

## **10 Things You Should Know About the Alliance Defending Freedom**

- 1. Working to promote its non-inclusive agenda, ADF is the nation's largest anti-LGBT legal advocacy group in the nation, raising over \$178 million over the past 5 years, with an annual budget of over \$45 million and rapidly expanding.*

**Over The Past Five Years, The ADF Has Had Over \$178 Million In Revenue, With Revenue Increases Each Year.** Over the same time period, ADF had almost \$170 million in net assets. [Alliance Defending Freedom, IRS Form 990, [2009](#) – [2013](#)]

**ADF Has An Annual Budget Of Over \$45 Million. In FY2013, Alliance Defending Freedom had expenditures of \$46,988,302.** [[Alliance Defending Freedom Consolidated Financial Statements Years Ended June 30, 2013 and 2012](#)]

**ADF Employs More Than 40 Attorneys Directly And Partners With More Than 2,000 More.** “Alliance Defending Freedom currently employs 44 attorneys. Nearly 2,200 allied attorneys serve nationwide.” [Alliance Defending Freedom Media Kit, [7/12/12](#)]

**In 2012 The Alliance Defending Freedom's Revenue Was Among The Top Ten Religious Right Groups At \$35 Million.** Church & State reported, “Groups To Watch Out For! The movement known as the Religious Right is the number-one threat to church-state separation in America. This collection of organizations is well funded and well organized; it uses its massive annual revenue and grassroots troops to undermine the wall of separation in communities nationwide...Alliance Defending Freedom (formerly Alliance Defense Fund). Revenue: \$35,145,644. The ADF may have changed its name, but it still promotes a familiar Religious Right agenda. The Arizona based organization, which was founded by far-right TV and radio preachers, attacks church-state separation, blasts gay rights, assails reproductive freedom and seeks to saturate the public schools with its narrow version of fundamentalism. In recent years, the ADF, headed by Ed Meese acolyte Alan Sears, has worked aggressively to overturn a federal law that bars tax-exempt churches and other nonprofits from intervening in partisan elections. The group says church-state separation is not in the Constitution and calls the church state wall ‘fictitious.’” (Church & State, October 2012)

**ADF Has Been “The 800-Pound Gorilla Of The Christian Right” And Has Become “The Most Powerful Force Fighting For Its [Christian] Agenda.”** Think Progress reported “ADF has had a hand in many of the most prominent legal battles of the past 20 years. In some cases, such as the Citizens United v. FEC, that consisted of filing an amicus brief in opposition to the challenged campaign finance restrictions. In others, including Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Group of Boston (which affirmed the right of St. Patrick's Day Parade organizers in Boston to exclude LGBT groups) and Boy Scouts of America v. Dale (which affirmed the right of some private organizations to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation), ADF provided funding and/or organized moot court preparations for the attorneys handling the cases. In the high profile Terri Schiavo case, ADF reportedly gave six-figure funding to the attorney representing her parents in their efforts to keep Schiavo on life support. As it has grown enormously, other similar organizations have seen their own finances stagnate or

have withdrawn from the legal arena entirely. And while ADF's success has been mixed, allies and opponents alike agree that it has become the most powerful force fighting for its agenda." [Think Progress, [5/1/14](#)]

- 2. ADF practically invented marriage discrimination. They literally wrote the original language for discriminatory same-sex marriage bans in Idaho (2005), Colorado (2006), and South Carolina (2006).*

**ADF Senior Counsel Michael Norton Also Drafted 2006 Colorado Marriage Amendment.** According to a local notice announcing a debate between church and state in Colorado, Michael Norton, senior counsel for Alliance Defending Freedom, was also "drafter of the 2006 Colorado Marriage Amendment to the state constitution." [Daily Times-Call, CO, 5/2/14]

**The Alliance Defense Fund Wrote The Language For Idaho's Proposed Anti-Gay Marriage Amendment.** The Spokesman Review reported, "'We're up here to stand in support of traditional marriage,' said Julie Lynde, of the Cornerstone Institute, opening a news conference that revealed that the Alliance Defense Fund, a group based in Scottsdale, Ariz., wrote the language in Idaho's anti-gay marriage amendment. That group and the national Christian group Focus on the Family voiced their support and noted that the Alliance Defense Fund has been involved in similar efforts in 17 other states." (Spokesman Review, 1/30/05)

**The Alliance Defense Fund Advised Legislators Writing South Carolina's Gay Marriage Ban in 2006.** According to their website, "Alliance Defending Freedom attorneys advised state legislators [in South Carolina] on a constitutional amendment that was enacted by voters in November 2006." [ADF, Legal Landscape, [Accessed 9/9/14](#)]

- 3. Sticking their head in the sand, ADF stubbornly refuses to stop defending same-sex marriage bans, even when leaders in those states abandon them and stand on the right side of history.*

**ADF Continued To Represent Schuylkill County Clerk To Appeal Pennsylvania Same-Sex Marriage Ban After PA Governor And Attorney General Declined To Do So.** According to a press release from the Alliance Defending Freedom, the ADF filed a motion on behalf of the Schuylkill County clerk to stay the district court order striking down Pennsylvania's ban on same-sex marriage. ADF Litigation Counsel Caleb Dalton said, "Marriage expresses the reality that men and women bring distinct, irreplaceable gifts to family life, especially for children who deserve both a mom and a dad. The time-honored marriage laws of Pennsylvania deserve a full defense instead of being nullified by a single federal judge. A public official like the Schuylkill County clerk, who is responsible for issuing marriage licenses, is the correct official to defend the law when the governor and attorney general refuse to do so." [Alliance Defending Freedom, Press Release, 6/19/14]

**ADF Represented County Clerks In Virginia After Virginia AG Refused To Defend State Gay Marriage Ban.** According to Gannett, "Because Virginia's new Democratic attorney general, Mark Herring, had refused to defend the state's gay marriage ban, that task was left to circuit court clerks from two counties. Brian Babione, senior counsel at Alliance Defending

Freedom, which represented one of the clerks, said they were considering their options. ‘In his dissent, Judge Niemeyer correctly noted that ‘there is no fundamental right to same-sex marriage, and there are rational reasons for not recognizing it,’ Babione said.” [Gannett, 7/28/14]

- 4. ADF wants the “freedom” to discriminate. They’ve sued cities and states for passing LGBT-inclusive anti-discrimination laws and ordinances—because it isn’t just about marriage, it’s about protecting the “freedom” to discriminate against LGBT people.***

**In 2003 The Alliance Defense Fund Represented Joined Three Republican Legislators In Suing The Governor Over His Executive Order Prohibiting Employment Discrimination Based On Sexual Orientation In Certain State Agencies.** The BC Cylce reported, “Three Republican legislators and a Christian group challenged an executive order barring employment discrimination based on sexual orientation in some state agencies. The group that filed the challenge in the Arizona Supreme Court argues Democratic Gov. Janet Napolitano overstepped her authority and is legislating through executive order. ‘The governor has demonstrated that her style of leadership is not by example, but by legislation,’ said Rep. John Allen, a Scottsdale Republican and one of three state legislators involved in the suit, filed by the Scottsdale-based Alliance Defense Fund.” (BC Cycle, 7/29/03)

