

European values

by Maciej Giertych
Member of the European Parliament

© Maciej Giertych
April 2007-04-15

Publisher:
Maciej Giertych
60 rue Wiertz
1047 Bruxells

Opinions presented in this publication are the private Author's opinions and do not represent the official European Parliament position.

European values

What are European values? Our continent does have its specific identity. Christianity started in Palestine. It spread to North Africa where there still linger some remnants of it, primarily Monophysitic. It spread to Eurasia first in its Nestorian and later Orthodox form. However it is in Europe, primarily under the influence of Rome, the seat of the Vicar of Christ, where it developed in a manner that not only shaped the nature of the continent, but also spread from it to all corners of the world. It is evident not only in the architecture of every European town and village, not only in the magnificent literature in European languages, not only in the faith of the majority of Europeans, but primarily in the way communal life is organised in Europe, in the values on which European life is built.

If today clarity of these values is in doubt, as a consequence of atheistic, socialist and other anti-Christian forces questioning them, it is time we sat back and took the effort to discuss what we really mean by European values. What should we adhere to and what should we reject.

As I see it the primary values are:

- Defence of life in all circumstances, from conception to natural death.
- Defence of the monogamous, autonomous, nuclear family composed of a husband and wife and any children their union will be blessed with.
- Defence of personal dignity of each human being.
- Special respect for women as being of unique value to the society.
- Respect for diversity.
- Acceptance of inequality arising from differential effort.
- Defence of religious freedom and tolerance of minority religions.
- Defence of national identities, the right to remain different and tolerance of national or ethnic minorities.
- Laws and jurisprudence based on justice derived from natural law and Christian ethic.
- Justice to be meted out by courts independent of the state and not by private vendettas.
- State is endowed with physical force to defend citizens from harm and not to defend the rulers from the citizens.
- Democracy, understood as representative government and responsibility of the rulers to the ruled.
- Freedom of speech. The right to express different opinions and criticise those in power without being penalized for this.
- Readiness to help others, accept asylum seekers, mediate in crisis areas.
- Promotion of dialogue and compromises, without ever conceding on the values mentioned above.

The list can be extended. I would welcome corrections, additions and debate on what should be included here.

The Berlin Declaration

On what values and principles is the European Union founded?

The *Berlin Declaration* of March 25th 2007 states that: "... [F]or us, the individual is paramount. His dignity is inviolable. His rights are inalienable. Women and men enjoy equal rights." The first sentence here sounds personalist. It is not. In German this reads: "bei uns steht der Mensch im Mittelpunkt". It was signed in Berlin by two Germans and a Portuguese (Hans-Gert Pöttering, Angela Merkel, José Manuel Barroso) and not by all the heads of state that met there for the 50th anniversary of the European Union as the media seemed to suggest,

and it was drafted by the German presidency in the European Union, thus, it is the German text that should be considered as obligatory. A correct translation should read “for us man stands at the centre point”. Lacking any reference to God, to religion, or to the soul in the *Declaration* simply means that there are no transcendent values, no measure that is independent of Man. The following statements about inviolable dignity and inalienable rights of men and women should be understood as excluding God, His dignity, His rights and His laws.

It is in this context that the *Berlin Declaration* should be read. There is a sentence that pertains to “common values”. It reads: “We are striving for peace and freedom, for democracy and the rule of law, for mutual respect and shared responsibility, for prosperity and security, for tolerance and participation, for justice and solidarity”. Since “we are striving” it means we still do not have them. Peace, freedom, prosperity and security are conditions, not values. They are in the same category as health. We either have these or we do not have them, depending on the current situation. Values are something we recognize regardless of the political situation. Everyone wants peace, freedom, prosperity, security and health. We may be prepared to defend them or strive to achieve them, but we shall not always have them – that depends not only on us but also on the activity of others (e.g. terrorists, foreign invaders, embezzlers, stock exchange etc.) and on accidental occurrences (crop failures, earthquakes, plagues, fires etc.).

Mutual respect, tolerance, solidarity, shared responsibility and participation are dependent not only on us but also on others. On those whom we respect and expect reciprocity, those we tolerate and expect reciprocity, those we support and expect reciprocity, those with whom we wish to share responsibility provided they also so wish, those whom we invite to participate provided they wish to do so. If we cannot assure the consent of the “others”, these propositions are no more than hopes or desires, and they need further defining. What about a smoking habit? Are we to respect it, tolerate it, be in solidarity with the smoker, share responsibility for it, participate? What about drug abuse? What about abortion? What about defence of life from conception? What about homosexual practices? What about divorce? The list is endless. The call for these “values” is empty without further specifications.

