the Order of the Legion of Christ, which is accompanied by the apostolic movement of Regnum Christi. Due to its association with a number of wealthy businesspeople, the Legion of Christ is also referred to as »The Millionaires of Christ«. They supposedly have an asset base of USD 2.5 billion at their disposal. However, after it was revealed that the founder of the Legion of Christ had committed sexual violence against boys during junior seminaries, the Vatican distanced itself from the Legionaries of Christ. In the course of the new evangelisation over recent years, more and more European Legionaries have been ordained as priests. Regnum Christi also publishes the magazine Zenit. The foundation of its apostolic mission is a form of teaching that involves the veneration of the saints and confession.

In Germany, the entrepreneur Michael Bommers provided the Legionaries with certain facilities. Bommers is a member of the Bund Katholischer Unternehmer (Association of Catholic Entrepreneurs) and the head of the study group Religiöse Spiritualität (Religious Spirituality). The study group’s activities are supported by the Legionaries of Christ, among others. Bommers also held a speech at the opening ceremony of the Regnum Christi kindergarten in Düsseldorf, Germany.

The married couple Klaus and Birgit Kelle also appear to be close to the Bommers and the Legionaries. Articles by Klaus and Birgit Kelle can often be found in the right-wing conservative magazine FreieWelt.net by the AfD politician Beatrix von Storch, and Birgit Kelle uses the website Demo-für-alle.de to organise the Stuttgart demonstrations against the 2015 education plans by the coalition of Social Democrats and Greens in the federal state of Baden-Württemberg. The website Demo-für-alle.de also belongs to the network of Sven und Beatrix von Storch. The secretary who organises Michael Bommers’ spiritual events in the context of the Association of Catholic Entrepreneurs is also the Deputy Chairwoman of Birgit Kelle’s association Frau2000plus. For a brief period of time, a limited company belonging to Birgit Kelle was registered at the same address as the Legionaries of Christ in the city of Düsseldorf, on Bommers’ commercial site. The Kelles also sat together on the podium with the Legionaries of Christ, praised the apostolic groups on the last Catholics Day, and showed significant support for the Legionaries on their personal Facebook pages. In addition, Birgit Kelle also accepted a number of invitations from Regnum Christi.

Brazil is home to the Associations for the Defence of Tradition, Family and Property (TFP), which was formed in 1960 by Plinio Correa de Oliveira. This movement is defined by its extreme anti-egalitarian attempts to re-establish the »Catholic hierarchy«. The desired inequality is to be seen as a form of hierarchical inequality that is taken from all areas of life: the man as the head of the family, the people as »servants« of the government, the predominance of spiritual work over physical work, and the recognition of superior, hereditary aristocracy. The movement believes God created the world to be unequal and hierarchically established; and that whoever hates inequality hates God. This content can be found in one of three background articles entitled »Die Diktatur der Gleichheit und die katholische Aternative« (The Dictatorship of Equality and the Catholic Alternative) on TFP’s German website (Solimeo 2014).

In the mid 1980s, TFP founder Oliveira criticised the »increasingly impertinent behaviour of homosexuals«, the level of impunity for homosexuality, and the flexibility of the Catholic church (Oliveira 2014).

In 1990, TFP collected over five million signatures globally in favour of the independence of Lithuania, a country shaped by Catholicism. At the time, this represented the single largest petition campaign to date. The Lithuanian Parliament has still been receiving TFP delegations in recent years. In Lithuania, the so-called Morality Law was brought into force in 2010 with the intention of protecting, among others, children and young people from »homosexual propaganda«.

The President of the German TFP is Mathias von Gernsheim. The association, like the Deutsche Vereinigung für eine Christliche Kultur (DVCK, German Association for a Christian Culture)\(^1\) has its headquarters in Bad Homburg. The aim of its current apostolic campaign—»Das Herz Jesu Apostolat für die Zukunft der Familie« (The Sacred Heart Apostolate for the Future of the Family)—is that the »social kingdom of the Sacred Heart of Jesus« be »enthroned«, and that to do this, it is necessary »to regenerate the family, the constituent cell of society«.

In addition to the Catholic-apostolic, family-oriented influences from Latin America, evangelical and familialist influences from the US are also apparent. This includes, above all,\(^{1}\)

---

\(^1\) The President of the DVCK is Benno Hofschulte, and its sub-groupings are Kinder in Gefahr (Children in Danger) and Aktion SOS Leben (SOS Life Action).
the American Center for Law and Justice (ACLJ) and the World Congress of Family (WCF).

The ACLJ was founded in 1990 by the television evangelist Pat Robertson, who in 1992 appointed Jay Sekulow as Director and Head of Legal for ACLJ. Eight years after its creation, the European Center for Law and Justice (ECLJ) was started as an offshoot, with Jay Alan Sekulow and Thomas Patrick Monaghan as founding members. The General Director of the ECLJ is Grégor Puppinck. He is also the president of the European committee of the European Citizens’ Initiative (ECI) One of Us, which—inspired by similar ideas from the US—would like to stop development aid if one of the participating organisations does not adhere to the »life protection« legal conditions for embryos. A more in-depth discussion of One of Us follows later in the text.

In 2012, the Slavic Center for Law and Justice (SCLJ) was established with the help of USD 300,000 (Blue 2014). As detailed by Miranda Blue, the ECLJ cooperates with the Russian Orthodox church (ibid.). More information on this later on.

Another US organisation exercising influence on European family and gender policies is the WCF, which was founded by Allan Carlson in 1997 and is a project of the Howard Center for Family, Religion & Society in Rockford, Illinois. The WCF is a network of familialist organisations and individuals from—according to its own sources—more than 80 countries. Its aim is to restore the »natural family« as the »fundamental social unit and the »seed bed« of civic society«.

Interestingly, none of the congresses have taken place in the US. Of the seven congresses to date, five took place in Europe, one in Mexico City, and the most recent in Sydney. The frequency of the events is increasing; congresses now seem to be taking place annually. In 2014, the congress »Every Child A Gift: Large Families—The Future of Humanity« was planned for Moscow. It was supposed to take place from 10–12 September in stately locations, such as the Kremlin, the Duma, Lomonosov Moscow State University, and the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow, but was cancelled due to the ongoing crisis in Ukraine.

The following was stated regarding collaborative efforts between the American WCF and Russian organisations:

WCF has been active in Russia since its founding in 1995. Professor Anatoly Antonov of Lomonosov Moscow State University—one of the nation’s foremost demographers and a member of the organizing committee for WCF VIII—was present at the conception. That activity increased dramatically with Father Maxim Obukhov’s presentation at WCF IV (Warsaw) in 2007, the appointment of Alexey Komov as regional representative in Russia and the CIS in 2010, and the world’s first Demographic Summit at the Russian State Social University in 2011. The Summit was the first international gathering devoted exclusively to the coming crisis resulting from the worldwide decline of fertility. It was followed by a second Demographic Summit in the Russian region of Ulyanovsk in 2012. (World Congress of Families 2014: 1f.)

Various European Parliament delegates took part in the WCF in Warsaw in 2007. The WCF 2012 in Madrid was hosted by the campaign network CitizenGo on its websites.

Both the American fundamentalist lobby group ACLJ and the equally fundamentalist WCF network not only exercise influence in Western Europe, but also link up additional conservative, familialist organisations from the Russian Federation, Europe and the US.

J. Lester Feder announced in a recent article that, according to research carried out by the US group People for the American Way, 2012 saw several million dollars sent by the largest Christian fundamentalist organisations to Europe alone:

A review of tax disclosures conducted by the progressive advocacy group People for the American Way found that several U.S. groups—many of which boomed in the 1990s—had recently invested in conservative drives across Europe: The American Center for Law and Justice, founded by Pat Robertson, sent $1.1 million to its European branch, the European Center for Law and Justice, in 2012, which is the most recent year for which tax disclosures are available. Another group founded by well-known American social conservatives called the Alliance Defending Freedom spent more than $750,000 on European programs that year. The Federalist Society, which promotes conservative legal philosophy, reported spending nearly $800,000 in »conferences and seminars« in Europe that year. Personhood USA, a small Colorado-based group that has tried to pass ballot measures that would give fetuses the legal status of »persons«—a strategy for rolling back abortion rights that is controversial even among pro-life activists—poured $400,000 into Europe in 2012, just after one of its ballot measures went down in flames in Mississippi. (Feder 2014)

Whether the networks close to the AfD profited from these transactions directly or indirectly, has not been investigated within the scope of this study.
2.1.3 Inclusion of Islamic Groups

In the course of large-scale protests that took place in France, new topics drew attention—for example, the so-called (premature) sexualisation of school teaching. The actions of Faridah Belghou should be mentioned at this point. She participated initially in the French protests against the equal treatment of gay/lesbian couples. For some time, she has been organising school boycotts against sex education—»Journée de Retrait de l’École«. These actions have led to an alliance being formed between Catholics and Muslims. While the middle classes are perceived to be predominantly involved in the protests against same-sex marriage, hetero-normative school boycotts with a religious undertone are also taking place in the more impoverished urban areas of Paris, the banlieues. Faridah Belghou also took part in a demonstration in Cologne—alongside Beatrice Bourges and a representative from Civitas—with the aim of creating an international protest movement.

Although the anti-feminist protest movements are aided by nationalist, conservative, and racist attitudes, this does not preclude them joining forces with Islamic-oriented organisations. Thus, the conservative Forum of German Catholics issued a statement explaining that Islam is a »natural ally« in the fight against the »culture of death« (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung 2009).

This position remains contradictory. In 2004, Jürgen Liminski wrote in Der Fels, the monthly publication from the Forum of German Catholics:

*Today, it is the perverse and the cowards that are in the driving seat.... The problem today is: we can no longer allow this cowardice. Not only because the German people is threatened by extinction.... No, because our continent and our children and grandchildren are threatened by Islam. (Liminski 2004: 323ff.)*

And for the first time, a representative of an Islamic organisation recently spoke at a demonstration in Stuttgart against the »Education Plan 2015«.

2.1.4 Russian Activities

Eastern Europe is to be viewed differently to Western Europe in terms of equality policy objectives. Miriam Hoheisel and Susanne Baer wrote the following in 2008:

*In the new Eastern European member states, there are other processes in part, but often similar needs. In this regard, the processes of globalisation and the transition from a socialist to a capitalist system can be seen to interact. The costs of the transformation are absolutely gender-specific, and often at the expense of women who find themselves in certain life situations. Demands for equality are, more often than not, rejected as an external imposition or unsuitable ideology. After both the EU and the international community played a key role as a driving force for equality policymaking in the build-up to an admission to the EU, and legal advancements were recorded in the process of adjustment to meet the legislative requirements of the EU. (Hoheisel and Baer 2008: 3 ff.)*

Under Vladimir Putin—and with the enthusiastic approval of the Russian Orthodox church—the Russian Federation saw the enactment of legislation against »homosexual propaganda«. In a speech that took place during one of the annually hosted Valdai conferences, Putin used vocabulary related to population policy that referenced set ideas from both Christian fundamentalism (»Satan«) and population biology ideologies (»direct path to decline«):

*We see just how many Euro-Atlantic countries have all but bid farewell to their own roots, among which are those Christian values that form the foundations of Western civilisation.... Both the moral foundation and all traditional identities are being rejected—the national, the cultural, the religious and even the legal.... A form of politics has taken hold where a family with many children and a same-sex couple are equated with one another, as are the belief in God and Satan.... The excesses of political correctness have reached an extent whereby the registration of political parties that have made it their goal to disseminate paedophilic propaganda is being taken seriously.... Many people in European countries are ashamed and fear expressing their own religious affiliation. Even festivals are being done away with, or being referred to by different names, leading to a shameful hiding of the essence of the festival itself.... a direct path to decline and primitiveness, as well as a deep demographic and moral crisis. (Putin 2013)*

However, things do not stop with laws and corresponding addresses in Russia, but with Russian state radio and the Institute of Democracy and Cooperation, whose influence is being exercised on the formation of gender and family policy in Western Europe. In this way, the Russian state radio broadcaster, The Voice of Russia, reported extensively and—for the most part—positively on the demonstrations against same-sex marriage in France.