**The Alliance Defense Fund Filed A Petition Against Governor Napolitano In Response To Her Executive Order Prohibiting Employment Discrimination Based On Sexual Orientation, Saying The Move Overstepped Her Authority.** The Associated Press reported, “Three Republican legislators and a Christian group challenged an executive order barring employment discrimination based on sexual orientation in some state agencies. The group that filed the challenge in the Arizona Supreme Court argues Democratic Gov. Janet Napolitano overstepped her authority and is legislating through executive order. ‘The governor has demonstrated that her style of leadership is not by example, but by legislation,’ said Rep. John Allen, a Scottsdale Republican and one of three state legislators involved in the suit, filed by the Scottsdale-based Alliance Defense Fund. Napolitano announced the executive order last month at an event held by the Arizona Human Rights Fund, a gay and lesbian advocacy group... The Alliance Defense Fund describes itself on its Web site as a ‘unique Christian legal organization that works to protect and defend traditional family values, religious freedom and the sanctity of life.’” (Associated Press, 7/29/03)

**In 2003 The Alliance Defense Fund Sued Allentown In An Effort To Overturn The Pennsylvania City’s Laws Guaranteeing Equal Housing And Employment For Homosexual Persons.** The York Sunday News reported, “An attorney affiliated with the Alliance Defense Fund, a conservative legal aid organization from Arizona that has successfully challenged numerous laws around the country, has sued Allentown in an effort to overturn that city's laws guaranteeing equal housing and employment for homosexuals. And, in a state that does not include sexual orientation in its fair housing and equal employment laws, both sides say the case could have implications beyond Allentown, specifically in York and the other cities that have adopted their own protections... The lawsuit was brought by four landlords who object to the city's requirement they not consider the sexual orientation of a prospective tenant. It is being bankrolled, at least in part, by the Alliance Defense Fund and was filed by attorney Randall Wenger, from the Lancaster law firm Clymer & Musser, whose building serves as the national

headquarters of the ultra-conservative Constitution Party. Wenger is among the hundreds of attorneys who have received training by the Alliance Defense Fund to try cases on issues ranging from religion in schools to abortion to gay rights. The group recently funded a case that led to the overturning of a Philadelphia law extending benefits to the partners of gay city employees. He said the city of Allentown went too far in adopting its gay rights law last year.” (York Sunday News, 8/10/03)

**ADF Was Lead Counsel In Case Challenging Wisconsin Domestic Partner Benefits Because Of Constitutional Amendment Banning Same-Sex Marriage.** According to a press release from ADF, “The Wisconsin Supreme Court ruled Thursday that state law, while affirming marriage as the union of one man and one woman, also permits separate domestic partnerships for same-sex couples even though a voter-approved constitutional amendment prohibits any ‘legal status identical or substantially similar to that of marriage for unmarried individuals.’... ‘While the Wisconsin Supreme Court has chosen not to invalidate the state’s domestic partnership scheme, the court nonetheless affirmed that domestic partnerships for same-sex couples are not like marriage, maintaining marriage as a unique legal status,’ said ADF Senior Counsel Austin R. Nimocks, who argued before the high court in October of last year. A group of taxpayers filed the lawsuit *Appling v. Doyle* in 2010 claiming that the legislatively created domestic partnerships were substantially similar to marriage. The taxpayers claimed that the domestic partnership plan, which Gov. Doyle proposed and signed into law as part of the 2010-11 state budget, was only available to same-sex couples and was, at its core, virtually identical to marriage.” [Alliance Defending Freedom, Press Release, 7/31/14]

**The Alliance Defense Fund Joined Northstar Legal Center In A Suit To Prevent Domestic Partners From Receiving Insurance Benefits In Washington State.** The Columbian reported, “A lot of those cities might never have even considered offering such benefits to their homosexual and unmarried heterosexual employees, fearing the expensive legal fight that might result. However, thanks to Donald Wildmon, James Dobson and the other anti-gay activists behind the Alliance Defense Fund, up to 175 Washington cities have been given the green light by the state Supreme Court to provide such benefits if they so desire... Yet the Alliance Defense Fund and the related Northstar Legal Center, which argued the case before the state Supreme Court last May, consider anything less than absolute, thundering, self-righteous condemnation of homosexuality to be an endorsement of the gay ‘lifestyle.’... But there it is: *Roni Heinsma vs. City of Vancouver*, in which the court ruled last week that our city is well within its authority when it provides insurance benefits to unmarried partners of its employees. The Supreme Court’s vote wasn’t even close 8-1, with the only dissent coming from Justice Richard Sanders, usually the champion of local control but in this case apparently unwilling to buck his right-wing constituency.” (The Columbian, 8/28/01)

**Alliance Defense Fund Affiliated Attorney Mike Johnson Filed A Suit Against New Orleans To “Scuttle” The City’s Domestic Partner Registry And Health Coverage For Gay Partners Of Municipal Employees.** The Times-Picayune reported, “Acting at the city’s request, a national gay-rights defense organization joined New Orleans on Thursday in opposing a suit designed to scuttle the city’s domestic partner registry and health coverage for gay partners of municipal employees... Representing the plaintiffs is Mike Johnson, a Shreveport lawyer affiliated with the Alliance Defense Fund, a Phoenix-based Christian law firm that has backed

several such suits. When Johnson brought suit in July, he said the filing was "not motivated out of hatred for homosexuals or anything like that," but because he contended New Orleans was equating out-of-wedlock relationships with traditional marriage. 'A city can't decide what marriage is,' he said." (Times-Picayune, 8/15/03)

**The Alliance Defense Fund Filed A Suit Against Salt Lake City Mayor Anderson's Executive Order To Create A Domestic Partner Benefits Plan.** The Associated Press reported, "An Arizona-based Christian group has sued over Salt Lake City Mayor Rocky Anderson's domestic-partner benefits plan. On Thursday, the Alliance Defense Fund (ADF) -- which is involved in a separate suit in Utah over child-visitation rights for gay couples -- asked Utah's 3rd District Court to declare Anderson's executive order illegal and prevent the city from providing insurance benefits to employees' domestic partners. ADF attorney Chris Stovall said Anderson flagrantly violated Utah's law and constitutional amendment, both of which define marriage as between a man and a woman. The suit says the city is establishing an 'imitation marriage' by providing benefits to domestic partners and by defining domestic partners in city policy... Anderson hadn't seen a copy of the ADF lawsuit, filed Thursday, but said his domestic-partner benefits isn't about imitating marriage. The mayor does support same-sex marriage. The executive order is a 'way of providing equal benefits to people regardless of sex orientation or marital status,' he said. And Anderson disputed that ADF should be called Christian. 'I don't see much Christian about discriminating against people on the basis of sexual orientation. I don't think they should smear Christianity by the use of that name.' ADF and Midvale-based attorney Frank Mylar are representing three Salt Lake City residents -- Carol Nabrotzky and George and Laurie Norman -- who say they will be harmed if the executive order is implemented. The suit argues taxpayer money will be used for the benefits, though Anderson disputes that... ADF sees one of its primary goals as defending Defense of Marriage Acts throughout the country, along with litigating against abortion and for religious freedom." (9/30/05)