This leaves us with democracy and justice, rule of law being, at least for me, synonymous with justice. Indeed we can believe in democracy regardless of what others think about it. The same is for justice. We may be deprived of both, but still adhere to these values. We can act democratically ourselves. We can act justly ourselves. Thus the values we adhere to are only sensible when we apply them to ourselves, when we restrict ourselves, showing our willingness to conform to a certain way of acting.

Democracy by its very nature places Man at the centre. It limits the power of the rulers by the will of other men. If we adhere to democratic values we shall involve those who will be affected by our decisions in the decision making process. If we act arbitrarily, ignoring the wishes of those whom our decisions will affect, we show ourselves to be non-democratic.

I consider justice and the rule of law as the same because I believe that the law should be just. If it is not, rule of law is not a value but its opposite, an oppression. Those, including authoritarian rulers, who write and enforce just laws are no problem. However when lawmakers write laws that suit themselves (in the Turanian civilisation) or their countries (in the Byzantine) rather than justice, the enforcement of such laws, such rule of law, is in fact an injustice and therefore cannot be included among values.

And what is justice? By whose measure is a law just or unjust, a court decision just or unjust? It is not enough to say it must have Man at its centre point. Which man? Men are often in conflict and it is the role of the judiciary to impose a just settlement. Just meaning in agreement with what? Reference to natural law and transcendental values is unavoidable.

Europe is a continent built on Greek culture, Roman law and Christian ethic. Excluding the latter from the consideration of European values not only impoverishes them, but it also makes them meaningless. The whole European concept of justice is based on adherence to a set of God given rules, the Decalogue and its extension in the Beatitudes. A human measure is not enough.

Freedom of speech

I shall start with freedom of speech, a value specifically European and yet as I have experienced recently no longer practiced in the European Parliament.

Booklet on civilisations

My publication of a booklet entitled “Civilisations at war in Europe” which presents the endless ideological struggle between various civilisations that have made Europe over the centuries and which pertains very much to the conflicts we are dealing with today, has created quite a turmoil in the Parliament and particularly in the media. Having distributed this booklet to the pigeonholes of all Members of the European Parliament I was accused of all sorts of sins, including racism, anti-Semitism and disrespect for human values. The booklet pertains very much to the issue of European values. I believe I defend them and I am accused of abusing them. Even a demonstration was organised outside the parliament building in Strasbourg calling for a revoking of my mandate. Obviously most of those who were attacking me have not read the booklet, but rely solely on the very biased media reporting on it. I am not ashamed of anything I wrote, I stand by it and am prepared to confront in debate anyone who claims I have done anything improper. In fact, this debate is already ongoing in the media and on the internet. I read both positive and negative reactions to my booklet.

However, it appears that in the European Parliament I am not entitled to voice my opinions.

I have been reprimanded by the President of the European Parliament, Hans-Gert Pöttering (Annex 1), under Rule 147 for “serious breach of fundamental rights, and in particular the dignity of human beings”. The President considered my booklet “Civilisations at war in Europe” as “containing several allegations of a xenophobic nature”. It is noteworthy that the President did not accuse me of racism or anti-Semitism of which I was accused by the media, because my book does not supply any substance to such accusations.

Now what is xenophobia? According to encyclopaedic definitions it is the “fear of aliens” or “dislike of aliens”. Is my book really advocating this? I leave the answer to my readers. My book defends itself – provided it is read and not just misquoted out of context as the media have treated it.

And what is understood under “fundamental rights and dignity of human beings”? Obviously my understanding of these seems to differ substantially from that dominating in the European Union. In this current booklet I am addressing the issue of European values, the fundamental rights and dignity of human beings as I see them. The President mentions in his reprimand (see Annex 1) principles laid down in Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure which specifies that “Members’ conduct shall be characterised by mutual respect, be based on the values and principles laid down in the basic texts on which the European Union is founded”. I have not been told which particular values or principles I have violated. In fact the values and principles appear to be quite vague. I always assumed that freedom of speech was one such value, at least in the civilisation I was brought up in. However, I was shown that this is not the case in the European Parliament. My views were proclaimed unacceptable.