The Institute of Democracy and Cooperation, with its headquarters in France, was founded in 2008 in order to encourage a »positive national image of Russia«. It is financed using Russian donations that do not have to be published in detail in France. The Institute is led by Natalia Narochitskaya, who was a member of the Duma and Vice President of the International Affairs Committee of the Duma. She
is active within the Russian Orthodox Church and belonged to the Russian parlia-
mentary delegation of the Council of Europe.

In 2013, Narochnitskaya and Jürgen Elsässer organised the homophobic event »Für
die Zukunft der Familie« (For the Future of the Family) in Leipzig. The following was
published on the website for the event:

In order that the German plight does not obstruct the view to finding solutions,
with the help of our cooperative partner, the Institute of Democracy and Co-
operation (IDC) in Paris—whose President is Natalia Narochnitskaya, and
whose Director is John Laughland—we have once again found international
contributors: The publicist Béatrice Bourges will be reporting on the popular
resistance against same-sex marriage in France. From Russia, we have the
President of the Family Committee of the Duma, Elena Misulina, and her Dep-
uty Olga Batalina, who have taken charge of elaborating on the new stance
on family policy by Putin. (Für die Zukunft der Familie! 2013)

Party leaders from the right-wing extremist party Front National, including Ay-
meric Chauprade, have appeared as lecturers at the Institute of Democracy and
Cooperation. Béatrice Bourges, who was excluded from the conservative alliance
Demo for All because her demands were considered too extreme, was also invited
to deliver a lecture on the »Defence of the Family« (Wiegel 2014).

In the Russian Federation, Marine Le Pen was received by the Chairman of the Duma,
Sergey Naryshkin, and the Chairman of the International Affairs Committee in the
Duma, Aleksey Pushkov. Marine Le Pen praised Putin for not »giving in to the in-
ternational gay rights lobby«: »Putin is a real patriot. Thanks to him, we will be able
to save Christian civilisation« (ibid.).

At the same time, familialist organisations headquartered in the US—such as ACLJ
and its respective offshoots, the ECLJ / Slavic Center for Law and Justice, and the
WCF—have all been pushing for collaboration with organisations in Russia. The
WCF announced on its website that the eighth WCF would actually take place in
Moscow in September 2014. However, it was cancelled due to the crisis in Ukraine,
as has already been detailed above.

2.1.5 Masculinist, Male Right-wing Scene

Whilst the groups named so far have been familialist, the last decade has witnessed—
especially in German-speaking regions—the emergence of an anti-feminist movement
that does not necessarily share a familialist orientation, or is critically or confrontation-
ally opposed to familialist attitudes, especially when associated with a so-called
mother cult. This refers to the anti-feminist, male right-wing movement whose rep-
resentatives call themselves »masculinists«.

This scene accuses the allegedly omnipresent »state feminism« (»femocracy«) of op-
pressing men and masculinity. It is affiliated with the paternal rights movement, but
is significantly more driven by its ideology and is more strongly anchored in the right-
wing scene and ideology. Masculinism has been strong for decades, above all in the
US. In recent years, an increasingly aggressive masculinist scene has begun to emerge
in Germany via the Internet. With regard to the significance of the mother’s role,
there are differences between the familialist-religious and masculinist approaches

2.2 EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTARY GENDER-POLICY
ACTIVITIES

2.2.1 Familialist NGOs

2.2.1.1 New Women for Europe

The feminist-oriented European Women’s Lobby (EWL), along with the 2,500 or-
ganisations it represents, is one of the European Union’s largest umbrella organisa-
tions. Conservative politicians are attempting to position non-feminist women’s
organisations against EWL. In this context, the NGO New Women for Europe (NWFE)
should be mentioned.

Recently, its position [Europeans Women’s Lobby (EWL)] has been challenged
by conservative women’s group New Women for Europe (NEW) that promotes
family and pro-life issues and finds the EWL to be ideologically too feminist
and too much on the left. The presence of NWE [sic] in European Parliament’s
hearings on equality has been promoted by conservative MEPs and has in some
cases overtaken that of the EWL. (Roland Augustin 2011: 251 – 2) (Kantola
and Nousianinen 2012: 46)

The organisation NWFE is an umbrella organisation with its headquarters in Brussels.
According to its own sources, the consortium of over 75 women’s and family as-
associations from 17 European countries was founded in March 2003, and currently
represents approximately 500,000 members (Jamborová 2009). On NWFE’s website
(updated: August-September 2014), there are no details about the organisations,
no names of responsible board members, and no history of the founding of the
organisation.
According to NWFE, its seven-member board includes, or included, Nathalie d’Ursel (President), Andrea Ettl (Vice President from 2002–2009), Jana Jamborová (General Secretary), and Birgit Kelle (elected to the board in 2010).

Since 3 January 2012, NWFE has been listed in the Transparency Register of the European Parliament, which was last updated on 3 January 2014. According to the Transparency Register, NWFE represents 50 individuals and 28 organisations with a total of 1,098 members.

No information can be found online regarding the group Lobby Leben, other than the fact that Birgit Kelle is the Chairwoman of the association, as well as the Chairwoman of the listed association Frau 2000plus. The total budget for the financial year 2012 was EUR 2,876. None of the individuals of this organisation have been accredited with access to the facilities of the European Parliament. The President of the organisation is Nathalie d’Oultremont.

The information that at least 75 organisations with half a million members enjoy representation by NWFE and have »observer status« in the European Parliament does not align with the details in the Transparency Register.

In July 2002, the European Parliament accepted the »Resolution of the European Parliament on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights« (European Parliament 2002) which, among other things, »recommends that abortion should be legal, safe and accessible for all, in order to safeguard the reproductive health and rights of women«, and »calls on all governments of the Member States and Accession Countries to refrain from any form of persecution of those women who have had abortions performed illegally« (ibid.).

NWFE’s founding took place in the context of protests against the liberalisation of abortion laws in Portugal. In 2004, the apostolic group Lichtzeichen e.V., which belongs to the Schönstatt Movement, announced:

Lichtzeichen e.V. successfully contributed to a petition that was initiated by the network NEW WOMEN FOR EUROPE. In this regard, Christian women’s organisations and women from across Europe have become involved by adopting a stance in situations where the dignity of women has been violated. The cause for the campaign was the introduction of a new law in Portugal for the legalisation of abortion. The petition campaign had the aim of challenging politicians / public figures to inform women of the negative effects of an abortion on their health. (Lichtzeichen 2004)

The group Associação Mulheres em Acção (Association of Women in Action), which sees itself as the Portuguese coordinator of NWFE, was also involved in the anti-abortion campaign. The group’s founding principles include, among other things:

- Gender complementarity for women and men
- Familialism—i.e., family as the foundation of society, the right of parenting for the family, recognition of family work
- Protection of life

NWFE represents similar values:

- »focussing on the real needs of the family«
- »monitoring the best interests of the child«
- »respecting the free choice of parents«
- »appreciating investments in human capital within the framework of the family«
- »offering a range of services and tools (pro-family measures)«
- »applying family mainstreaming«

[3] AFAMMER (17 members), Action Famille /Actie Gezin (150 members), Ano pre život (20 members), Asociación Mujer, Familia y Trabajo (15 members), Association Famille d’Oultremont (200 members), Chant d’Oiseau / Vogelzang (20 members), Espoir pour les Femmes (5 members), Familiathlon (15 members), Femina Europa (50 members), La Femme Contemporaine (50 members), Femmes et Médiation (5 members), Femme+ (5 members), Fórum života (39 members), Fundación de Ayuda a las Viudas (50 members), Fundación Madrina (30 members), Good Shepherd Sisters (30 members), Hungarian Women’s Alliance (17 members), Lobby Leben (20 members), Merurban (50 members), Associação Mulheres Em Acção (50 members), Nova Zena (15 members), Souffle de Vie (5 members), Szilágyi Erzsébet Charity (15 members), Tolerancia Zero (15 members), UNACOPL (150 members).

[4] The report was due to be renewed in 2013, because the European Parliament had been expanded to include a number of countries from Eastern Europe, some of which still adhere to restrictive abortion laws. However, the report written by Edite Estrela was rejected after several attempts were made.
• «not discriminating against those who have freely chosen to care of their children in their early years»

• «breaking down stereotypes in the view of and approach to these parents»

• «acknowledging the irreplaceable role of the family within the framework of intergenerational solidarity»

• «supporting the exchange of experience and good practice within the EU» (Jamborová 2009)

In March 2006, Polish MEP Konrad Szymansky (PiS) and Ari Vatanen (UMP) hosted the conference »Reproductive Rights—Facts, No Ideology!« In the explanation given by Szymansky, this conference—which took place in the facilities of the European Parliament—was a stand against the »very aggressive feminist lobby« in the European Parliament. Speakers came from the NGOs Matercare International, CARE for Europe, and NWFE, on whose behalf Andrea Ettl held a speech (Biuro Prasowe PiS 2006).

2.2.1.2 CARE for Europe

According to information available in the Transparency Register, CARE for Europe (Christian Action Research & Education for Europe) is a European, Christian NGO with 60,000 members and a total budget of approximately EUR 184,000. CARE for Europe stands for »the support of human dignity in accordance with the Judeo-Christian tradition« in various socio-political fields, including:

• social, family and equality policies

• the protection of women and children

• bioethics and questions of public health

• media standards

CARE for Europe has its headquarters in Brussels, and the responsible individual is David Fieldsend. CARE for Europe is not identified as an umbrella organisation.

CARE for Europe’s website displays the following information:

We are supported by churches and individual members from across the whole of Europe, and we represent their views with regard to the value of human lifes [sic] ... CARE for Europe longs for a Europe who [sic] clings to her [sic] Christian values, and which develops into a union in which every individual is treated with dignity. Through its lobbying efforts, it attempts to influence European politics with the values of Jesus Christ. As CARE for Europe is active on a european [sic] level, it can also contribute to shaping politics at a national level. (CARE for Europe 2014)

CARE for Europe was recently involved in two campaigns: The European Citizens’ Initiative [5] One of Us, and the rejection of the »Estrela Report«:

In this regard we have actively promoted the seminal European Citizens’ Initiative, »One of Us«, which asks the Commission to introduce a law prohibiting the use of EU monies for these purposes. Nearly 2 million people have signed the One of Us petition!