**An Alliance Defense Fund Attorney Denounced Scenarios Where Domestic Partners Were Barred From Seeing Their Loved Ones As A "Non-Existent Circumstance."** The Arizona Republic reported, "Phoenix has become the second city in Arizona to grant hospital-visitation rights to unmarried gay or straight couples who live together... Only one person publicly spoke in opposition to the registry. Austin Nimocks of the Alliance Defense Fund, a Christian group in Scottsdale that advocates for traditional family values, said the registry was unnecessary and called scenarios where domestic partners are barred from seeing their loved ones 'a non-existent circumstance.'" (Arizona Republic, 12/18/08)

- 5. ADF stands up for bigotry. They enthusiastically defended the "rights" of businesses to discriminate against LGBT people. They even developed Arizona's incredibly controversial bill, SB 1062, which would have legalized bigotry against LGBT people in restaurants, shops, and businesses all across the state.*

**Arizona's SB 1062, Which Would Have Allowed Discrimination Based On Religious Beliefs, Was Based On Model Legislation That ADF Backed In Several States.** According to the Arizona Republic, "SB 1062 would have offered a legal defense for individuals and businesses facing discrimination lawsuits if they proved they had acted on a 'sincerely held

religious belief.’ Supporters used the New Mexico case of a photographer sued for refusing to photograph a same-sex couple's commitment ceremony. Although not verbatim model legislation, several states have introduced bills over the past couple of years addressing similar issues. Unlike Arizona's, most bills in other states specifically mentioned same-sex couples. The Scottsdale-based legal organization Alliance Defending Freedom testified in support of this legislation in several states and worked with Phoenix-based Christian advocacy group Center for Arizona Policy to develop Arizona's bill. Both organizations have ties to the national Christian organization Focus on the Family.” [Arizona Republic, 4/5/14]

**ADF Represented NY Couple Decided Not To Host Any Wedding Ceremonies At Farm Rather Than Accommodate Same-Sex Couples After \$13,000 Discrimination Fine.**

According to Christian Today, “A New York couple fined [\$13,000 for violating state law forbidding discrimination based on sexual orientation] and ordered to allow same-sex wedding ceremonies at their farm have decided they will no longer host any wedding ceremonies on their property. Liberty Ridge Farm owners Cynthia and Robert Gifford, both Christians, decided to forgo all weddings rather than accommodate same-sex couples. They will still allow same-sex wedding receptions at the farm, however. ‘Going forward, [Cynthia and Robert Gifford] have decided to no longer host any wedding ceremonies on their property (other than the ones already under contract),’ Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) allied attorney James Trainor, who represents the Giffords, told The Blaze. ‘Since the order essentially compelled them to do all ceremonies or none at all, they have chosen the latter in order to stay true to their religious convictions, even though it will likely hurt their business in the short run.’” [Christian Today, [9/2/14](#)]

**ADF Represented New Mexico Photographer In Unsuccessful Case Over Whether Photographer Had The Right To Refuse Service To Same-Sex Couple.** According to the Washington Post, “The Supreme Court declined on Monday to consider whether a New Mexico photographer had a right to refuse service to a same-sex couple who wanted her to record their commitment ceremony. Without comment, the court said it would not review a decision by the New Mexico Supreme Court that the denial of service violated the state's public accommodations law, which bans discrimination by those offering their services to the public. ... ‘When Elane Photography refused to photograph a same-sex commitment ceremony, it violated the NMHRA in the same way as if it had refused to photograph a wedding between people of different races,’ the [New Mexico Supreme] court said. In their petition, the Huguenins and lawyer Jordan W. Lorence of the Alliance Defending Freedom mentioned religion frequently. But their plea did not cite constitutional protection of their right to freely exercise their religion. Instead, they relied on another part of the First Amendment: their right to free speech.” [Washington Post, 4/8/14]

**ADF Represented Colorado Baker Who Refused To Make Wedding Cake For Same-Sex Ceremonies.** “A Christian cake artist in Colorado filed an appeal Wednesday challenging a government order that says he and his staff must take "re-education" classes. The classes would "educate" employees about a state law that effectively demands that businesses celebrate same-sex ceremonies. Jack Phillips, who owns Masterpiece Cakeshop in Lakewood, Colo., declined to make such a cake back in 2012. After politely declining, he said he would happily create any other baked goods. The couple then filed a complaint with the Colorado Civil Rights Commission....In December of last year, a Colorado judge ruled that Phillips had to create cakes

for such ceremonies - and prove that he has done so. ADF appealed this decision in January. It was denied. On May 30, the commission issued an order demanding employees of Masterpiece Cakeshop must also take the so called re-education classes. 'In America, we don't force artists to create expression that is contrary to their convictions,' added ADF Senior Legal Counsel Jeremy Tedesco. 'An artist who identifies as homosexual shouldn't be intimidated into creating a painting that celebrates one-man, one-woman marriage. A pro-life photographer shouldn't be forced to work a pro-abortion rally. And Christian cake artists shouldn't be punished for declining to participate in a same-sex ceremony or promote its message.'" [CitizenLink, 7/17/14]

**6. ADF protects bullying. When school districts try to prevent harmful bullying of LGBT teens, ADF has stood up for the bullies by attacking the school districts for teaching tolerance. They'll also fight for a student's "right" to wear an anti-LGBT slogan on a t-shirt.**

**ADF Sent A Letter To Janesville, WI High School Applauding Their Apology For Showing YouTube Video Called "Kids React To Gay Marriage."** According to CitizenLink, "In April, students at Craig High School in Janesville were shown 'Kids React to Gay Marriage.' The YouTube video shows young people answering questions in ways that support such marriage. 'Schoolchildren should receive an education that is free from ideological or political bias and that does not disparage any of their beliefs,' said Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) Senior Legal Counsel Jeremy Tedesco. 'Student indoctrination is inappropriate, especially on an issue as important as marriage.' ADF sent a letter to the Janesville School District applauding its apology. The legal group explained that the district was correct in determining that showing the video violated its policies." [CitizenLink, 5/27/14]