Of course, I have appealed the President's reprimand to the Bureau (Annex 2) as Rules of Procedure (art. 148) entitle me, asking the Bureau to specify which sentences or parts of my book conform to the accusations placed against me.

I got a reply from the Bureau, signed by the President (Annex 3), which explains nothing, quotes nothing but adds the accusation that "the whole brochure, including its title, was interspersed with allegations insulting and harming the value of human dignity in general". It also stated that "it would be easy to cite examples of what would be a long list of allegations of a xenophobic nature" but fails to mention even one. Obviously the argument for a reprimand arising from the quoted articles of the Rules of Procedure of the Parliament (shown in Annex 4) is stretched and any quotation would demonstrate its absurdity. Furthermore, there is an added objection that my booklet "bore the official logo of the European Parliament on the cover page" and that my ideas were presented "in what appeared to be an official European Parliament publication that the Bureau found so objectionable and unpalatable". The Bureau "decided unanimously to confirm the reprimand".

Of course the Bureau knows very well that according to the regulations of the parliament (see Annex 4) I am obliged to place the logo of the Parliament on the cover of my publication if I want to claim a refund from budget item 4000 and I intend to distribute it free of charge, as I did. As required by these rules I have placed a disclaimer in the book reading: "*Opinions presented in this publication are the private Author's opinions and do not represent the official European Parliament position*". There is no preventive censorship in the European Parliament, so I had no means of checking whether I would receive a refund for the book prior to its publication.

Since I have abided by all rules of the Parliament it is strange that I am accused of doing exactly as the rules demand.

As soon as I got a bill from the printers I presented it to the Financial Bureau of the parliament (Annex 5). They replied that the expense will not be reimbursed because my booklet "does not comply with article 1.1.1 of the rules". This article specifies that such a publication should be "in connection with the European Union's political activities". Thus the administration takes upon itself the decision which activity of an MEP is and which is not "in connection with EU political activities".

Needless to say I appealed this decision (Annex 6) to no avail. I got a reply (Annex 7) to the effect that my booklet raised issues that "relate to moral, religious and social values which the administration considers to be private in nature". It is not political, says the administration. If so how come it created such a row? The administration assures "that the refusal of the expenditure ... was not a reaction to the media coverage the booklet received". Yes, of course, that is obvious.

This is not the first time I met with censorship in the European Parliament.

Pro-life exhibition

In mid November 2005, I organised a pro-life exhibition in the Parliament in Strasbourg. As the rules demand it was previously shown to the responsible Quaestor and approved. The exhibition showed the development of a child from a zygote, through various stages of foetal life to, smiling babies and children. The last poster showed two photographs of children behind barbed wire, a recent one from Kosovo and a World War II one from a German concentration camp. Above the former there was a quotation from Mother Teresa of Culcutta which read: "The greatest danger to peace today is abortion. If a mother is allowed to kill her own child, who is to prevent you or me from killing each other?" Once opened some lady MEPs have complained in the Hemicycle that it contains content they do not like, particularly the last poster. On the decision of the responsible Quaestor, the last poster was

forcibly removed by the security services of the Parliament. The argument was that it links abortion with the Holocaust.

In place of the removed poster, on a blank board, we placed the inscription: “Censored by intolerance”. As a result the whole exhibit was closed by the security services following a letter I received from the responsible Quaestor (Annex 8). The argument was that some photographs shown in the exhibit were not included in the original application. This was not true. I appealed to the President of the Parliament (Annex 9) calling for a reopening of the exhibit. He took 10 days to respond (Annex 10) and reduced the complaint to: “that the material effectively exhibited ... was not identical to the material submitted for prior authorisation”. The difference was that when submitting the photographs, the two on the contested poster were sent separately (by E-mail, one was coloured and the other black and white), and only the Kosovo one had above it the quotation from Mother Teresa, so the responsible Quaestor did not see the proximity of the word “abortion” with the photograph from a German concentration camp. Placing these two photographs on the same board was obviously, a grave infringement on my part. As the responsible Quaestor explained later (in an E-mail to Polish MEPs) the closing of the whole exhibit was caused by the words “Censored by intolerance” which were not submitted for prior authorisation by the Quaestors.