We have also been fighting hard against anti-life parliamentary reports most notably Mrs Estrela’s seeking to create a »right for abortion« and the sexualizing of young children through school classes. Happily this was defeated twice! (CARE for Europe 2014)

As part of the campaign »EU Elections 2014—The Issues. The Candidates. The Results«, gender-related topics in particular were utilised, such as the One of Us campaign and the EU reports by Ulrike Lunacek (»Action plan against homophobia and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity«) and Edite Estrela (»Report on sexual and reproductive health and the associated rights«). The respective positions of the political parties on these topics were presented, and voters were encouraged to vote for politicians / political parties who had spoken in favour of One of Us and against the reports by Estrela and Lunacek.

2.2.2 Familialist Intergroups

Intergroups in the European Parliament have no decision-making authority, and may not speak for the European Parliament. In order to found an intergroup, the

---

[5] European Citizens’ Initiatives (ECIs) are official petitions for changes to the law in the EU. In order to successfully implement an ECI, activists from several EU countries must join together and, in their respective countries, gather a minimum number of votes. In sum, one million votes have to have been collected within one year. If all conditions are met, the European Commission must address this concern.
signatures of MEPs from three parliamentary groups must be obtained. Every parliamentary group has a particular number of signatures depending on its size; in the legislative period 2009–2014, it was between 5 and 21 signatures. Familial positions were especially adopted by parliamentary groups representing the family, and the rights and protection of children respectively. The intergroup Family and the Protection of the Child was formed on 16 December 2004 under the presidency of Maria Panayotopoulos-Cassiotou. The intergroup Family and the Rights of the Child & Bioethics was formed on 1 July 2010 under the presidency of Anna Záborská, Miroslav Mikolasik, and Margrete Auken. In this particular case, it is apparent that the MEPs from the Green parliamentary group were more interested in the issue of bioethics, while the MEPs from conservative parliamentary groups were more interested in issues related to families and the children’s rights.

The intergroup Family and the Rights of the Child included the founder of Front National, Jean-Marie Le Pen (France). Similarly, there are MEPs who took part in the anti-feminist WCF: Carlo Casini (Italy), Jaime Mayor Oreja (Spain), Konrad Szymanski (Poland), Anna Záborská (Slovakia).

### 2.2.3 Current Gender-related Debates in the EU Parliament

The focus now turns to the current family and gender policy-related debates taking place in the EU Parliament: the reports by the MEPs Edite Estrela and Ulrike Lunacek, as well as the ECI One of Us. Reference is also made at this stage to the previous expert opinion »Keimzelle der Nation? Familien- und geschlechterpolitische Positionen der AfD—eine Expertise« (Foundation of the nation? Family and gender-policy positions of the AfD, Kemper 2014: 37ff.).

#### 2.2.3.1 Reports: Estrela and Lunacek

Reports by the European Parliament are to be understood as recommendations for the member states; they have no binding effect but are able to strengthen political decisions within those member states.

The report on »Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights« was delivered in 2002. It covered the topics of contraception, unwanted pregnancy and abortion, sexual and reproductive health in teenagers / sex education and sexual and reproductive health policies in the European Union in general (European Parliament 2002).

Passage 12 »recommends that abortion should be legal, safe and accessible for all in order to safeguard the reproductive health and rights of women«, and passage 13 »calls on all governments of the Member States and Accession Countries to refrain from any form of persecution of those women who have had abortions performed illegally«. These passages sparked intense debates in some of the member states with restrictive abortion laws.

Ten years on, especially in view of the expansion of the EU to include new member states from Eastern Europe, the report on sexual and reproductive health and rights was due for renewal. The discrepancy between these rights in the different member states is seen as large. In the Eastern and Southern European member states, there are »either insufficient or even non-existent sex education programmes in place« (European Parliament 2013). This correlates with the »highest birth rate and number of abortions among teenagers in Eastern European member states« (ibid.). In Spain and Hungary in particular, there have been increasing attacks on the rights of women with regard to reproductive self-determination. In the Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality, the Portuguese MEP Edite Estrela was commissioned with the task of creating this report, which from this point on, will be referred to as the »Estrela Report«.

The conservative MEP Anna Zaborska adopted an opposing minority stance in the committee against the report, citing, among other things in this context, that the ECI One of Us was at odds with a full-scale implementation of the recommendations of the report regarding questions of abortion (ibid.). While the criticism expressed by Anna Zaborska focused on the protection of embryonic life, both conservative and church groups were most strongly mobilised by the passages regarding sex education.

In particular, the modernised passages from 2002 regarding »comprehensive sex education and youth rights« were branded a scandal. The report envisaged that teenagers’ access to sexual content should be taken into consideration critically in the course of sex education, and that an anti-discriminatory stance should be conveyed with regard to »a positive view of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, as well as intersex and transgender individuals«. The report was rejected—after a number of attempts—even after the drafting of a watered-down version in which certain criticisms had been adopted.

Edite Estrela and Cornelia Ernst, MEP from the German left-wing party Die Linke, reported a flood of spam emails (cf. Kemper 2014: 38ff.). In a statement, Cornelia Ernst accused Beatrix von Storch (prime AfD candidate for the European parliamentary election in 2014) of co-orchestrating the attacks:

*The ECI »One of Us* [http://www.1-von-uns.de/](http://www.1-von-uns.de/), which demands an end to EU funds for population control measures and family planning, receives support..."*
Indeed, in the online publication Freie Welt—which belongs to the Zivile Koalition network—the importance of this network was indirectly highlighted:

The European Citizens’ Initiative ONE OF US and the initiative »Familienschutz« (Family Protection)—both led by Hedwig von Beverfoerde—organised a demonstration in front of the European Parliament in Strasbourg and called for an email protest against the proposed resolution. (Die Freie Welt 2013)

Hedwig von Beverfoerde heads up the internet presence Familienschutz.de, which also belongs to the Zivile Koalition e.V. She was also voted »Political Christian of the Year 2013« by the evangelist »life protection« network IDEA for her commitment to fighting against the »Estrela Report« and for the ECI One of Us.

2013 saw a further mobilisation by conservative Christian forces against another report. The report envisages a »Europe-wide action plan against homophobia« and was drafted by the Austrian Green Party MEP Ulrike Lunacek. The report »demands that the Commission, the Member States and the relevant institutions together develop a comprehensive policy for the protection of fundamental rights of LGBTI individuals over a period of several years« (Lunacek 2014).

Ulrike Lunacek also reported many personal slanderous remarks and a flood of 40,000 spam emails (Fülbeck 2014). The Lunacek report was adopted.

Yet it did not end with just verbal attacks against Ulrike Lunacek. She was apparently targeted in a butyric acid attack during a gay pride parade on 14 June 2014 (Der Standard 2014). The perpetrator was found, but was deemed non compos mentis and therefore could not be prosecuted. As he had already carried out a number of butyric acid attacks against animal rights activists, Ulrike Lunacek insisted on a review of the psychiatric assessment.

2.2.3.2 European Citizens’ Initiative One of Us

The ECI One of Us demands that three changes be made to the law regarding the protection of embryonic life. It surpassed the necessary quorum of one million signatures, with a total of 1.74 million signatures. Of this number, 623,000 originated from Italy, home of the Fondazione Vita Nova—one of the initiators of the citizens’ initiative, which provided EUR 120,000 in sponsorship funds. The specific demands were:

• »No budgetary resources may be allocated to treatments that lead to, or require, the destruction of human embryos.«
• The following research fields are not supported: »Research activities that involve the destruction of human embryos, including such activities that have the aim of extracting embryonic stem cells, or by which stem cells are used having been acquired by different means.«
• »The development aid of the Union may not, on the basis of the current regulation, be used for the financing of abortions, either directly or by means of financing an organisation that carries out or supports abortions« (European Commission 2014: 2ff.).

The European Commission rejected the application made by One of Us.

The German coordinator of One of Us is Hedwig von Beverfoerde. She and her initiative Familienschutz.de belong to the network surrounding the association Zivile Koalition e.V., which was founded by AfD MEP Beatrix von Storch. The German-language webpage of One of Us also lists Beatrix and Sven von Storch as the Presidents of the Zivile Koalition e.V. Officially, seven individuals from seven EU member states are responsible:

• Gregor Patrick Puppinck, President (France)
• Filippo Vari, Movimento per la vita (Italy)
• Manfred Liebner, Stiftung Ja zum Leben (Germany)
• Alicia Latorre, Federacion Española de Asociaciones Provida (Spain)
• Josephine Quintavalle, ProLife Alliance and Core (Great Britain)
• Edith Frivaldszky, Together for Life Association (Hungary)
• Jakub Baltroszewicz, Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements (Poland)

Tobias Teuscher was appointed representative for One of Us. He was previously employed by the »life protection activists« Dana Scallon (Ireland) and Anna Zabor-ska (Slovakia). Born in Brandenburg, Germany, Teuscher recently stood for the party Force Vie in the European parliamentary elections. Another prime candidate of this party, who did not make it into the European Parliament, was Antoine Renard of the Federation of Catholic Family Associations (FAFCE). As a European Catholic
umbrella organisation, FAFCE aims to promote the interests of Catholic family associations in the European Parliament.

In an interview, Teuscher expressed his hope for the Austrian Liste REKOS party and the AfD. The Front National is a party he views as both a source of danger and hope:

There is a great deal of hope placed in the young movement of REKOS—Liste Ewald Stadler (The Reformist Conservatives), a party in which many young people are involved. The EU is a civilising project.

At the only official event at the European Parliament for One of Us, he was even the only German-speaking MEP with a clear presence who defended EU law in the area of protection for embryonic lifes [sic]! We hope that REKOS will be able to establish themselves for the long-term....

When the nationalist parties leave the middle, consensus-oriented individuals turn away. This is something that is being witnessed in Germany with the success of Alternative für Deutschland which will take over from the FDP in questions of economic policy, and which represents a very practical alternative for conservative CDU / CSU voters. In Austria, there are the Reformkonservativen (Reformist Conservatives). In France, new parties have sprung up along with the largest civil society movement for the protection of marriage and the family....

The end of the French two-party system because of Front National represents both a source of opportunity and danger at the same time. In order to work in the long term, we must unite, limit ourselves to core topics, not enter into false compromises before any negotiations, not embark on a fundamental debate regarding every topic and simply have the courage to highlight the political relativism of the centre-right parties....

Together with Antoine Renard (President of the European Catholic Family Associations) we represent a list of courageous, resilient citizens. (Nardi 2014)

The following section covers how, and in what form, the AfD has entered the European Parliament with regard to gender and family policy-related lines of conflict. REKOS, the party mentioned by Teuscher, is part of the centre-right conservative European party MELD. REKOS missed the benchmark for entering the European Parliament by a long mark, with just 1.18 per cent of the vote.

2.3 THE 2014 ELECTION RESULTS FOR THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT WITH REGARD TO CONSERVATIVE GENDER AND FAMILY POLICIES

In the framework of the European Parliament, it is critical to differentiate the national parties from the European parties, the parliamentary groups (groups), and the intergroups in the European Parliament.

In the EU member states, MEPs from the parties at a national level are voted into the European Parliament. Some of these parties have also joined forces to form European parties. In the European Parliament, it makes sense for parliamentarians to attach themselves to parliamentary groups.