**The Alliance Defense Fund Sent A Letter To The Anoka-Hennepin School District Urging It To "Maintain Its Neutrality Policy On Sexual Orientation."** The Minnesota Independent, a blog, wrote, "Lawyers for the Alliance Defense Fund (ADF), a national conservative Christian legal organization, sent a letter to the Anoka-Hennepin School District this week urging it to maintain its neutrality policy on sexual orientation.... Reports of suicides and bullying of LGBT students have touched off national concerns in the Anoka-Hennepin district, particularly over a policy that prevents teachers from discussing LGBT issues in the classroom. The SPLC and NCLR view that policy as contributing to an unsafe environment for LGBT students and have threatened to file a lawsuit if the policy isn't changed. The ADF told the district that the two groups are only trying to promote a narrow agenda, not help the districts students and accused the groups of exploiting student suicides... The ADF wrote: SPLC and NCLR wrongly claim that the Policy singles out LGBT students for disfavored treatment, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. First, the Policy, on its face, does not mention (let alone target) students who identify as homosexual, bisexual, or transgendered. Rather, it requires neutrality regarding sexual orientation. Sexual orientation is a broad concept that encompasses all sexual orientations, including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and heterosexual. The Policy does not target anyone, but rather treats all persons the same, regardless of their claimed sexual orientation. That is at odds with what the district says. When asked last fall by reporters if the policy pertains to discussion about heterosexuality, including topics like marriage and sexual health, or whether it merely singles out discussions about LGBT issues, a

district spokesperson said, That's correct. It only pertains to discussions of GLBT issues. And the policy itself stems from a similar 1995 policy, pushed by conservative Christian parents, that said homosexuality should not be taught/addressed as a normal, valid lifestyle in the districts schools. The policy was changed in 2009 after a Minnesota Department of Human Rights complaint against two teachers accused of harassing a student they thought was gay. The policy reads, in part, Teaching about sexual orientation is not a part of the District adopted curriculum; rather, such matters are best addressed within individual family homes, churches, or community organizations. Anoka-Hennepin staff, in the course of their professional duties, shall remain neutral on matters regarding sexual orientation including but not limited to student led discussions.” (Minnesota Independent, 6/30/11)

**In 2012 The Alliance Defending Fund Developed An Anti-Bullying Policy Yardstick To Determine Whether Policies Protect All Students Or “Only A Select Few Favored By Activist Groups Advancing A Homosexual Agenda.”** In a press release Alliance Defending Freedom wrote, “Alliance Defending Freedom, in a joint effort with Focus on the Family, has developed an Anti-Bullying Policy Yardstick that allows public schools and the general public to evaluate several legal aspects of a school's proposed or existing policies, including whether a policy protects all students from bullying or only a select few favored by activist groups advancing a homosexual agenda. ‘All students deserve to be protected from bullying, not just ones favored by certain political activist groups. And all schools need help to ensure that their policies comport with their students' First Amendment freedoms and other legal protections. This tool is designed to provide that help,’ said Alliance Defending Freedom Legal Counsel Jeremy Tedesco. ‘Unfortunately, activist groups that promote homosexual behavior often dupe schools into adopting policies that protect students based on their 'sexual orientation' or 'gender identity,' which can unconstitutionally silence students who want to express their biblically-based views on sexuality,’ Tedesco explained. ‘This new Anti-Bullying Policy Yardstick helps schools identify which policies are driven by a narrow political agenda and which ones protect First Amendment freedoms.’ The Yardstick is a tool that can help public school officials evaluate proposed and existing anti-bullying policies and laws, outlining the good and bad approaches to the top 10 most common components of these policies. Among other things, the Yardstick will help those officials detect strictly pro-homosexual programs propagated in the name of ‘safe schools’ or ‘anti-bullying.’ Alliance Defending Freedom's cover letter explains that ‘homosexual behavior advocates are demanding that protections for 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity' be inserted into existing anti-bullying policies so that inappropriate, sexually-based materials can be promulgated to our children.’ As a result, ‘schools are being transformed from places of safety and learning to places of unprecedented sexual education.’ In fact, Alliance Defending Freedom attorneys stress that schools do not need to adopt ‘anti-bullying’ policies to prevent bullying because school officials already possess authority to prohibit that type of behavior under existing policies. However, according to the Yardstick, a good anti-bullying policy, if a school or school district chooses to have one, ‘provides a precise definition of 'bullying' that regulates bullying conduct’ and ‘focuses on the acts or words said by the alleged bully rather than the intent or motives behind the actions.’” (Targeted News Service, 8/28/12)

**In 2008 The Alliance Defense Fund Sent A Legal Memo To Minneapolis Public Schools Urging Them To Discontinue Their Bullying Curriculum, Which Was An Initiative Of The Human Rights Campaign.** The Minnesota Monitor reported, “The Alliance Defense Fund, a

conservative Christian nonprofit in Scottsdale, Ariz., that receives funding from Focus on the Family, sent a legal memo to Minneapolis Public Schools urging them to drop the ‘Welcoming Schools’ curriculum that they are currently considering implementing at Hale and Jefferson schools. ‘Welcoming Schools’ is an initiative of the Human Rights Campaign, and Minnesota is one of three states that are being used as a pilot for the program. The curriculum addresses three main topics: family diversity, gender stereotyping and name-calling. The curriculum is an anti-bullying tool kit for schools to use to confront violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students. While the curriculum has been met with suspicion by some parents based on religious objection, school officials have noted that they have had requests from parents to implement the program. The Alliance Defense Fund letter (PDF) says, ‘The indoctrination of children with HRC’s anti-religion political agenda will present serious practical and legal problems, especially adults are charged with the safety and security of other people’s children. You are urged to please refrain from allowing your schools to be utilized as a pilot program for HRC.’ While the ADF letter claims that religious freedom is an issue for MPS, their own representatives make it clear that it instead is a reaction to the religious right’s favorite catchphrase: the ‘homosexual agenda.’ ‘The government should promote and encourage strong families,’ said ADF Senior Legal Counsel Austin R. Nimocks in a press statement Monday. ‘When school officials have to choose between protecting children in those families or furthering the homosexual agenda, the choice is obvious: protecting our children comes first.’ Curiously, the ADF opened the Center for Academic Freedom in Nashville, Tenn. That freedom appears to only work in one direction as ADF’s attempts to quash the ‘Welcoming Schools’ curriculum would restrict rather than expand the breadth of discussion.” (Minnesota Monitor, 5/6/08)

**The Alliance Defense Fund Delivered A Legal Memo To The Erie Community Unit School District Supporting Its Decision To Discontinue The Curriculum Produced By The Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network.** In a press release the Alliance Defense Fund wrote, “The Alliance Defense Fund has delivered a legal memo to the Erie Community Unit School District supporting its decision to discontinue the use of curriculum produced by the Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network for elementary school students. ‘Public schools should not be coerced by groups who want to indoctrinate children into supporting homosexual behavior by exposing them to inappropriate material,’ said ADF Legal Counsel Jeremy Tedesco. ‘Schools are supposed to serve as institutions of learning, not propaganda. The school board was right to listen to parents’ concerns and abandon the GLSEN materials.’” (Alliance Defense Fund, Press Release, 6/29/12)

**In 2005 The Alliance Defense Fund Initiated A Nationwide Counter-Event To Day Of Silence, Called Day Of Truth.** The Associated Press reported, “Irrked by the success of the nationwide Day of Silence, which seeks to combat anti-gay bias in schools, conservative activists are launching a counter-event this week called the Day of Truth aimed at mobilizing students who believe homosexuality is sinful... The driving force behind the Day of Truth is the Alliance Defense Fund, a Christian legal group that has opposed same-sex marriage and challenged restrictions on religious expression in public schools. The event is endorsed by several influential conservative organizations, including the Christian ministry Focus on the Family and the Southern Baptist Convention’s Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission. Mike Johnson, an Alliance Defense Fund attorney from Shreveport, La., said organizers were unsure how many students would participate in the Day of Truth, but expressed hope it would grow in coming

years as more people learned about it. Johnson said the event is meant to be 'peaceful and respectful,' but made clear it is motivated by belief that homosexuality is wrong. 'You can call it sinful or destructive - ultimately it's both,' he said. The event is designed as a riposte to the Day of Silence, which began on a small scale in 1996 and is now observed by tens of thousands of students annually at hundreds of schools and colleges across the country.' (Associated Press, 4/12/05)