Needless to say the cost of the catering prepared for the opening of the exhibit I had to cover myself. The administration refused to refund it.

Anti-war display

In August 2004, I have asked the President to commemorate the victims of World War II on the occasion of the 65th anniversary of the beginning of this war by a minute of silence on the 1st of September 1939. The President refused. Later there have been several such commemorations, on the 60th anniversary of liberation of the German concentration camp in Auschwitz, on the 70th anniversary of the civil war in Spain, on the 50th anniversary of the Budapest uprising etc. On each of these occasions a special session was organised and a document produced. But not for World War II.

My windows are in a visible place opposite a busy corridor of the third floor. I decided to place anti-war posters in my windows for the month of September 2006, September being the month we commemorate in Poland as the time when Germans attacked us on September the 1st 1939 and conquered within a month. It was only towards the end of the month that the media noticed this anti-war exhibit and made noise about it in the German press. Senior German MEPs have complained that the exhibit violates peace and dignity in the Parliament. I got a letter from the Quaestors (Annex 11) saying that “posters such as you placed on your office windows in October (sic!) are not and will not be admitted”. The complaint was that they have shown “German execution squads, German fighter bombers in action and Hitler together with German fighting troops”. I replied in protest (Annex 12) and distributed the correspondence by E-mail. One British MEP commented: “you have infringed on rule no. 1 of this Parliament – do not mention World War II”. The letter I got in reply from the Quaestor was as devoid of any explanation as the previous one.

Needless to say the administration refused to refund me for the posters.

Spanish civil war

I was also severely criticised for my speech in connection with the 70th anniversary of the Spanish civil war. It turned out that I was the only speaker supporting the Catholic side in their war with the Spanish communists. I was allotted 2 minutes for my speech and nobody stopped me, so this was not a censorship incident, but the reactions also reflected the inadmissibility of opinions at variance with the political correctness dominating in the European Parliament.

The Heidelberg encounter

When the EU ministers of education met March 1st 2007 in Heidelberg, on the invitation of the German presidency, they tried to spell out the common values on which the European Constitution is to be based. My son Roman Giertych, the Polish minister of education, had a speech (Annex 13) which was very severely criticized. It was considered divisive and out of line with the current political correctness.

During the years and months I sit in the European Parliament I have found that on the issues of abortion and promotion of homosexuality the opinions are extremely divided. There is no common position. This is well reflected in all votes touching on these issues. They are always very far from unanimity.

As I see it, the right to life is the most fundamental of human values. However, currently some people would like to exclude pre-born children and the burdensome moribund patients from this right.

Abortion

The laws pertaining to abortion differ from country to country in the European Union, from total ban in Ireland to its availability on demand in Spain (both predominantly Catholic countries). Availability of abortion was first introduced in Poland by the Germans during the II World War. This was immediately revoked after the war, but under Soviet occupation the atheistic communists reintroduced it. It is time we abandon this legacy. Unfortunately, in Poland we still have access to abortion in a few restricted situations: when the foetus is disabled, when the pregnancy is a consequence of a crime and when it endangers the life of the mother or seriously the health of the mother. Just recently we tried to introduce a clause in our constitution that would protect human life from conception so as to eliminate these exceptions. Regrettably we failed.

Defective babies

In the European Union there is much talk about concern for the disabled. We are to provide special parking lots for them, special access to bypass steps, special toilets etc. Fine. This is all very necessary. But why should we exclude the pre-born babies from these considerations? Why should it be permissible to kill babies with defects, just because they are disabled and have not been born yet? Are they not human? The logic of arguments for this is incomprehensible. The smaller the child the more care we should show it. It is defenceless. It needs our protection. To exclude it from this protection just because someone prefers to define humans as beginning at birth is simply illogical.

The argument for killing disabled babies stems from eugenic considerations. The Darwinian philosophy of survival of the fittest, demands that the weaker members of a species perish. Whatever definition one wishes to apply to humans, pre-born babies are members of our species, the human species. They are very weak members and for this reason nature has provided them with a highly protective environment, the mother's womb. They should be safe there. When a child is ill, crippled, defective, it needs more care and not less, especially from the mother. If we allow this eugenic thinking with respect to pre-born babies what is to stop us from extending it to born babies (some ideas along these lines are already being proposed in some parts of the EU), to disabled adults, to what in Nazi Germany was referred to as *lebensunwertes Leben* (life not worth living) that justified the extermination program for the mentally ill.