Currently, there are 13 European political parties and seven European parliamentary groups:

**European political parties:**
- EPP European People’s Party
- PES Party of European Socialists
- ALDE Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
- AECR Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists
- EGP European Green Party
- EAF European Alliance for Freedom
- EL Party of European Left
- MELD Movement for a Europe of Liberties and Democracy
- EDP European Democratic Party
- EFA European Free Alliance
- AENM Alliance of European National Movements
- ECPM European Christian Political Movement
- EUD Europeans United for Democracy

**European parliamentary groups:**
- EVP Parliamentary group of the European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) (EVP)
- S&D Progressive Alliance of Social Democrats in the European Parliament
- ECR European Conservatives and Reformists
- ALDE Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
- GUE – NGL United European Left / Nordic Green Left
- Greens/EFA The Greens / European Free Alliance
- EFDD Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy
The seats of the German parliamentarians are broken down as follows:

**Distribution of German MEPs in the parliamentary groups**

- **EVP:** 34 seats (29 CDU, 5 CSU)
- **S&D:** 27 seats (SPD)
- **Greens/EFA:** 13 seats (11 Greens, 1 Pirates, 1 Ecological Democratic Party [ÖDP])
- **GUE/NGL:** 8 seats (7 Left Party, 1 Animal Protection Party)
- **ECR:** 8 seats (7 AfD, 1 Family)
- **ALDE:** 4 seats (3 FDP, 1 Free Voters [Freie Wähler])
- **non-attached members:** 2 seats (1 NPD, 1 The Party [Die Partei])

In the European elections, the AfD received 7.1 per cent of votes and was able to enter the European Parliament with seven candidates: Bernd Lucke, Hans-Olaf Henkel, Bernd Kölmel, Beatrix von Storch, Joachim Starbatty, Ulrike Trebesius, and Marcus Pretzell.

### 2.4 AfD Affiliation to a European Parliamentary Group and to a European Party

To date, the AfD has not affiliated itself with a European political party. Because the AfD has now affiliated itself with the European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR), and this parliamentary group is closely associated with the Alliance for European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR), it would seem appropriate that the AfD affiliate itself with the AECR. However, the Turkish party AKP is also affiliated with the AECR, and the AfD has spoken out against Turkey joining the EU. Moreover, the AfD has adopted an anti-Islamic stance.

Even the affiliation with the parliamentary group ECR was controversial. While Bernd Lucke and Hans-Olaf Henkel spoke out in favour of an alignment with the Tories (the British Conservative Party), many AfD members spoke vehemently in favour of an affiliation with the right-wing populist movement UKIP under Nigel Farage. After Bernd Lucke announced to the press that David Cameron of the Conservative Party was a preferred partner in the European Parliament, two state board members made a point of meeting with Nigel Farage in London.

The Junge Alternative NRW (Young People’s branch of AfD in North Rhine-Westphalia) also invited Nigel Farage to Cologne during the EU election campaign. Three hundred participants were involved in the event, the majority of whom were AfD members. Even Marcus Pretzell, who sits on the Advisory Committee of the Federal Board of the AfD—now the board of the largest national association of the AfD (LV NRW)—and is a member of the European Parliament, took part in the podium discussion, which led to him receiving a verbal caution from the Federal Board of the AfD.

Nevertheless, it is not the contradictory views within the AfD alone that are making an affiliation with the ECR parliamentary group difficult. Even David Cameron, leader of the Conservative Party, called for the AfD not to be permitted to join the ECR. The AfD was indeed not initially accepted into the ECR. At first, the AfD’s admission was postponed, during which time six new parties were able to join the ECR: both Scandinavian right-wing populist parties Danish People’s Party (DF) and the True Finns (PS); the right-wing populist The Independent Greeks (Anel); two Slovakian parties; and the German Family Party.

It was only on the second attempt that the AfD became a member of the ECR. While both Lucke and Henkel saw the motivation for an affiliation with the Tories—and not with UKIP—to lie in a gain in respectability from the Tories, this increased respectability would unlikely be possible after the acceptance process for the AfD. Only 29 members spoke in favour of an acceptance of the AfD, while 26 members—above all the Tories—rejected the acceptance. This means that the AfD was accepted into the ECR thanks to the votes of the new right-wing populist parties in the ECR.

### 2.5 The Current Situation Facing the AfD in the European Parliament Regarding Questions Related to Gender Policy

The website Familien-schutz.de, run by Hedwig von Beverfoerde, initiated a survey among politicians regarding topics related to gender and family policy. The question was asked whether eight »European conventions [sic] for families and children« could be agreed to (Beverfoerde 2014a). In addition to familialist viewpoints, the question was also asked as to whether the candidate could affiliate him/herself with an »intergroup of the European Parliament which takes action for the issues affecting families and children« (ibid.).

In the evaluation, it was stated:

_The policies of the European Parliament in previous years have, unfortunately, repeatedly shown, that [sic] many MEPs have losed [sic] sight of the significance of marriage and family—let us direct your attention towards the discussions concerning the Estrela and Lunacek report. We, as families, hold the opportunity in our hands to stop and even reverse this development._ (Beverfoerde 2014b)
In specific terms, the German political parties were appraised as follows:

While the majority of those candidates who were surveyed from the AfD, the AUF Party and the ÖDP, as well as several candidates from the PBC, CSU and CDU and one from the FDP, have subscribed to our conventions, it is of little surprise that not one candidate from the SPD, the Green Party, the Left or the Pirate Party would like to offer their unconditional support for these conventions. However, it has been revealed thanks to the highly evasive answers of some CDU candidates, among others the prime candidate David McAllister, that they are also not prepared to get behind our family policy-related demands. (ibid.)

The following politicians provided unlimited support for these demands and who entered the European Parliament: Hans-Olaf Henkel (AfD), Beatrix von Storch (AfD), Ulrike Trebesius (AfD), Marcus Pretzell (AfD) and Arne Gehricke (Familienpartei). All MEPs joined the parliamentary group ECR. It can therefore be assumed that any family and gender policy-related demands made by the network Zivile Koalition will be echoed above all in the ECR.

In France and Great Britain in particular, far-right extremist parties increased their number of seats during the European parliamentary elections in May 2014. Whilst the Front National adopted a distinct stance related to gender policy during their election campaigns, and spoke out for greater restrictions to be placed on abortions and against same-sex marriage, UKIP took on an anti-feminist stance but did not make this topic its main focus.

2.6 AfD’s Activities Related to Gender Policy in the European Parliament

The ECR has three MEPs: Beatrix von Storch (AfD, Germany), Jadwiga Wisniewska (PiS, Poland), Jana Žitnanska (NOVA, Slovakia); and their deputies Arne Gerricke (Familien-Partei, Germany), Julie Girling (Conservative Party, Great Britain) and Branislav Škripek (Obycajni Ludia, Slovakia) in the Women’s Committee FEMM in the European Parliament.

Beatrix von Storch was chosen as Vice President in the Women’s Committee by her parliamentary group ECR. According to a statement by the Internet-based news publication Freie Welt, preliminary arrangements had been made through the Council of Elders. If this were indeed the case, the majority in the committee did not adhere to this. In a secret vote for the election of the Vice President, Beatrix von Storch’s candidacy was rejected.

However, Beatrix von Storch was elected as the coordinator of the ECR for questions relating to the Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality, FEMM (ECR 2014: 2). The ECR represents the third largest group / parliamentary group in the EU. Taking into account the fact that all paperwork from FEMM makes its way across the ECR’s desk, her scope of potential influence is not insignificant.

[6] I would like to thank Neil Datta for this information.
ADF’s State-Specific Drafts and Statements Regarding Family Policies (Parental Voting Rights, Children’s Pension Model)
3.1 INTRODUCTION

Under the title «Same-sex Partnerships Are Not Marriages», the Pational board issued the following statement to clarify the position of Frauke Petry, state spokeswoman of the AfD in Saxony, during a press conference on 30 July 2014:

Frauke Petry has made reference to the fact that for decades, there have been too few children in Germany, and that the AfD advocates the three-child family model as a value consensus in German society in order to counteract urgent societal problems in Germany. Furthermore, Petry stated that although same-sex partnerships deserve tolerance, they are not to be viewed as marriage. In terms of economic policy, the AfD in Saxony would like to cultivate support for the middle classes as the backbone of the German economy by offering ..., among other things ..., a rejection of the quota system. (AfD Federal Committee 2014)

During the same press conference, Björn Höcke, state spokesman of the AfD in Thuringia, made the following statement under the title »Political Correctness ist ein Feind der Meinungsfreiheit« (Political Correctness Is an Enemy of Freedom of Opinion):

Björn Höcke advocates a tailored education policy, both in terms of the school education model and in the training of teachers. The so-called gender mainstreaming that aims to do away with natural gender polarity must be removed from our schools and universities without delay. By contrast, the classical family model is to be conveyed as a guiding principle in our pedagogical and educational establishments. Furthermore, he spoke decisively against the dominant sense of political correctness in Germany that covers our country like mildew. An open-minded discussion concerning political areas relevant for the future such as immigration, demography and currency is inhibited by the cartel of old political parties. The freedom of opinion guaranteed by the German Basic Law is something that must be achieved in reality. (ibid.)

After this joint press conference on the approaching state elections, Franz Eibl—press spokesman for the AfD in Bavaria and Regional President for Upper Bavaria—stepped down from his post at the AfD and left the party. He issued a statement in which he made clear, among other things:

The image for society presented yesterday is nothing short of reactionary and simply unacceptable for those people who stand for a pluralistic, liberal, open and tolerant society. There is only talk of foreigners in the context of criminality, how many children women are expected to have in future, and demands are being made that disabled children are not to be taught together with non-disabled children. (Eibl 2014)

3.2 AF D SAXONY’S 2014 STATE ELECTION MANIFESTO

TAfD Saxony’s state election manifesto is shaped by family policy-related demands (AfD Saxony 2014). The first and most comprehensive point of the election manifesto is the topic of family (ibid.: 3 ff.), and even the preamble contains several references to family policies.

The preamble is characterised by its extreme choice of wording, which can be found throughout the entire election manifesto: »enforced conformity« (ibid.: 2), »ridicule of the family« (ibid.: 2), »Corrective measures« (ibid.: 7), »state-prescribed newspeak« (ibid.: 19). Explicitly, there is a reference to the »anger« of the party.

In the name of children and so-called generational justice respectively, criticism is expressed for a »reckless ... accumulation of debt« (ibid: 2). Correspondingly, austerity measures are also demanded in the areas of gender and family policymaking: »All expenses, with the exception of expenses for education and national security, are to be examined and reduced accordingly« (ibid. 9). Simultaneously, family policymaking should introduce significant tax relief, which would automatically mean that the AfD’s family policymaking in Saxony would be geared towards higher-income earning parents or guardians and their families.

The AfD Saxony draws its support explicitly from the »values ... of the Christian West« (ibid.: 2) and demands a »pregnancy counselling system which is primarily obligated to the protection of life« (ibid.: 3). Because the family is considered the »most natural of all collectives«, it has a »particular significance« and has earned a »special form of protection« (ibid.: 2). The family guarantees the »continuation of society and state« (ibid.).

Apparently, we are witnessing the »openly conducted ... degradation and ridicule of the family« (ibid.), to which the AfD Saxony views itself in its preamble as an »alternative« (ibid.). The AfD Saxony also labels the initiator of this »enforced conformity«: it presents this »awry genderism« as a continuation of Marxist-Leninism within the meaning of »strangulated«, »misanthropic« ideologies that are being enforced »with full power« (ibid.).