**In Anticipation That Some Students Participating In Day Of Truth Would Be Admonished By School Staff, The Alliance Defense Fund Provided A Hotline With Attorneys On Call To Provide Legal Advice About Free Speech.** The Associated Press reported, "Echoing the stance taken by defense fund lawyers in several court cases, Johnson said teachers and students critical of homosexuality have been pressured to stifle their views while at school. They cite the case of a San Diego-area high school student, Chase Harper, who was disciplined last year for refusing to change out of a T-shirt that read, 'Homosexuality is Shameful.' 'We wouldn't have come up with the Day of Truth if Christian kids hadn't been silenced in the first place,' Johnson said. The Alliance Defense Fund is anticipating that some students who try to participate in the Day of Truth may be admonished by school staff. Its resource kit includes a hotline number, with attorneys on call to provide legal advice about free-speech rights on school grounds." (Associated Press, 4/12/05)

**The Alliance Defense Fund Filed A Federal Lawsuit Against The Sampson County School Board When A High School Student Was Refused Permission To Wear A Day Of Truth Shirt.** The Associated Press reported, "A civil rights group has filed a federal lawsuit against the Sampson County school board claiming a ninth-grader was wrongfully suspended this week for disregarding a warning about expressing his Christian faith. Attorneys with the Alliance Defense Fund said students at Midway High School were allowed to participate in the April 26 Day of Silence, an event promoted by the Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network. The group said student Benjamin Arthurs was refused permission to wear a Day of Truth shirt on the following day and distribute cards presenting a Christian viewpoint on homosexual behavior during non-instructional time. He was suspended Monday for ignoring the warning. The county school superintendent said the student was allowed to wear his shirt but was told he couldn't pass out leaflets." (Associated Press, 5/5/06)

**The Alliance Defense Fund Represented Two Chicago High School Students Who Were Not Allowed To Wear Anti-Gay Shirts.** The Associated Press reported, "Two suburban Chicago students filed a lawsuit in U.S. District Court claiming their high school violated one of the students' civil rights by not letting her wear an anti-gay T-shirt last year. Heidi Zamecnik, 17, of Naperville, and Alexander Nuxoll, 14, of Bolingbrook students at Neuqua Valley High School in Naperville filed the lawsuit Wednesday seeking court permission to openly express their opinions on homosexuality during the National Day of Silence, scheduled for April 18. On the Day of Silence, students can refrain from speaking as an effort to protest discrimination against homosexuals. In response to a Day of Silence event at the school in April 2006, Zamecnik wore a shirt that read 'MY DAY OF SILENCE, STRAIGHT ALLIANCE' on the front and 'BE HAPPY, NOT GAY' on the back, according to the suit filed Wednesday. According to the suit, one school administrator ordered Zamecnik to remove the T-shirt and another official ordered her to cross out 'NOT GAY' with a marker. The suit alleges Zamecnik suffered unlawful

discrimination and humiliation because school officials didn't agree with her viewpoint. Nuxoll did not attend the school at the time of the incident. Calls by The Associated Press to the Indian Prairie School District and Neuqua Valley High School were not immediately returned Thursday morning. The Arizona-based Alliance Defense Fund, a conservative Christian litigation group, is representing Zamecnik. 'At its core, this is about students' fundamental right to express their beliefs, no matter how controversial or whether they are in the minority or not,' said Nate Kellum, an Alliance Defense Fund attorney in Memphis, Tenn., who is representing the two students. 'This is a fundamental First Amendment issue.' Gary McCaleb, senior counsel for the group, said the organization has filed at least eight similar lawsuits nationwide. McCaleb said the Alliance Defense Fund is trying to 'enable Christian students to express a contrasting viewpoint on homosexuality.' McCaleb said Zamecnik and her parents discussed the incident with school officials to work out an agreement allowing the teen to wear a similar T-shirt during next month's Day of Silence event. The suit said school officials declined the request." (Associated Press, 3/22/07)

- **The Alliance Defense Fund Lost A Suit Against A Chicago Suburban High School Over Two Students Wearing Shirts With Anti-Gay Slogans.** United Press International reported, "A federal judge in Chicago has upheld a suburban high school's ban on clothing with anti-gay slogans. The Alliance Defense Fund had asked U.S. District Judge William T. Hart for a preliminary injunction allowing a Neuqua Valley High School student to wear a shirt saying 'Be Happy, Not Gay' as part of a national effort Thursday to publicly oppose homosexual behavior, the Chicago Tribune reported. A civil lawsuit was filed against the school after it banned Heidi Zamecnik of Naperville, Ill., from wearing the shirt last year. The newspaper said the school district was willing to allow the students alternatives such as 'Be Happy, Be Straight' but said the phrase 'Be Happy, Not Gay' was like saying 'Be Happy, Not Christian.'" (United Press International, 4/19/07)

7. *Forget about dignity and respect. ADF thinks they know best. They've fought to overrule principals and stop schools from treating transgender students with the dignity and respect they deserve, arguing: "Are parents supposed to be OK with allowing such boys to use the girls' restroom and locker room facilities?"*

**ADF Fought Tucson Unified School District's Updated Non-Discrimination Policy Adding Gender Identity Or Expression, Which Was Updated To Accommodate Use Of Boys' Bathroom By Transgender Elementary School Student.** According to the Arizona Daily Star, "TUSD passed the policy March 25, updating its existing non-discrimination policy -- in a way that other states and districts already have -- without much debate or fanfare...A student born as a girl identifies as a boy and began to use the boys' bathroom. When the child tried to use the urinal, boys saw it. That set off controversy, with a few parents going so far as picketing over the administration allowing the child to use the boys' bathroom. Eventually, in an unproductive early response, school officials sealed off the urinals. That led to the policy change, and now, to the Alliance's effort to overturn the policy, an effort that essentially denies the existence of transgender people. 'Permitting students to use opposite-sex restrooms would seriously endanger student safety, undermine parental authority, and severely impair an environment conducive to learning,' the Alliance said in a letter it sent on Thursday to TUSD's board and superintendent.