Pregnancy from criminal intercourse

The law providing acceptability of abortion when the pregnancy arose from a criminal act stems from the belief that no one should be forced into pregnancy. This is very true. Rape should be forbidden and severely penalized. But why penalize the pre-born child? It is not guilty of the rape. Why declare a death penalty on it, for the sin of the father?

Rape is a very traumatic experience. It is very rare that it results in a pregnancy, because the female body defends itself against it. However it does happen occasionally. The rape trauma cannot be revoked by killing the baby that is its consequence. In fact, the abortion itself will be another trauma that will add on to the one already suffered because of the rape. These may be accompanied by other traumas such as loss of virginity or venereal disease. Rape is, in general, a very unpleasant memory that is not easy, nor possible to erase. However if the child that arose from it is allowed to live, be born and grow up, it will be eventually recognized as a positive consequence of a very bad experience. A child in itself is something good. It will recompense the suffering rape caused. It will represent something good arising out of a painful experience. It will have a healing influence. An abortion will only enhance the traumatic memory.

The law allowing abortion following rape actually does not mention rape but criminal intercourse. Thus it includes also pregnancies from paedophilia. Underage pregnancies are quite common, primarily due to peer unions, so they do not count as paedophilia. If indeed the age discrepancy between the parents is sufficient to term it paedophilia, the actual consequence for the family is the same. A child is pregnant. What normally happens in such situations is that the child is accepted and raised jointly by the mother and the grandparents. It is a memory to all around that sexual activity results in reproduction. It cautions against juvenile promiscuity. Again, the pre-born baby is innocent and should not be killed for the sins of the parent or parents.

When the mother's health or life is at stake

This exception is very difficult to justify. It is normal for mothers to risk their health, even life, just to protect their child. This lies in the maternal instinct, common to all species. Why should we treasure the health of the mother more than the life of the child she is carrying under her heart. Of course a mother is entitled to health protection. She is entitled to undergo therapies necessary to cure her. But an effort must be made to cure her and avoid damaging the baby. Any deliberate act directed against the baby is a decision that the child should give its life for the health of the mother. This is a decision that doctors are asked to take. It may happen in adult life that a child may decide to risk its life to save a parent. But here we are speaking not of self-sacrifice but of sacrificing the child by the mother, with the collaboration of a medical team. It may prove impossible to save the mother and child or even one, but an effort must be made to save both.

A doctor is often placed with the situation that he has to decide whom to help first. He may be at a road accident where several casualties require his immediate attention. He may have available only one life saving machine and two or more patients simultaneously needing it. He may be called simultaneously to two different patients. He has to make a quick decision about whom to help first, a difficult decision. Life may depend on it. But he is never allowed to kill one patient so as not to be bothered when treating another. It is exactly this that is allowed by this exception in our abortion law.

Exceptions as loop holes

The purpose of all these exceptions is to desensitize the medical profession and the public at large to the ills of abortion. If it is allowed in these few cases, then why not in others similarly serious such as tragic living conditions, poverty, alcoholism. There are always

attempts to expand the exceptions. The number of undesirable features in a pre-born baby may be increased and placed under foetal defects. The definition of rape may be expanded to include “unprotected” intercourse. The health risks for the mother may be exaggerated to include cosmetic consequences etc. Leaving a loop-hole always leads to its expansion, and often that is its main purpose.

The pro-abortion lobby will never be satisfied with exceptions. It will drive for abortion on demand. The reasons may be numerous. The abortuaries and their staff may be interested in the financial benefits associated with the procedures. Insurance agencies may be interested in fewer children with defects. The pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries may be interested in the supply of raw materials for their products (partial-birth abortions appear to be driven by this). Fornicators will be interested in freeing themselves of visible consequences of their life styles and child support problems. Pleasure seekers may prefer not to have children interfering with their vacation or other plans. Antireligious fanatics may be interested in breaking the backbone of public morality. None of these causes are noble. These lobbies deserve to be censured.