[7] This pattern of argumentation is known from right-wing circles. The similarities of this section in the preamble with the corresponding passages in the preface of »Manifesto 2083« by the fanatical mass murderer Anders Behring Breivik are uncanny: »This short essay has sought to show one critical linkage, that between classical Marxism and the ingredients of the ›cultural revolution‹ that broke out in Western Europe in the 1960s. Of course, the action does not stop in the ’60s; the workings of
In the chapter on family policy, it is explicitly stated that the family should once again be the primary focus of family policymaking, and may not be defined by economic or equality policies (ibid.: 3). This statement is in contrast to a statement made by Frauke Petry to the right-wing weekly news publication Junge Freiheit during the Leipzig Book Fair. She defined family policy in terms of population policy: «The AfD is a family-oriented party and, as it is permitted to say once again, family policy is population policy» (Petry 2014). In fact, the focus on the family is significantly reduced in the preamble: «Family policy must keep the majority of functioning families in its sights» (AfD Saxony 2014: 3). What is understood by AfD Saxony in terms of «the majority of functioning families» is not elaborated. It does, however, rigorously reject families with same-sex partners: «Official homosexual life partnerships have already become a constitutional and societal reality. A continued equal ranking of the so-called «gay marriage» as well as the adoption of children by homosexuals is something we do not advocate» (ibid.: 3).

According to the AfD, families of foreign nationalities should by no means enjoy the protection that is afforded to German «functioning families». They criticise, for example, the increase in «unguided immigration by way of family reunion» (ibid.: 17) and they demand that EU citizens should only receive child support when they actually reside in Germany and «have undertaken a professional role for a minimum of five years that has led to the payment of social security contributions» (ibid.). In this regard, it is questionable as to whether AfD Saxony takes the interests of less well-off families into consideration, as well as it does those of well-off middle-class families for whom they would like to introduce extensive tax relief by way of so-called family splitting (ibid.: 3). Child poverty is something AfD Saxony only seems to know as a term meant for a family with a small number of children, and not as a description of an increasingly multidimensional poverty suffered by children (Holz et al. 2012: 6 ff.). They also appear to have not considered the educational disadvantages suffered by children from poorer families.

Among the specific legislative demands being made by AfD Saxony is the so-called Family Electoral Right, which entails the active electoral right of minors: «From the moment of birth, the family electoral right should be implemented by ensuring that the vote of the child up until the completion of the sixteenth and eighteenth year of life respectively be submitted by the legal guardian» (ibid.: 3). In the case of multiple parents or legal guardians (e.g. father and mother), both should receive an additional vote per child; according to the logic of AfD Saxony, children from single-parent families would therefore be disadvantaged in comparison to those children from «functioning majority families».

Interestingly, AfD Saxony has simultaneously spoken out against a change to election rights that would allow 16-year-olds the right to vote. According to statements made by AfD Saxony and information provided by the so-called Wahl-O-Mat (Elect-O-Mat) in Saxony, 16-year-olds do not have the «necessary maturity» to fulfil the cognitive requirements for voting. In other words, AfD Saxony is in favour of allowing the parents of these 16- and 17-year-olds to hold the right to vote, and to vote in their name and even against their own election wishes—and with twice the voting power.

Within the meaning of the normative higher-income earning «majority family», the demand appears to be for so-called family splitting, which should not be viewed as an alternative, but rather as an addition to «standard marital status relief». The «family income» should be split and taxed across all family members (ibid.). This taxation model should help high performers, most of whom are childless, to fulfil their desire for children (ibid.). Family splitting should be differentiated from uniform tax-free allowances for children, which could only be legitimised with the costs incurred by raising children. While uniform tax-free allowances assume an equal value for children, the concept of family splitting acts as an income-dependent lump-sum allowance for children: the larger the income, the larger the lump-sum allowance. In other words, larger tax-free allowances for higher-income earning families would imply that children from higher-income earning families need, and should receive, greater financial means than children from lower-income earning families. This would presumably contradict constitutional law if the state were to provide greater financial means for raising children to higher-income earning families than to lower-income earning families, because constitutional law forbids penalising anyone because of their social origin.

The so-called Schreiber Plan could also be seen as similarly unjust and unconstitutional, with its demand for so-called child and youth pension schemes. Under the label of «generational justice», the AfD demands the implementation of a children’s pension scheme in accordance with the Schreiber Plan (ibid.: 4). In the 1950s, the

the Frankfurt School are yet very much with us, especially in the field of education…. Political Correctness is not at all about -being nice-, unless one thinks gulags are nice places. Political Correctness is Marxism, with all that implies: loss of freedom of expression, thought control, inversion of the traditional social order, and, ultimately, a totalitarian state…. Perhaps no aspect of Political Correctness is more prominent in Western European life today than feminist ideology.» (Breivik 2011; see Kemper 2013)

[8] Accordingly, an educational system is being demanded that uses learning materials and educational content that is aligned with the reality of the majority, and not that of the minority. The «indoctrinating influences» of LGBT educational content is to be counteracted.
alternative models of uniform child maintenance and that of an income-dependent child pension scheme were established. As the President of the Association of Catholic Entrepreneurs, Schreiber developed the children’s pension scheme alongside that of the old-age pension scheme. The children’s pension scheme was to be paid out in relation to the income of the father (6 to 8 per cent of income) from a pension pot, into which the respective children would then pay once they reached the age of 35. The payments made into the pot would be dependent on both the current income and the current number of children. If an individual had no children of his own, he would have to pay double the contribution. The more children a family had, the lower the pension contribution to be paid would become. From the sixth child onwards, no further contribution would have to be paid.

The injustice of this system is quite clear. By replacing uniform child maintenance with an income-dependent children’s pension scheme, the children of higher-income earning parents would receive more money than those of parents earning less. This would be unconstitutional, as the German Basic Law forbids any individual from being penalised on the basis of the social origin. So-called social climbers would be particularly affected by this injustice: they would pay a larger contribution into the pension pot—in holistic societal terms—than they would have received as children themselves.

This arrangement would also be unjust if the AfD were to implement its demand that same-sex couples would not be permitted to adopt children.

Child care should be ‘restructured’ (ibid.: 4): the state should provide support to individual families in a «homogeneous and ideologically free manner», in order to establish an optimal base for care and upbringing (ibid.). The text features a cryptic demand in this context: «Furthermore, we advocate that current neuro-scientific findings be made accessible to a wider public base, and should receive significant consideration and objective discussion in debate» (ibid.). It is possible that an allusion is being made to so-called «attachment research», which suggests that it is detrimental to a child to be sent to day-care centres too early.

In specific terms, it is demanded that a «child-care remuneration» be created. This would then be paid from a newly created fund. The fund should be generated by taking those funds that are currently allocated for «financial support for infant and toddler day care (= under the age of three)»: i.e., from «child maintenance resources, child care subsidies and subsidies for the operating costs of day-care centres». This «child-care remuneration» would be «paid out in equal amounts to the parents up to the end of the third year of the child’s life» (ibid.: 4).

This demand has an egalitarian effect in the sense that income-dependent child maintenance money would be paid out in equal amounts. AfD Saxony has not answered the question as to whether this «child care remuneration» is to be made possible using payments in the form of unemployment benefits. If this were the case, not only would child maintenance and supervision remuneration be allocated as before, but also the equivalent of day-care centre operating costs. Depending on whether or not the «child-care remuneration» would be charged to unemployment benefits would mean that recipients of unemployment benefits, on an individual basis, would potentially be better or worse off.

AfD Saxony aims to use the child care remuneration to put an end to the supposed «ideological control» of the state by allowing people to choose between using «care remuneration as a form of compensation for one’s own parenting efforts, or for the purchasing of non-parental care» (ibid.). The criticism that child-care money is a «stay-at-home parenting bonus» would be highly appropriate for the far more comprehensive concept of child care remuneration, especially as child maintenance money should also seek to support the upbringing efforts of fathers, which would then be completely dispensed with if there were a transfer of child maintenance funds into a child-care fund. It is also of great concern that, should there be the creation of care remuneration, even fewer children from lower-income earning families would be able to attend day-care centres.

The AfD advocates a number of measures that are supposed to improve the situation of parents: exemption of children from contributions to social security coffers (ibid.: 3); recognition of «family work as gainful employment when calculating pensions» (ibid.: 4); «advancement of the «have child while you study» model» (ibid.); «advancement of opportunities to re-enter the workforce» by «reducing bureaucracy, offering tax relief or financial support for the employer» (ibid.); «preferential employment and removal of time limit for approval for parents working in the public sector» (ibid.). Moreover, the generation of greater housing space should be advanced by the reintroduction of so-called «Baukindergeld» (a savings policy geared towards facilitating more affordable housing for children later in life), or the acceptance of loan guarantees». The population movement from rural areas should be enabled through the introduction of a long-term communal «lease hold» (ibid.).

With reference to the topic of «Education - University - Science», AfD Saxony commented that «[f]amilial and institutional education» stand together in equal importance, and mutually complement one another (ibid.: 5). In contradiction to this, the party also demands that there be greater disciplinary measures at schools and criminal law relating to young offenders through the state: «By tightening discipli-
AfD Saxony claims a »premature and hypersexualisation« is taking place in kinder-garten facilities and schools, something that it aims to fight. According to AfD, Sex education is something that should only be introduced once children reach puberty. In this regard, the educational content and teaching materials »should be orientated to the living environment of the majority«. The »indoctrinating influence on children and youths by LGBT teaching content« is »something to be combatted« (ibid.: 7). Correspondingly, »colleges and universities« are required—in accordance with the logic of AfD Saxony—to effect what would be an immediate cessation of the »advancement of so-called gender studies« (ibid.: 8). »Gender mainstreaming« is an »ideologically motivated«, »socio-political corrective measure« that is to be rejected (ibid.: 7). This »State-prescribed newspeak« contradicts the »natural evolution of native language«. In the instance, AfD Saxony sees an attempt to limit the Ministry for Social Affairs, and transferred into the sphere of responsibility of the Ministry for Education (ibid.: 5).

AfD Saxony takes a significant stand against affirmative action programmes, such as the gender quota in business: »In the private sector as in the public sector, the employment opportunities of the affected youth are not impeded. The parents will have to contribute to these courses financially, as such a form of support for the necessary corrective education of social skills represents a »service« for the entire lives of these young people, something that the parents themselves were unable to deliver to date: therefore, the value to be placed on such a service can hardly be high enough. Unemployed or low-income earners can make themselves useful in other ways within the school environment. Both points are a contribution to the re-networking of a society that is becoming increasingly devoid of relationships, indeed atomised.« (ibid.: 10).

In the context of family policymaking, a particular interesting section of the election manifesto can be found under the title of »Erziehungsoffensive für bessere Disziplin« (Upbringing Offensive for Better Discipline):

>Every day, the disregard for common interests, such as is expressed through the damage inflicted on community bodies, sends the disastrous message that those who carry responsibility in our society are neither willing nor able to safeguard society against the moods and frustrations of certain individuals. Teachers must once again be empowered, by way of efficient pedagogical measures, to protect both themselves and those students willing to learn from those students who repeatedly wish to disrupt or inhibit lesson time. These measures include allowing the school head teacher, in the interest of the school community, to utilise his or her power of authority in a timely and non-bureaucratic manner. (ibid.: 6ff.)