‘TUSD should require students to use restrooms appropriate to their biological sex.’... For the attorneys at the Alliance Defending Freedom, though, it's a threat. The non-discrimination policy opens up TUSD to liability if students' privacy is violated in bathrooms and locker rooms, attorney Jonathan Scruggs told me.” [Arizona Daily Star, 5/4/14]

**ADF Sent Letter To Kentucky School Board To Overrule Principal Who Allowed Transgender Teen To Use Girl’s Bathroom.** According to the Associated Press, “Last week, a Christian legal group, Alliance Defending Freedom, asked the Louisville, Kentucky, school board to overrule a high school principal who allowed a transgender freshman to start using the girl's bathrooms. The principal has since limited the student to one girl's restroom but said treating her like other female students adhered to the recent Title IX guidance. ‘When the issue of gender identity was brought to my attention, I had to educate myself on the issue and what this means in terms of fair and just treatment of transgender people,’ Atherton High School Principal Thomas Aberli said. Alliance Defending Freedom attorney Jeremy Tedesco said schools should instead give transgender students the option of using staff or unisex facilities, as many do. ‘The fact that we are in a position culturally where schools are just caving to these demands is very concerning,’ he said.” [Associated Press, 5/19/14]

**ADF Attorney Clint Elliott Argued To School Board Against Decision To Allow Transgender Teen Use Girls Restroom, Said “Are Parents Supposed To Be OK With Allowing Such Boys To Use The Girls’ Restroom And Locker Facilities?”** According to the Louisville Courier-Journal, “Clint Elliott, a Louisville attorney with the Christian-based legal group Alliance Defending Freedom, asked the school board Monday night on behalf of several parents to overturn Aberli's decision granting the student access to the girls' facilities. ‘Imagine this scenario - a transgender student, a biological boy who decides that he wants to identify with the female gender, and yet he acknowledges that he has a girlfriend and is sexually attracted to girls,’ Elliott said. ‘Are parents supposed to be OK with allowing such boys to use the girls' restroom and locker room facilities?’ Elliott argued that Title IX ‘certainly doesn't require opening up opposite-sex facilities.’ ‘(This is) a violation of parents' rights regarding the oversight of their children and educational environment of their children, and it is certainly a violation of a student's rights to privacy,’ he told board members. ‘What about those girls and their rights to privacy and safety? What about the First Amendment rights of all students?’” [Louisville Courier-Journal, 5/14/14]

**ADF Consulted George Fox University To Request Title IX Exemption In Response To Request Of Transgender Student For Housing With Other Male Students.** According to the New York Times, “George Fox, a Quaker school southwest of Portland, asked the Department of Education for a religious exemption from Title IX. Rob Felton, a university spokesman, said the request was prompted by the position the government took in the California case, and by warnings from Jaycen's lawyer that he intended to file a Title IX complaint. In drafting its petition, the university consulted with an evangelical group, Alliance Defending Freedom, that has fought attempts to allow transgender students to use what they see as the sex-appropriate school restrooms and other facilities. The department granted the Title IX exemption on May 23.... Now, the Justice Department is looking into whether George Fox's transgender policy might violate nondiscrimination requirements in federal housing law. Advocates say that, too, would be a first. George Fox administrators say that they have no animus toward transgender

people, and that they have been respectful of Jaycen, including referring to him with male pronouns.” [New York Times, 7/26/14]

8. *ADF is committed to keeping families together, unless of course someone is LGBT. ADF fights to split families apart by defending disgraceful decisions of biological parents to deny visitation rights to LGBT people who've raised children as their own.*

#### **ADF Advocated For Biological Mother In Custody Dispute In Jenkins V. Miller Case.**

According to the Windy City Times, “Some of the most contentious Lawsuits involving the rights of LGBT people have occurred when the biological parent of a child uses anti-LGBT Laws to try and deny the child's non-biological parent custody or visitation.... There have been a number of recent cases across the country in which a biological or adoptive parent tries to claim the other parent has no parental rights. Best known among them is the case of Janet Jenkins and Lisa Miller, which has grabbed headlines nationally. Miller, the biological mother, asked courts in both Virginia and Vermont to deny Jenkins visitation and custody, and has taken issues to the U.S. Supreme Court five times, without success each time. Miller was eventually ruled in contempt of court for defying a Vermont court order that she allow Jenkins visitation. The court then granted Legal custody to Jenkins. But Miller went hiding with the girl at the end of 2009, and a man accused of helping her leave the U.S. was arraigned in a federal court in April.... In several of these cases, notably Miller v. Jenkins, attorneys from conservative legal organizations such as Liberty Counsel and the Alliance Defense Fund have represented the biological mothers.” [Windy City Times, 9/14/11]

#### **ADF Represented Biological Mother in Washington Custody Dispute With Former Partner.**

According to the Associated Press, “[Washington State’s Supreme Court] found that Sue Ellen "Mian" Carvin could pursue ties to the girl as a ‘de facto parent.’ [Supreme Court] Justices declined to take up the case. Carvin's former partner, Page Britain, said that as the biological mother she had a constitutional right to make decisions affecting the girl, who is now 11. ‘This is an issue that the Supreme Court is going to hear at some time in the future,’ said Jordan Lorence, one of Britain's lawyers. Lorence works for a conservative Alliance Defense Fund. Carvin and Britain had lived together for five years before they decided to become parents. Britain was inseminated, and then gave birth in 1995 to the daughter, known as L.B. in court papers. The girl called Carvin "Mama" and Britain "Mommy." Britain broke up with Carvin in 2001, and the following year, when the girl was 7, she barred her former partner from seeing the girl. After Carvin went to court, Britain married the sperm donor. They now live in Thailand. Britain and the child are with the donor for an extended visit, lawyers said.... The case appears to paint a difficult battle between the two women. Britain said that she wanted to have the girl baptized in a Roman Catholic church, and that her former partner wanted to take L.B. to a Buddhist temple. Carvin said she was the active parent, while Britain focused on her job.” [Associated Press, [5/16/06](#)]

**The Alliance Defense Fund Represented A Woman’s Suit For Parental Visitation Rights Because She Was “A Churchgoing Woman Who [Had] Abandoned Her Lesbian Past.”** The Salt Lake Tribune, “After considering Utah law and the best interests of a 3-year-old girl, 3rd District Judge Timothy Hanson has decided the child is better off with two mothers. One is her

birth mother, who conceived her through artificial insemination while in a lesbian relationship. The other is the birth mother's former partner, joined to her in a Vermont civil union before the girl's birth. Hanson ruled state laws allow the former partner to maintain a parent-child relationship with the girl through visitation. The case is now before the Utah Court of Appeals, which will examine how much protection Utah law provides to gay or unmarried couples raising children related to only one partner. The conservative Alliance Defense Fund, which litigates cases involving religion, publicized its role in the case Tuesday by describing it as a battle for parents' rights waged by a churchgoing woman who has abandoned her lesbian past. But Hanson has said the case does not turn on the debate over gay marriage or gay adoption. 'What this case is about, is whether or not a child is better off in this rather uncertain world, with as many people as possible taking an interest in the child, both financially and emotionally,' the judge said in an October court hearing. . . Attorney Frank Mylar, who is affiliated with the Alliance Defense Fund and represents Barlow, says Hanson has done an end-run around Utah laws. Mylar said in loco parentis only applies to cases where the parent is absent from the child's life. 'Where does it end, when you have a legal stranger that is not related by blood, marriage or adoption, and they are claiming rights to your child?' he asked. 'Anyone who is a fit parent has a constitutional right to say how their child is to be raised, and what associations they are to have.'" (Salt Lake Tribune, 12/8/04)