Embryo manipulation

Related to abortion is the now very vigorously discussed issue of *in vitro* embryo manipulation. The European Parliament has been dealing with this problem in connection with the funding of stem-cell research. The medical procedure of *in vitro* fertilisation services childless families satisfying their desire to have children. The procedure is aimed at satisfying the parents. It does not cure their infertility, because they remain infertile, but it provides a child for them in an unnatural way. In the process many embryos are produced and only some used. The unused embryos (members of our species) are refrigerated or flushed down the sink. The idea of using embryos to produce stem cells for research arose from the availability of these excessive embryos. This later developed into production of embryos specifically for research purposes, into cloning human beings and other abuses of these most defenceless babies. Often their parents are unaware of their existence. These babies have no womb to cuddle in. They live in Petri dishes, on artificial nutrients or dormant in liquid nitrogen. They are objects of research, donors of stem cells and most commonly unwanted, disposable, supernumeraries. This is a fate comparable to that of inmates of old age homes.

Ex utero embryo production should be totally forbidden.

Abortifacient contraceptives

Also related to the abortion issue is the production of abortifacient contraceptives. Inter uterine devices (IUDs) are specifically made to inhibit the implantation of an embryo in the womb. Fertilisation takes place, the embryo develops, but when time comes for its implantation in the uterus, the IUD hinders this process and the child is excreted with the menstrual flow. It is killed.

Many of the oral contraceptives have the same effect, particularly the “morning after pill”. The hormonal contraceptives are aimed at destroying the natural hormonal balance needed for the normal reproductive process. They inhibit this process. This may be by preventing ovulation, that is prior to fertilisation, but it may also act on the implantation process preventing the embryo from settling in the womb. Deliberately disrupting the natural hormonal balance cannot be without negative consequences.

Poland penalized for restricting abortion

Just recently the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg has penalized Poland for making it difficult for a lady to have an abortion. Alicja Tysi c claimed that giving birth would hinder her health (poor eyesight). The doctors did not agree and refused an abortion on

this ground. She gave birth to a girl. She complained to the Court. The Court decided her rights were abused. Poland is to pay her €25,000.-

The overruling of our internal legal procedures by international regulations about when and how to deal with the issue of abortion is a very dangerous signal that we have found ourselves under an alien overlordship.

Promotion of homosexuality

The other topic that featured prominently in my son's Heidelberg speech is promotion of homosexuality. To start with I wish to make it perfectly clear that what is at issue is not tolerance of homosexuals but tolerance of the promotion of homosexuality. Homosexuals are in the same category as adulterers. I disapprove of adultery but am tolerant of adulterers. However once they start bragging about their sexual conquests, showing pride in them and advocating free love they become a problem, at least in some professions. Certainly I do not want teachers to promote in schools their disordered sexual mores.

Homosexual acts are disordered by the very nature of them. The sexual impulse has a biological purpose, and this biological purpose is to perpetuate the species. No reproduction arises from homosexual activity. Thus it is biologically useless.

Homosexuality is not an inborn condition. Here I speak as a geneticist. Features pertaining to reproduction that hinder it are very quickly eliminated by natural selection. A mutation inhibitive to reproduction gets lost in a matter of one generation. A sterile sex drive cannot be inherited. Some press reports about the inheritance of the homosexual condition do not stand up to scientific criticism (see *Homosexuality and Hope*. Statement of the Catholic Medical Association USA. <http://cathmed.org/publications/homosexuality.html>). Homosexuality is an upbringing defect. Female homosexuality is usually the consequence of some unpleasant sexual encounter in early life that results in fear of men as sexual partners. Male homosexuality is usually a consequence of being raised by a domineering mother with an absent (or insignificant) father as a role model. Being an upbringing defect it is a condition that can be reversed - but this would require cooperation with the therapists, desire to become heterosexual and spiritual motivation to shed the disordered condition. It is as easy/difficult as shedding inclination to fornication, pornography, self abuse and other misuses of the sexual instinct.

People who claim that homosexuality is a normal condition and wish to advertise this view, or the fact that they themselves are active homosexuals, should be kept at a distance from jobs in which they could influence the opinions of minors. Homosexuality, just as promiscuity, are private problems to be dealt with as little advertising as possible.

Needles to say, such public demonstrations of support for homosexuality as "gay parades" should obviously be forbidden. How are parents to explain to their children what is going on in the streets? Similarly parades of fornicators should be forbidden. We should be engaged in the promotion of public morality. Immorality should remain private.