This passage goes against the supposed intention of the AfD to leave the task of upbringing, above all, within the family. Exactly how this »Upbringing Offensive for Better Discipline« is supposed to look is not elaborated on in the election manifesto. However, in a paper entitled »AfD Sachsen—Kernforderungen der AG Familie, Bildung, Hochschule, Wissenschaft« (AfD Saxony—Core Demands in Terms of Family, Education, Higher Education, Science), there is an extensive concept of so-called Nacherziehung (corrective education):

Students who have to be suspended from lessons will, for the duration, visit corrective behavioural courses (»courses on how to behave well«). If students abscond from these, child maintenance will be docked immediately, and the threat of youth detention for one weekend up to a maximum of four weeks will be enunciated and, after one warning, enacted. In contrast to youth detention, the arrest—a measure that already exists but is simply not used with significant consequence—does not lead to a criminal record in the legal sense. As the focus is on educational and not judicial punishment, the professional opportunities of the affected youth are not impeded. The parents will have to contribute to these courses financially, as such a form of support for the necessary corrective education of social skills represents a »service« for the entire lives of these young people, something that the parents themselves were unable to deliver to date: therefore, the value to be placed on such a service can hardly be high enough. Unemployed or low-income earners can make themselves useful in other ways within the school environment. Both points are a contribution to the re-networking of a society that is becoming increasingly devoid of relationships, indeed atomised.

In addition to the AfD national spokesperson Frauke Petry, six other members claim responsibility for this internal paper: Thomas Hartung, Ralf Hickthier, Torsten Weiss, Bodo Herold, Hans-Thomas Tillschneider, Uta Nünberger, and Hans-Gerd Hübner. The demand for »corrective education«, »behaviour courses«, and, above all, the threat of forced labour for low-income earners and the unemployed whose children do not conform to certain behavioural standards make it very clear that the AfD is not »family friendly«, but only grants families—within a very tight framework—a form of upbringing that is in line with the AfD’s ideology.
Furthermore, attention should also be given to statements by Frauke Petry as prime AfD candidate in the Saxony state elections, which the news publication Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung circulated under the title of Überleben des eigenen Volkes sicherstellen« (Ensuring the Survival of Our Own People). Frauke Petry made the case for a three-child policy and spoke out in favour of a petition for a referendum on a tightening of paragraph 218:

Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) is debating the prospect of a referendum regarding a tightening of criminal law paragraph 218.... For many members, the then fiercely contested legislation surrounding the issue of abortion has not been fully settled from an ethical standpoint, explained Petry. A change could also be a means of tackling the low birth rate in Germany.

At the same time, national spokeswoman Petry spoke in favour of a tightening of immigration law. She said she has nothing against immigration as a form of supplementation ... But: »German politics carries a basic responsibility to safeguard the survival of its own people, and its own nation« she explained. Therefore, Petry considers it desirable for a normal German family to have three children, thus reinforcing the standpoint of her party.... A party spokesman stated on Thursday in Berlin that Petry declared that her party advocates referenda on core issues such as immigration, currency and a reform of the European Union. She herself could also envision a referendum concerning a reform of paragraph 218. (Ewert 2014)

3.3 AfD Thuringia’s State Election Manifesto

To complete the picture, the demands being made by AfD Thuringia’s state election manifesto are presented in order to document the fact that the demands by the AfD in Saxony are, in essence, no exception.

In the state of Thuringia’s election manifesto, there is also resentment against a supposed (but not further elaborated on) form of gender ideology, and demands for the active advocacy of a normative, tightly defined family image:

The family policies of the Federal Republic and the States, must [sic] follow a uniform concept whereby a family consists of a father, mother and children with the inclusion [sic] of the older generations. Any efforts to expand the meaning of the word »family« as defined in Article 6, Paragraph 1 of the Federal German Constitution to include other groupings, and to take away the particular protection afforded to the family unit by the State, with the assistance of gender ideology, is to be combatted. Gender ideology conflicts with the results of natural science and developmental psychology, as well as life experience. The continual efforts to implement this using international organisations with no democratic legitimacy should be prevented, both in the interests of the matter and in the interest of democracy. (AfD Thuringia 2014: 6)

In terms of the choice of wording, it is identical in certain parts with Saxony’s election manifesto, where warnings are given of a »premature and hyper-sexualisation« and an ideologically motivated »re-education« of children:

We oppose a premature and hyper-sexualisation in schools and kindergartens. Sex education must [sic] be in keeping with the physical and emotional development of children and, for that reason, does not belong in kindergartens but rather in the time of puberty. Educational and teaching material has a role model function. It should orientate itself primarily to the living environment of majorities, and not primarily to that of minorities. Socio-political re-education measures such as »gender mainstreaming« are something that we reject just as much as ostensibly gender-neutral denotations (»those on foot« instead of »pedestrians« or »teaching staff« instead of »teacher« [translator’s note: these terms are used to avoid a solely masculine form in German]). In doing so—from an ideologically motivated standpoint—the grammatical gender is equated with the biological. (ibid.: 11)

Björn Höcke, AfD spokesman for Thuringia, puts this in his own words:

Damaging, expensive, taxation-financed societal experiments that serve the removal of the natural gender order (so-called gender mainstreaming) are to be stopped immediately. The classical family is to be re-established as the societal role model. (Höcke 2014)

During the press conference for the upcoming elections, he stated:

The maxims of gender equality belonging to the old party-establishment—often incomprehensibly termed »gender mainstreaming«—that serve the removal of natural gender polarity, must be removed immediately from kindergartens, schools and universities. Instead, the classical family model is to be conveyed as a guiding role model in our pedagogical and educational establishments. Furthermore, he spoke decisively against the dominant sense of »political correctness« in Germany that covers our country like mildew and acts as a limiting control in people’s heads. (Brandner 2014)
AFD’S ACTIVITIES AGAINST SEX EDUCATION REFORMS
As previously detailed in the first part of this expert opinion, members of the AfD have adopted an active leading role in protests against education policymaking. Both the »Estrela Report«, which makes reference to the responsibility borne by sex education in educational institutions to ensure an understanding of reproductive rights, as well as educational plans that no longer permit heteronormative narrowing-down of definitions, were and will be fought on the front line by the members of the AfD. In doing so, education plans will be shortened to exclude »the indoctrinating [...] influences on children and youths through LGBT teaching content« (AfD Saxony 2014: 8).

The debate surrounding sex education was not led through merely democratic means on the part of the conservatives—it was also driven by personal attacks that resulted in threats of murder and rape being made against a female sex education teacher. Several attempts and constant linkages were required from the campaign network Zivile Koalition e.V. by the AfD European delegate Beatrix von Storch, before the wave of outrage began gaining in strength.

The process of scandalising began with an article that Birgit Kelle wrote on 21 March 2014 under the title of »›Puff für alle‹ als pädagogisches Stilmittel« (»Brothels for all« as a Teaching Style). The Internet publication Freie Welt.net had previously published numerous articles by Birgit Kelle and her husband Klaus Kelle. In the article, the content of the edited volume Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt (Sexual Pedagogy of Diversity) from 2008 was polemically criticised. The article appeared in the online publication European and was also shown one day later in the online publications belonging to the Zivile Koalition e.V. (in Hedwig von Beverfoerde’s Familien-schutz.de and Sven von Storch’s Freie Welt.net).

Four days later, the website Demo für alle (Demo for All) was activated. The initiators of the organisation Demo für alle include Birgit Kelle and Hedwig von Beverfoerde. In the Legal Notice section, Sven von Storch is also mentioned. As already mentioned, Hedwig von Beverfoerde and Sven von Storch are central figures within the campaign network Zivile Koalition.

However, Birgit Kelle’s article was initially not used any further for the purposes of scandalising. A little later, on 24 April 2014, an article by Christian Weber appeared in the newspaper Süddeutsche Zeitung about Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt, with the title »Was sie noch nie über Sex wissen wollten« (What They Never Wanted to Know about Sex, Weber 2014). Arno Orzessek, a former journalist for the Süddeutsche Zeitung picked up on the article for German radio Deutschlandfunk Kultur and, two days later, weighed in with criticism, not for the polemic in Weber’s article, but by asking on behalf of the Süddeutsche readership why the condemnation had not been clearer (Orzessek 2014).

On 03 July 2014, the best-selling author Akif Pirincci posted on his Facebook page the article »Nach Puffreis in den Puff« (From Cocoa Pufss to Pimps), which was endorsed by many Facebook users despite its hateful language, thus adding to the spiral of hatred. In Pirincci’s name, there were numerous open calls made for the murder and rape of the co-authors of Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt.

In a follow-up Facebook post, Pirincci also insulted another gender researcher who declared his solidarity with the co-authors of Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt. The university institution whose member of staff was threatened, and the German Society of Sociology (DGS) felt impelled to condemn these attacks on the scientist with the following statements:

Statements by the German Society of Sociology (DGS) regarding the current campaigns that serve to discredit and defame scientists

It is with grave concern that we are observing an ever increasing number of hate campaigns aimed at sociologists who do research within the fields of gender and research on sexuality. At present, individual colleagues are being attacked, denounced and even threatened using social media, such as Facebook, in blogs and with emails.

The German Society of Sociology (DGS) condemns such attacks. The authors of such texts, through their tirades deliberately targeting individuals, and at times glorifying violence, transgress the social boundaries of respectful and peaceful discussion. In this instance, individual scientists are being attacked in such a way that is completely inappropriate, and which ultimately falls back on the author in its more than questionable style.

The DGS states its solidarity explicitly with those colleagues who have been the victims of attacks, just as with all those scientists who have been exposed to racist, homophobic and sexist attacks. Hate campaigns not only represent a serious level of impertinence for the individual colleagues. They make it impossible to conduct a civilised, public debate on topics that are relevant to society. (Vorstand DGS 2014)

[9] This statement was deliberately de-contextualised by the masculinist publicist Michael Klein and represented as a statement of solidarity for the anti-feminist sociologist Gerhard Amendt, who demands the abolition of women’s refuges.
The university of the scientist in question who was the subject of the attack also condemned the «defaming abuse». DGS reacted with an ad-hoc event »Genderismus—Der Umbau der Gesellschaft«. Soziologische Annäherung an einen aktuellen Krisendiskurs» (»Genderism—Restructuring of Society«. Sociological Approach to a Current Crisis Discussion), during the DGS congress in Trier.

The campaign network Zivile Koalition led by the AfD politician Beatrix von Storch was a frequent catalyst of this hate campaign; corresponding contributions were placed and linked in the Internet publication Freie Welt and in the Internet sites Familien-schutz.de and AbgeordnetenCheck. These online sites also saw apologetic comments on the campaign. For example, on 29 July 2014, a prominent article appeared in Freie Welt by Gerhard Alfens as the leading article under the title »Zoff um Thesen aus dem ›arabischen Puff‹« (Argument about Theories from the »Arab Brothel«) with photos of Akif Pirincci and the scientist who had been the subject of the attack. Gerhard Alfens’ article is entitled »Sachlich auseinanderge setzt« (An Objective Analysis) and suggests, with rhetorical questions, that Pirincci’s discussion on the edited volume Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt is thoroughly objective.