**ADF Requested West Virginia Lawmakers Consider An “Adoption Preference” Law That Would Give Heterosexual Couples Priority Over Same-Sex Couples.** According to CBN, “The Alliance Defense Fund is asking West Virginia lawmakers to consider an adoption preference law that would give married couples priority in foster and adoption cases. ‘What is really down the pike here is basically a judicial determination that all types of families are equal that they are all just as good for children as any other type of parental structure or family structure,’ explained The Alliance Defense Fund's Byron Babione. ‘I think if they realize that is where the courts were going with this, they would go to their legislature and tell them what they know and that is children do best when they are raised by a married mother and father.’ That adoption preference law would have to be approved by West Virginia's state legislature.” [CBN, [6/9/2009](#)]

*9. ADF loves science, especially the pseudo type. ADF defends the tremendously harmful and debunked pseudoscience known as reparative or “conversion” therapy. Telling LGBT kids they can change who they are if they just try hard enough, they’ve fought against efforts—including in New Jersey—to ban this destructed and discredited practice.*

**ADF Represented Ex-Gay Therapist Christopher Doyle To See IF He Had Grounds To Sue Maryland Legislator Trying To Ban Reparative Therapy For Defamation.** According to the Baltimore Sun, “In the latest salvo aimed at Doyle and his practice [International Healing Foundation, gay rights activists in Maryland say they hope to ban clinical therapy for children that is based on the notion that their sexual orientation can change. They hope to build on success banning the practice in other states, and success here in securing same-sex marriage and protections for transgender residents. . . . Doyle says he has never received a complaint from a patient, and has obtained legal representation from the Alliance Defending Freedom, a Christian legal organization focused on defending religious liberties, to look into whether Doyle's

foundation has grounds to file a defamation case against [Del. Jon S.] Cardin, who is running for state attorney general. Cardin said he welcomes the investigation, writing in an ‘open letter’ on his campaign website that Doyle and the foundation ‘do not have a right to inflict a lifetime of serious psychological damage on children by preaching false science disguised as medicine.’” [Baltimore Sun, 5/12/14]

**ADF Represented Families Suing New Jersey To Continue “Ex-Gay Therapy” (Reparative Therapy) After Ban Issued.** According to Think Progress, “After New Jersey passed its ban on ex-gay therapy for minors last year, two lawsuits were filed challenging the law, one by therapists wishing to continue to practice the harmful treatment and one by a family seeking to continue the treatment for their son. In November, a federal judge ruled against the therapists, and on Thursday, the same judge dismissed the family’s challenge, again upholding the ban.... The plaintiffs in this case made the same arguments that the therapists made in theirs; in fact, they were represented by the same lawyer — Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) affiliate Demetrios Stratis.... The only new argument put forth in this case was the claim that the law infringes upon the parents’ ‘due process rights to care for the mental health of their child as they see fit.’ Wolfson rejected this claim outright. ‘Surely, the fundamental rights of parents,’ she wrote, ‘do not include the right to choose a specific medical or mental health treatment that the state has reasonably deemed harmful or ineffective. To find otherwise would create unimaginable and unintentional consequences.’” [Think Progress, [7/31/14](#)]

**The Alliance For Therapeutic Choice, A Professional Organization For Reparative Therapists, Stated That The ADF And Liberty Counsel Was “Taking The Legal Action Necessary To Resist Laws” Banning Reparative Therapy.** “You know, there is some pretty bad information and some fairly common misconceptions kicking around out there in the public square. The born that way myth and the ‘change is impossible’ propaganda are just two common examples. Sadly, these and other unscientific concepts fuel legislative and legal efforts that seek to limit the right of individuals and families to work with a therapist that will honor the values they hold dear. ...The Alliance, our clinical Partners, and concerned organization members - along with our trusted allied organizations Liberty Counsel (and Alliance Defending Freedom) - are taking the legal action necessary to resist laws that would limit the right of individuals and families to secure professional clinical assistance that is congruent with their personal or family values. We must resist efforts rob people of their freedom and their opportunity to choose.” [Alliance for Therapeutic Choice, Accessed [8/12/14](#)]

**In 2005 The Alliance Defense Fund Represented Two Memphis Reparative Counseling Ministries Suing The State, Claiming It Violated The Groups’ Religious Freedom By Requiring A License To Care For Mentally Ill Patients.** The Associated Press reported, “A religious organization that runs two facilities that counsel gays to give up homosexuality has sued the state, claiming it is violating its religious freedom by requiring a license to care for mentally ill patients. Love In Action International Inc., based in Memphis, is being represented by the Alliance Defense Fund, an Arizona-based Christian legal firm that is also representing Tennessee lawmakers in a suit brought by the ACLU regarding a proposed gay marriage referendum. The suit names Gov. Phil Bredesen and officials with the state Department of Mental Health & Developmental Disabilities and claims that Love In Action does not offer any treatment requiring state licensure and that the state is discriminating against the ministry

because of its controversial religious mission. The department determined after a pair of inspections in July and August that Love In Action was providing housing, meals and personal care for mentally ill patients without a license. The department gave Love In Action until Friday to cease operation of the facilities and apply for a state license. ‘LIA's ministry is not designed to treat mental illness, nor do they make any attempt to treat mental illness,’ the suit says, although the facilities do accept mentally ill patients who are deemed ‘able to take care of themselves.’ The ministry confirms that prescription medications are kept in a central location, but only to deter theft or tampering. It allows patients access to their medications at all times to be taken as directed by their own physicians, the suit claims. ‘LIA does not supervise or oversee how the medication is dispensed,’ the suit says. Under state regulations, facilities that dispense medication to patients require a license. Love In Action's stated mission is ‘the prevention or remediation of unhealthy and destructive behaviors facing families, adults and adolescents,’ including promiscuity, pornography and homosexuality. That has drawn the ire of many gay rights advocates, which Love In Action claims were instrumental in getting the state to inspect the facility and push for its closing. ‘This issue has nothing to do with religion or faith-based organizations or even the mission of Life In Action,’ state spokeswoman Lola Potter said Friday. Potter said the state is justified in requiring the facility to be licensed based on three criteria: Life In Action had two people who had been clinically diagnosed with mental illnesses; the facility was administering their medication; and they were in a restricted living arrangement, unable to come and go as they pleased. The suit was filed Friday in U.S. District Court in Memphis.” (Associated Press, 9/30/05)

***10. ADF is an exporter of hate. They have an entire international program dedicated to promoting their hateful anti-LGBT laws and rhetoric abroad. They’ve advocated against the rights of LGBT people in international human rights cases, and have partnerships with attorneys in 31 countries around the world.***

**Alliance Defending Freedom Launched A “Global Initiative In 2011” And Boasts Of Alliances With Attorneys In 31 Countries.** “In 2011, the ADF launched a ‘Global Initiative’ to take its legal struggle international. [...] ADF seeks to win strategic, precedent-setting cases for religious freedom, broadly interpreted to include pro-life, pro-marriage and pro-family causes (i.e., anti-abortion and anti-gay). Increasingly, it does litigation itself; it also coordinates, funds, and provides other resources for litigation by its allied attorneys and organizations. Where it lacks standing to litigate, it may also file amicus briefs or offers legal counsel. The ADF coordinates legal efforts in strategic, precedent-setting cases with allied attorneys and organizations, developing strategy and providing resources. By February 2013, the ADF boasted alliances with 300 organizations and 2,200 attorneys in 52 states/territories and 31 countries.” [“Lobbying for Faith and Family: A Study of Religious NGOs at the United Nations,” Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, [February 2013](#)]