My position is exactly the same as that of the Catholic Church. I am tolerant of the sinner, intolerant of sin. Every sexual activity outside marriage is a sin, and marriage is understood as being composed of a husband and a wife.

On March 20th 2007, a group of MEPs from the Greens, Liberals and Socialists from the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs have requested that an analysis be made whether the proposal of the Polish vice-minister of Education, Mirosław Orzechowski, that homosexual propaganda be forbidden in schools is in compliance with EU law. The European Parliament is to formally ask the Polish Government for explanation of the situation. Does that mean that the EP considers itself competent to tell Poland that we must allow homosexual propaganda in schools? *Cui bono?* In who's interest?

We managed to stand up against the communist ideological impositions during Soviet times and we shall also stand up against the political correctness stemming from the EU. On moral issues the Union will not dictate how we should behave.

National identity

Finally, a word about national identity, which is a topic also mentioned in my son's Heidelberg speech (see Annex 13).

The European project is said to be based on the principle of subsidiarity. As I understand the word it does not mean that nations should be subsidiary to the European Commission, but that the Commission should not take upon itself issues that can be best settled at the national level. However, from what I have managed to observe so far in my contacts with the European Union, it attempts to function in a manner where subsidiarity pertains only to the relations between the Union and regions. The principle of subsidiarity is used to justify the transfer of responsibility from nation states to regions, if possible also to Euro-regions. In fact, what is proposed is that responsibility be transferred from nation states downwards to regions and upwards to the Commission in Brussels. The responsibilities of nation states are to diminish, dwindle, down to non-existence. What is planned in fact is a Federal Republic of Europe, on the mode of the Federal Republic of Germany, with a strong central government and small regions dealing with local issues.

This is not Europe. Europe is a continent of nation states, states that are the property of individual nations, states that have their own identities, of which they are proud and which they wish to perpetuate. The whole beauty of Europe is that it differs so much from one country to another. What unites us is a common ethic, a set of common values, among which respect for diversity is one of the most important. Egalitarianism is alien to Europe. Communists tried to impose it in Central Europe, but they failed. We differ as people, we differ as nations, we differ as states. We accept differences and we cherish them.

Bureaucrats of the European Union think they know better what is best for us in our own countries. They managed to force Britain into abandoning its traditional fox-hunting. Now they are working on the elimination of bull-fighting traditional for Spain. They have been telling us how to protect storks (we have more storks' nests in Poland than the rest of the EU). Now they tell us we must not build a road through a region under nature protection. We have 16% of our land area under protection whereas the whole of the EU has about 3%. We need no coaching from Brussels in this field. Surely other countries have their own grievances about the way Brussels is interfering with their traditional way of living and handling things.

Overregulation is one of the primary ills of the European Union, at the expense of national identity.

Papal admonition

On March 24th, Pope Benedict XVI spoke to the participants of a COMECE (Commission of the Bishops' Conferences of the European Community) conference in Rome on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome. His words are very pertinent to the issue of European values and are worth quoting here. Among others he said:

“From all this it clearly emerges that an authentic European "common home" cannot be built without considering the identity of the people of this Continent of ours. It is a question of a historical, cultural, and moral identity before being a geographic, economic, or political one; an identity comprised of a set of universal values that Christianity helped forge, thus giving Christianity not only a historical but a foundational role vis-à-vis Europe. These

values, which make up the soul of the Continent, must remain in the Europe of the third millennium as a "ferment" of civilization. If these values were to disappear, how could the "old" Continent continue to function as a "leaven" for the entire world? If, for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, the Governments of the Union wish to "get nearer" to their citizens, how can they exclude an element essential to European identity such as Christianity, with which a vast majority of citizens continue to identify? Is it not surprising that today's Europe, while aspiring to be regarded as a community of values, seems ever more often to deny the very existence of universal and absolute values? Does not this unique form of "apostasy" from itself, even more than its apostasy from God, lead Europe to doubt its own identity?"