Akif Pirincci has held lectures in the states of Bavaria, Mecklenburg-West Pomerania, and Saxony, which were also co-hosted and financed by the AfD. The lecture in Saxony took place during the state election campaign, after the abuse and attacks on the gender research scientists. Pirincci makes no secret of his sympathetic disposition to the AfD. In response to surveys that put the AfD on a federal level at 10 per cent he wrote on his Facebook page on 23 September 2014: »Hahaha! Starting to shit bricks are we, you arseholes?! Just you wait until I get back from my island ... Go Ahead, Lucke!«

Estelle Ferrarese, a philosophy professor from Strasbourg and co-initiator of the petition »Les études de genre, la recherche et l’éducation: la bonne rencontre« (Studies of Gender, Research and Education: The Right Match), highlighted during an event titled »Im Rückwärtsgang durch Europa? Zur Stimmungsmache gegen Feminismus, Vielfalt und reproduktive Rechte« (Going backwards through Europe? Propaganda against Feminism, Diversity and Reproductive Rights) that in the course of the homophobic protests, hoaxes—i.e., false reports and misinformation—were utilised.
Part 2 of the expert’s opinion on gender and family-related policymaking by the AfD is a snapshot of the young political party. At the centre of the analysis is the emergence of a form of gender conservatism that is referred to here as »familialism«—which does not mean an orientation towards the family in general, but distinguishes a limited, population-biological-national, and normative idea of the family. Families who do not correspond to this idea—such as single parents, non-German families, financially weak families, and so-called patchwork or rainbow families—are marginalised, or even antagonised. Correspondingly, this form of familialism opposes individual lifestyles that do not envisage a parental role. This familialism is also nationalistic, bound to a national population policy; what Michel Foucault would refer to as »biopolitics«. Several statements made by the AfD shed light on the fact that their population policies do not adopt a merely quantitative approach, but a qualitative approach: in other words, a form of policymaking that not only seeks to regulate how many children are allowed, but which groups in society should or should not have children. When, in the following section, the term »familialism« is used, reference is being made to these normative demands concerning population policy which stand in direct contradiction to the right of reproductive self determination.

It is clear that the gender and family policies—in particular those presented by Beatrix von Storch—are embedded in a European network, which also maintains close ties with Latin and North America, and Russia. The Zivile Koalition under Beatrix von Storch operates as an Internet-based campaign network similar to that of the Spanish network CitizenGo, whose founders brought along years of experience from the US. Family-oriented US organisations not only support the fundamentalist movement in Germany and Europe with money (several million dollars in 2012 from just a few organisations), but also provide networking potential (World Congress of Family) and judicial capital (European Center for Law and Justice).

The more confident stance being adopted by ultra-Catholic apostolic movements and organisations could be linked to the decision of the Vatican to promote a new evangelisation of Europe. What is problematic concerning these movements are not only the excessive »life protection« and heteronormative demands, but also a contempt for the principles freedom and equality, which are in contrast to the »Catholic hierarchy« and the corresponding disciplinary virtues. The disproportionate share of ultra-Catholic—but also Prussian-evangelist functionaries with an aristocratic or even high nobility heritage—is difficult to overlook, and fits with the demands being made for inequality. In terms of a societal analysis, the term »Un-Gleichzeitigkeit« (primarily translated as »asynchronicity«) by Ernst Bloch (1985: 104ff.) is best suited to describe this milieu.

The situation is similar with regard to political demands at state level. These are also driven by the spirit of inequality and discipline. When referring to family policies, a nationalistic population policy that envisages the high-earning German middle classes is implied, the so-called functioning majority. Non-German families, patchwork, or so-called rainbow families, single parents, and financially weak families would be overlooked. The level of aggression with which gender studies and, above all, same-sex marriages and sex education are attacked can be explained by Michel Foucault’s work The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: The Will to Knowledge. In his view, sexuality in its current form acts as a hinge between the bourgeois family and the bourgeois nation-state. In times of economic crisis, declasification fears can make a flight towards the authoritarian, destructive, or conforming seem attractive, as was described by Erich Fromm in 1941. Most recently, a »brutalisation« of the middle classes has been identified (studies of group-focused misanthropy), referring specifically to readers of Thilo Sarrazin’s works, whom the AfD continues to add to as a political party. According to Fromm, the 1930s saw a flight of the middle classes towards brutality that was not only the result of financial worry, but, above all, the result of instability in the bastion of security: the family. As a so-called foundation of the nation, the family offers both gender-related and national identity. And even this group—the middle classes—was seen by Bloch as being in a position of asynchronicity, with a strong tendency towards reactionary behaviour.

Finally, a third group that has made a contribution to the AfD’s establishment must be named: the associations of family businesses, even though they have not made an active contribution to the forming of the AfD. Since 2010, a division of interests among capital factions has become apparent. The Confederation of German Industry (BDI) approved of the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), in contrast to the associations of family businesses. Interventions by the family business associations in the CDU/CSU were just as ineffective as the member survey conducted in the FDP party. In other words, the family business associations had no explicit parliamentary representation in this regard. Neo-liberal economics professors recognised this vacuum and founded a new political party: the AfD. It remains to be seen just how strongly the family business associations will financially support the AfD. The family business entrepreneur August von Finck has already supported the AfD’s predecessor, the right-wing populist Anti-Euro-Partei Bund Freier Bürger (Anti-Euro Party Alliance of Free Citizens), with DM six million, and a campaign by BürgerKovent (which is now incorporated into the campaign network of the Zivile Koalition) with an additional EUR six million.

Because the AfD’s familialism does not simply involve a rational approach, such anti-feminist defensive methods—for example, in the »anti-PC strategy« (by US
President Bush, Sr. through to Russian President Putin)—can be seen as being particularly influential. Interestingly, the emancipatory criticisms of the last 150 years—which take a stand against the establishment, corrective behaviour, and reactionary thinking—are being imitated in terms of form. The tables are being turned, so to speak; emancipatory criticism is being drained of its content and portrayed as bourgeois, overly correct, and reactionary (back to the 1970s or Real Socialism) (cf. Kemper 2014). A fundamental component of this anti-PC strategy campaign is the dissemination of so-called hoaxes and false reports. This anti-PC strategy also serves to conceal individual interests. In this regard, it is not common knowledge that the anti-feminist protagonists Birgit Kelle and Beatrix von Storch work together with apostolic, ultra Catholics who specifically seek »starry-eyed idealism« and »correctionism« through the veneration of the saints and the Catholic hierarchy, and for which purpose the anti-PC strategy is used.

As the AfD is incorporated into a European, familialist network through the Zivile Koalition, emancipatory policymaking must also be networked throughout Europe, if it is to have any effect. Campaign networks similar to Zivile Koalition can also be found in Spain (CitizenGo). Neil Datta explained the success of the mass-mailing campaigns by Zivile Koalition and CitizenGo with a shock effect: »If you have a big cannon, the first [time] you shoot it, everybody runs away scared« (quoted in Feder 2014). These campaigns are already more familiar in the US. There is talk of an »astro turfing movement« that simulates a large-scale grassroots movement. These so-called cannon shots are accompanied by a non-PC commentary storm in Internet articles that use a form of speech that is truly offensive and intimidating (Rosenbrock 2012b). Emancipatory awareness raising on strategies for combating astro turfing, hate speech, and anti-PC strategies must take place at the European level.
• **Aktion SOS Leben (SOS Life Action)**: This initiative was founded in December 1990 in order to prevent a liberalisation and legalisation of abortion; it is an initiative of the → **DVCK**

• **AUF – Party for Labour, Environment and Family**: Christian-conservative minority party, member of the European political party → **European Christian Political Movement**; → **Christa Meves** was a prime candidate in the European parliamentary elections in 2014, however, she did not achieve a mandate.

• **Besorgte Eltern NRW (Worried Parents NRW)**: An initiative against sex education in schools

• **Faridah Belghoul**: Participated in the French protests against same-sex marriage, organised school boycotts against sex education »Journée de Retrait de l’École« through which an alliance was made between Catholics and Muslims, visited the demonstration by the → **Besorgten Eltern NRW** (Worried Parents North Rhine Wesphalia) in Cologne along with → **Beatrice Bourges**, in order to internationalise the protests.

• **Besorgte Eltern NRW (Worried Parents NRW)**: An initiative against sex education in schools

• **Michael Bommers**: Catholic family entrepreneur, responsible for the study group Spirituality in the → **Bund Katholischer Unternehmer** (Association of Catholic Entrepreneurs). Work undertaken with both the → **Legionaries of Christ** and the couple → **Birgit Kelle** and Klaus Kelle.

• **Béatrice Bourges**: Chairwoman of the right-wing organisation → **Printemps Français** (French Spring). She organised → **Le Manif pour Tous** (Demo for all), but had to leave the board because she was considered too radical. Bourges took part in both the → **Jürgen Elsässer**’s event »Für die Zukunft der Familie« (For the Future of the Family) in Leipzig and the demonstrations organised by the → **Besorgte Eltern NRW**.

• **Bund katholischer Unternehmer (Association of Catholic Entrepreneurs)**: An interest group formed in 1949. The first Managing Director was Wilfried Schreiber, who developed the German pension system model; Schreiber also developed the so-called → **children’s pension model**, which → **Frauke Petry** of AfD Saxony would like to see introduced. The interest group Spirituality is led by → **Michael Bommers**.

• **Allan Carlson**: Founded the network → **World Congress of Family**

• **Aymeric Chauprade**: French political scientist, prime candidate of Front National in the European elections, lecturer at the → **Institute of Democracy and Cooperation**

• **CitizenGo**: International campaign network with its headquarters in Spain, founded by → **Ignacio Arsuaga**. In 2012, it hosted the → **World Congress of Family**, it also provided support across the border to → **La Manif pour Tous** in France. CitizenGo was one of the first groups to oppose the → **Estrela Report**. The foundation board is comprised of Ignacio Arsuaga, Walter Hintz, and Blanca Escobar and the CEO is Álvaro Zulueta.

• **Civitas**: A Catholic association that is closely associated with the Pius Brotherhood; they participated in → **La Manif pour Tous** (Demo for All). Civitas in Munich also provides support for campaigns on the website (demonstrations, etc.) if they defend Jesus Christ.

• **Deutsche Gesellschaft zum Schutz von Tradition, Familie und Privateigentum e.V. (TFP, German Society for the Protection of Tradition, Family, and Property)**: The German society of → **Associations for the Protection of Tradition, Family and Property**; First Chairperson is → **Mathias von Gernsdorf**, other members include → **Paul Herzog von Oldenburg**. TFP Germany has its headquarters in Bad Homburg.

• **Deutsche Vereinigung für eine Christliche Kultur (DVCK, German Association for a Christian Culture)**: This group fights for the re-establishment of Christian civilisation; it manages the initiatives → **Kinder in Gefahr** (Children in Danger) and → **Aktion SOS Leben (SOS Life Action)**. The Chairman is → **Benno Hofschulze**; the DVCK has its headquarters in Bad Homburg.

• **DVCK**: → **Deutsche Vereinigung für eine Christliche Kultur (German Association for a Christian Culture)**

• **ECR**: → **European Conservatives and Reformists**

• **Jürgen Elsässer**: Editor of the magazine Compact, AfD sympathiser, organiser of the event → **Für die Zukunft der Familie (For the Future of the Family)**.