• **ADF Litigates Foreign Cases In Order To Ensure That Foreign Rulings Serve Its Domestic Objectives.** “The ADF is also actively litigating religious freedom cases overseas. Because U.S. justices are increasingly citing progressive international jurisprudence in their opinions and decisions, much of the ADF’s international litigation is aimed at ensuring that foreign rulings serve its domestic objectives. This, despite ADF Chief Council’s Benjamin Bull’s comment that ‘The Constitution is the only arbiter of American law. Allowing foreign or

international law to determine the legitimacy of American law is completely unjustifiable and rife with dire consequences.’ Presumably it is fine for activist American justices to cite international jurisprudence if it advances their religious agenda. Roger Kiska, an Ave Maria-trained lawyer, runs ADF’s European office. Located in Vienna, it’s a Eurail ride from both the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg and the European Court of Human rights in Strasbourg, where Kiska spends a great deal of time. Kiska is developing an allied attorney network dedicated to litigating European cases with the potential to impact ADF work in the United States.” [Religion Dispatches, [6/12/12](#)]

**ADF Has Offices In Vienna, Mexico City And Delhi.** “With strategically placed offices throughout the world, including Vienna, Austria; Mexico City, New Delhi, India; New York City, and Washington D.C., we are at the forefront of the international legal battles for religious liberty, life and marriage and the family. Together with hundreds of allied Christian lawyers and like-minded organizations around the globe, we are winning key legal victories at the European Court of Human Rights, the European Union, the Organization of American States and the United Nations, as well as national parliaments and courts.” [Alliance Defending Freedom, [accessed 10/6/14](#)]

**2014: ADF Filed An Amicus Brief In Support Of An Anti-LGBT Referendum In Slovakia.** “Alliance Defending Freedom, among the leading opponents of same-sex marriage in the U.S. courts, is pressing that message abroad, this time before the Constitutional Court of Slovakia. The court is considering a petition seeking a referendum submitted by the Slovak Alliance for Family. The measure calls for a vote on four questions: The definition of a marriage as a union of one man and one woman; A requirement that adoptive parents be married; Prohibiting registered partnerships between gay and lesbian couples; Permitting parents to opt out their children from sex education classes taught at public schools. ‘The people of Slovakia should have the freedom to preserve marriage and family if they so choose,’ said Alliance Defending Freedom senior legal counsel Roger Kiska, who filed an amicus brief with the court. ‘This referendum will allow Slovaks to affirm current Slovak law and important social values, which is perfectly acceptable under the Slovak Constitution.’” [National Law Journal, [9/30/14](#)]

**2014: Alliance Defending Freedom Was Granted Permission To Intervene As A Third Party In The Defense Of Italy’s Same Sex Marriage Ban Before The European Court Of Human Rights.** “Alliance Defending Freedom filed a brief with the European Court of Human Rights Friday in defense of Italy’s sovereign right to define marriage as the union of one man and one woman. The court’s Second Section agreed last week to allow Alliance Defending Freedom to intervene as a third party in defense of the country’s marriage laws. ‘The people of Italy recognize that men and women bring distinct, irreplaceable gifts to family life, especially for children who deserve both a mom and a dad,’ said Senior Legal Counsel Roger Kiska. ‘Under the European Convention of Human Rights, the Strasbourg court is obliged to allow Italy to define marriage in a manner consistent with this truth. This lawsuit is asking the court to step outside of its bounds and impose a redefinition of marriage upon a Council of Europe member state that has exclusive authority over marriage within its own borders. The court should reject this request.’” [Alliance Defending Freedom Press Release, [2/17/14](#)]

**2012: Piero Tozzi And Jeff Ventrella Of Alliance Defending Freedom Addressed An Annual Human Rights Conference In Kingston Hosted By The Jamaica Coalition for a Healthy Society And Lawyers' Christian Fellowship.** [International Conference "Human Rights, International Law and the Family," [12/8/12](#)]

- **Tozzi: Jamaica Must Retain Its Anti-Sodomy Law Because Same Sex Sexual Relations Are Physically Dangerous.** "I will also tell you why I believe it is important that Jamaica retain its existing anti-sodomy legislation. [...] The modes of behavior concerned affect most directly those who practice them and are harmful not only spiritually and psychologically, but also physically: To cite one example, according to the Journal of the American Medical Association, the practice of anal sodomy is estimated to increase the risk of contracting anal cancer by up to 50 *times* – not 50 percent – and, if one has AIDS, by up to 84 times." [Remarks of Piero Tozzi, Archdiocesan Clergy Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, [12/11/12](#)]
- **Tozzi: Jamaica's Sodomy Law Is A "Bulwark" Against The Larger Gay Agenda.** "It is also important to understand that the pressure to revise the penal law is part of a larger agenda and that once the law is removed the pressure will not stop, but the activists will move on to the next step in the agenda. Ultimately, as has happened in countries such as Sweden, Canada and the United Kingdom, and even increasingly, the United States, once accept as rights, we will see a conflict with truly fundamental rights such as religious liberty and freedom of expression. [...] Retention of the legislation prohibiting sodomy is a bulwark against this agenda: remove it and I guarantee the rest of the agenda will follow within a matter of years." [Remarks of Piero Tozzi, Archdiocesan Clergy Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, [12/11/12](#)]
- **Tozzi: The Anti-Sodomy Law Allows High Schools To Protect Children From A "Pro-Homosexualist Message."** "Consider this experience from the United States: so long as the criminal law exists on the books, even if unenforced, a high school principal can exclude advocacy groups from seeking to push a pro-homosexualist message directed at students, on the grounds that they are advocating illegal conduct, just as they can restrict a pro-marijuana message. Once the statutory prohibition is removed, however, then it becomes a rights issue, and prohibition of the message becomes an issue of viewpoint discrimination under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution or here, the Jamaican Charter of Rights. Adolescence is a time of confusion and search for identity; to protect the youth at this vulnerable stage of their lives, it is particularly important *not* to throw away this shield." [Remarks of Piero Tozzi, Archdiocesan Clergy Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, [12/11/12](#)]
- **Tozzi: LGBT Identity "Has Its Roots Most Often In Childhood Trauma, And Is Inconsistent With The Way God Designed Us."** "Advocates say that one needs to remove the stigma of penalization, because incidents of depression and suicide tend to be much higher among those who self-identify as homosexual. The experience from Holland, which is very tolerant and accepting, however, shows that the depression and suicide and depression rates remain the same, or even higher, in Holland. The depression still exists because the way they are living has its roots most often in childhood trauma, and is inconsistent with the way God designed us." [Remarks of Piero Tozzi, Archdiocesan Clergy Conference, Kingston, Jamaica, [12/11/12](#)]