"In reality, if compromise can constitute a legitimate balance between different particular interests, it becomes a common evil whenever it involves agreements that dishonour human nature. A community built without respect for the true dignity of the human being, disregarding the fact that every person is created in the image of God ends up doing no good to anyone. For this reason it seems ever more important that Europe be on guard against the pragmatic attitude, widespread today, which systematically justifies compromise on essential human values, as if it were the inevitable acceptance of a lesser evil. This kind of pragmatism, even when presented as balanced and realistic, is in reality neither, since it denies the dimension of values and ideals inherent in human nature. When non-religious and relativistic tendencies are woven into this pragmatism, Christians as such are eventually denied the very right to enter into the public discussion"

"... [B]e actively present in the public debate on a European level" is the papal admonition to all European Christians.

Dear Colleagues!

I am pleased to have an opportunity to talk sincerely about the future and values of Europe. It is undoubtedly a crucial issue for the future of Europe.

Europe needs a sincere and honest debate on values. First of all, we need to discuss the right of European nations to their identity and liberty. Today, liberty is curtailed by an attempt to impose on us opinions of small ideological groups. This is especially evident in education.

Today, we can see that several actions are taken in order to promote youth education in a spirit of permissiveness and belief that no standard of values should be met. It is time to change this attitude in Europe. Europe was strong when it was based on natural law and when youth education drew on this law.

Recently, I have learned that eleven-year old boys would participate in a gay parade and that local authorities had already given their consent for such propaganda in one of the European countries. I am aware that in some countries this topic is taboo. Fortunately in my country, we can talk about that frankly.

Homosexual propaganda is reaching younger and younger children. In some countries, children at hospitals are forbidden to talk or read about mummy and daddy because this may allegedly infringe minority rights. Let us abandon this unconsidered political correctness. If we do not work hard to strengthen the family, there will be no future for our continent. Europe will become a continent in which representatives of the Islamic world, who care for their families, will outnumber us. We cannot propagate within youth education that the same sex partner relationships are normal, because in objective terms they are a departure from the natural law. And it is not about discrimination but quite the opposite! The truth does not discriminate anyone, and each person, regardless of their weaknesses deserves respect, protection and understanding.

Each human being, including the not yet born, needs protection. Not admitting the truth about the tragedy of millions of Europeans aborted each year is one of the gloomy realities of our times. This crime legalized by several parliaments is a new form of barbarity. A nation, which kills its own children, is a nation without a future. A continent of people, which kills its own children, will be replaced by the ones who do not kill them. You cannot educate European youth effectively, if you do not relate to millions of their brothers and sisters aborted with the state's consent.

You cannot educate youth without a true message. Therefore, if we think of a common program for youth education, we should start with a discussion on fundamental issues. And let us speak frankly, without newspeak.

Europe needs change. We should immediately prohibit abortion. Human life is the most fundamental value worldwide. We need to limit homosexual propaganda so that children do not have a distorted picture of the family. We must strengthen the family and return to traditional European values of human life, family and natural law.

We should guarantee in a separate document rights and liberties of European nations. What we need today is a Great Charter of European Nations' Rights, which will guarantee liberty and identity in keeping with the values I have mentioned before. Only having discussed and adopted common values, can we talk about taking further steps, such as the European Constitution.

Table of Contents

European values

The Berlin Declaration

Freedom of speech

 Booklet on civilisations

 Pro-life display

 Anti-war display

 Spanish civil war

The Heidelberg encounter

 Abortion

 Defective babies

 Pregnancy from criminal intercourse

 When the mother's health or life is at stake

 Exceptions as loopholes

 Embryo manipulation

 Abortifacient contraceptives

 Poland penalized for restricting abortion

 Promotion of homosexuality

 National identity

Papal admonition

Annex 1 Letter of reprimand by the President of the European Parliament

Annex 2 My appeal of the President's reprimand

Annex 3 The reply of the President in the name of the Bureau

Annex 4 Articles of the Rules of Procedure quoted in the above correspondence and article 6a of the regulations specifying conditions for the refunding of publication costs from line 4000 allotted to the Non-attached members of the Parliament.

Annex 5 Refusal of the Financial Services of the Parliament to pay for my booklet.

Annex 6 My appeal of the Decision of the Financial Services

Annex 7 Reply of the Financial Services

Annex 8 Quaestors decision to close my exhibit

Annex 9 My letter to President of the European Parliament calling for a reopening of the exhibit.

Annex 10 President's reply

Annex 11 Quaestors complaint about my window display

Annex 12 My reply to Quaestor Lulling

Annex 13 The Heidelberg speech of Roman Giertych, the Polish Minister of Education