• **Europa Christiania**: → **Föderation Pro Europa Christiania**

• **Europäische Christliche Politische Bewegung (European Christian Political Movement, ECPM)**: Christian-oriented European political party, belongs to the...
parliamentary group → European Conservatives and Reformists; the German members include the → AUF and the Partei Bibeltreuer Christen (Party of Bible-abiding Christians).

- **European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR):** Parliamentary group in the European Parliament with a conservative orientation. The political party AfD and the Family Party of Germany belong to the ECR.

- **AFACE:** Federation of Catholic family associations in Europe, founded in 1997

- **Family and Protection of Childhood Intergroup:** European intergroup, founded by → Maria Panayotopoulos-Cassiotou on 16 December 2004 with support from the parliamentary groups → PPE-DE, → IND/DEM, → UEN.

- **Familie, Kinderrechte, Solidarität zwischen den Generationen, aktives Altern und demographische Zukunft Europas (Family, Children’s Rights, Solidarity between Generations, Active Ageing and Europe’s Demographic Future):** European Union intergroup

- **Family, Child Protection and Solidarity between Generations:** Intergroup in the European Parliament

- **Family Party of Germany:** German political party with a seat in the European Parliament (→ Arne Gerricke); has associated itself with the → ECR in the European Parliament

- **Fédération Pro Europa Christiana (FPEC):** A consortium of diverse Christian-oriented organisations in Europe, including: → DVCK (Germany), Stowarzyszenie Kultury Chrześcijańskiej Piotr Skarga (Poland), Fundacja Institut Edukacji Społecznej i Religijnej im. Ks. Piotra Skargi (Poland), Acción Familia (Portugal), Avenir de la Culture (France), Tradition Famille Propriété (France), Droit de Naitre (France), Luci sull’Est (Italy), SOS Ragazzi (Italy), Österreichische Jugend für eine Christlich-kulturelle Gemeinsamkeit innerhalb des Deutschschprachigen Raumes (Austria). The president is → Caio Xavier da Silveira; the office manager in Brussels is → Paul Herzog von Oldenburg.

- **Fondazione Vite Nova:** Italian »Life protection« group. Was involved in the creation of → One of Us, a European Citizens’ Initiative and was one of its financial sponsors (EUR 120,000).

- **Force Vie:** French political party that entered into the European parliamentary elections in 2014, but failed to win any seats. The prime candidates were, among others → Tobias Teuscher and → Antoine Renard

- **Forum deutscher Katholiken (Forum of German Catholics):** The union was founded in 2000 as a conservative competitor to the Central Council of German Catholics; the forum publishes the monthly journal → Der Fels.

- **FPEC:** → Fédération Pro Europa Christiana

- **French Spring:** → Printemps Français

- **Für die Zukunft der Familie (For the Future of the Family):** Second »Compact-Veranstaltung für Souveränität« (Compact Event for Sovereignty) in Leipzig on 23 November 2013. The event was organised by → Jürgen Elsässer and → Rodina Natalia Narochnitskaya, Head of → Institut de la Démocratie et de la Coopération. The speakers were Elena Misulina, Olga Batalina, Thilo Sarrazin, Bernhard Lassahn, Monika Ebeling, André Sikojev, and → Béatrice Bourges.

- **Mathias von Gernsdorff:** First Chairman of → TFP

- **Arne Gerricke:** European parliamentary representative of the → Familien-Partei Deutschlands (Family Party of Germany)

- **Julie Girling:** MEP Conservative Party

- **HazteOir:** A Spanish campaign network in line with US role models. It was Founded in 2001 and, since 2010 has organised hundreds of thousands of people against the liberalisation of restrictive abortion laws in Spain.

- **Das Herz Jesu Apostolat für die Zukunft der Familie (Apostolate of the Sacred Heart for the Future of the Family):** An apostolic campaign by the → Deutsche Gesellschaft zum Schutz von Tradition, Familie und Privateigentum e.V. (TFP). The campaign aims to create a »social kingdom of the most Sacred Heart of Jesus«, and it attempts this through »regenerat[ing] the enthronement of the family, the constituent cell of society«. The Head of the campaign is → Paul Herzog von Oldenburg
• **Benno Hofschulte**: Chairman of the ➔ DVCK

• **Institut de la Démocratie et de la Coopération (IDC)**: An institute in France financed by Russian donations. It is directed by ➔ Rodina Natalia Narochnitskaya; the lecturers include members of the right-wing extremist Front National, such as ➔ Aymeric Chauprade

• **Birgit Kelle**: Chairwoman of ➔ Frau 2000plus. Member of the Board of ➔ New Women For Europe (NWFE) since 2010

• **Children in Gefahr (Children in Danger)**: A Catholic initiative founded in 1993 by the ➔ Deutsche Vereinigung für eine Christliche Kultur e.V. (DVCK); it manages the online website ➔ Kultur und Medien Online. Among other issues, the initiative exposes the problems of Satanism, liberal abortion laws, the »sexualisation of childhood«, and the »massacre of childhood« by the German teen magazine Bravo.

• **Children’s Pension**: A model that was developed by Wilfried Schreiber in 1956 as the president of the ➔ Association of Catholic Entrepreneurs. Instead of receiving equal child maintenance, the parents receive up to 8 per cent of income as a subsidy from the so-called Kinderrentenkasse (child and youth state pension scheme). The respective adolescents must pay into this pot from the age of 35, in relation to their earnings at the time and the number of children that they have (with six children or more, no payment; with no children, twice the payment).

• **Kultur und Medien Online**: Online website of ➔ Kinder in Gefahr (Children in Danger).

• **La Manif pour Tous (Demo for All)**: Demonstrations in France against »marriage for all«, the speaker was ➔ Ludovine de la Rochere, another founder is ➔ Béatrice Bourges. She is no longer permitted to appear as a speaker because she was considered too radical, which led to the founding of ➔ Printemps Français.

• **Marine Le Pen**: Leader of the right-wing extremist political party Front National and the daughter of the party’s founder.

• **Jürgen Liminski**: Editor / Presenter at Deutschlandfunk, member of ➔ Opus Dei; Managing Director at ➔ I-DAF

• **Christa Meves**: Catholic and anti-feminist therapist, prime candidate of the political party during the European parliamentary elections in 2014; ➔ AUF – Party for Labour, Environment and Family; active within ➔ Familiennetzwerk.

• **Elena Misulina**: Author of the Russian legislation against »gay propaganda«, participated in the event ➔ Für die Zukunft der Familie (For the Future of the Family).

• **Rodina Natalia Narochnitskaya**: Former Russian member of parliament. Now leads the ➔ Institut de la Démocratie et de la Coopération in France. She invited ➔ Béatrice Bourges to a lecture on the topic »Verteidigung der Familie« (Defence of the Family). She also organised the event ➔ Für die Zukunft der Familie (For the Future of the Family) together with ➔ Jürgen Elsässers.

• **New Women for Europe (NWFE)**: This European umbrella association represents, according to its own sources, more than 100 women’s organisations from across Europe, with a total number of members equalling over half a million women; it also has a consultative status with the European Parliament.

• **Paul von Oldenburg**: Paul von Oldenburg is Head of the Brussels office of the ➔ Fédération Pro Europa Christiana, member of the German society of the ➔ TFP, and cousin of ➔ Beatrix von Storch

• **Plinio Correa de Oliveira**: »Spiritual father« of ultra-orthodox associations such as the ➔ TFP, whose first group was founded by him in Brazil in 1960

• **One of Us**: European Citizens’ Initiative; representative ➔ Tobias Teuscher

• **Maria Panayotopoulos-Cassiotou**: Nea Dimokratia (Greece); Group of the ➔ European People’s Party (Christian Democrats) and member of ➔ European Democrats

• **Frauke Petry**: Board of the Federal AfD (together with Bernd Lucke und Konrad Adam), state-level board of AfD Saxony and member of the state parliament in Saxony. Petry demanded a federal referendum regarding a tightening of abortion laws, in order to implement the demographically-relevant concept of a three-child family. She also represents the so-called ➔ children’s pension model

• **Printemps Français**: National conservative French organisation, the head of which is ➔ Béatrice Bourges

• **Grégor Puppinck**: General Director of the ➔ European Center for Law and Justice (ECLJ), President of the European Committee of the ECI ➔ One of Us
• **Antoine Renard**: Board of the → FAFCE Föderation der Katholischen Familienverbände, prime candidate of → Force Vie.

• **Ludovine de la Rochere**: Speaker of the French movement → Demo for All

• **Dana Scallon**: Irish-American MEP, opponent of abortion, → Tobias Teuscher works as her assistant

• **Caio Xavier da Silveira**: President of the Fédération Pro Europa Christiana. In 1960, he founded the first Society for the Defence of Tradition, Family and Property together with Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira in Brazil, and co-founded the Brazilian Society for the Defence of Tradition, Family and Property (TFP).

• **Beatrix von Storch**: AfD MEP Beatrix von Storch and her husband Sven von Storch founded the campaign network → Zivile Koalition e.V. She is the cousin of → Paul von Oldenburg.

• **Tobias Teuscher**: Tobias Teuscher stood for the French political party → Force Vie in the European parliamentary elections. In the European Parliament, he was the assistant to the anti-feminist parliamentarians → Dana Scallon (Ireland) and → Anna Záborská (Slovakia). In the European Parliament, Teuscher is a representative of the ECI → One of Us

• **TFP**: → Vereinigungen zum Schutz von Tradition, Familie und Privateigentum (Associations for the Defence of Tradition, Family and Property); → Deutsche Gesellschaft zum Schutz von Tradition, Familie und Privateigentum e.V.

• **Deutsche Gesellschaft zum Schutz von Tradition, Familie und Privateigentum e.V. (TFP, German Association for the Defence of Tradition, Family and Property)**: The first TFP group was founded in Brazil by Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira in 1960, who took a stance against the land reform and was strongly opposed to centre-left Catholicism. In 1990, the TFP collected over five million signatures for the independence of Lithuania, a country shaped by Catholicism, which at the time was considered to be the most extensive petition campaign to date. The TFP is against equality, adopts the position of the »Catholic hierarchy« and is sympathetic to aristocratic ideas. It participates on a global scale in the so-called March for Life and is considered heteronormative. Well-known representatives are Mathias von Gernsdorff and → Paul von Oldenburg, the European coordinator of TFP is → Caio Xavier da Silveira

• **Jadwiga Wisniewska**: Member of → PIS (Poland)

• **World Congress of Family (WCF)**: An international familialist network which, to date, has hosted seven congresses—the last three of which were held in Warsaw, Amsterdam, and Madrid. According to its own sources, the congresses brought together activists from over 80 countries who view the restoration of the »natural family« as the foundation of society. WCF was founded in 1997 by Allan Carlson and is a project of The Howard Center for Family, Religion & Society in Illinois.

• **Anna Záborská**: Slovakia, MEP, political party → Krest’anskodemokratické hnutie (KDH, Christian Democratic Movement). Head of the European intergroup → Family, Child Protection and Solidarity between Generations, which adopted an opposing stance on the → Estrela Report: »How on earth does a taboo-free and interactive sex education lesson take place between the teacher and pupils in a primary or secondary school, without the express permission of the parents? Is this not a carte blanche for paedophiles with a seal of approval from the [sic] European Parliament?«

• **Jana ŽITŇANSKÁ**: Slovak New Majority (Nová väčšina – NOVA) (Slovakia)
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