Right of Reply

Forbidden Colours is committed to transparency and the right of reply. Any individual or organisation mentioned in The Hate Review may submit a written response to contact@forbidden-colours.com. Submitted replies will be published in this document within 10 working days of receipt. Each individual or organisation may exercise their right of reply once, and submissions must be received no later than 30 November 2026.

Disclaimer

Replies are published in the interest of transparency and do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of Forbidden Colours. Forbidden Colours does not endorse or assume responsibility for the content, accuracy, or claims made in these replies. Responsibility for the content rests solely with the respective authors.

Table of Contents

1. ***Alliance Defending Freedom International (1)*** ***2***
2. ***Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements*** ***3***
3. ***Alliance Defending Freedom International (2)*** ***5***
4. ***Genspect Portugal*** ***16***

1. Alliance Defending Freedom International (1)

The following paragraph is attributed to a ADF spokesperson:

"*Alliance Defending Freedom is a faith-based legal advocacy organisation with expertise in international law. We are a non-profit, non-partisan organisation working to advance the right to live and speak the truth of every person, focused on protecting the sanctity of life, marriage and the family, parental rights, religious freedom, and freedom of speech. We strongly contest this report's gross mischaracterisation of Alliance Defending Freedom as an "anti-rights actor," in addition to any false and misleading characterisations of our advocacy as motivated by anything other than the protection of core human rights. As Christian legal experts dedicated to the defence of fundamental freedoms, we are committed to conducting legal advocacy that benefits everyone, regardless of their beliefs*."

Received on 9 October 2026.

2. Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements

POLSKA FEDERACJA
RUCHÓW OBRONY ŻYCIA
ul. Wrocławska 37A, lok. 202, 30-011 Kraków
sekretariat@federacjazycia.pl, www.federacjazycia.pl

In 2012, the Federation was awarded the European Citizen's Prize of the European Parliament for its activities. The Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements has been operating since 1992 and brings together several dozen pro-family and pro-life organisations.

L.dz. 336/2026 13 October 2026

Forbidden Colours
Attn: The Hate Review – Right of Reply
Rue d'Alost 7
1000 Brussels, Belgium

Subject: Formal Right of Reply – *The Hate Review*

Dear Forbidden Colours Team,

On behalf of the **Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements**, explicitly named in *The Hate Review: How the Anti-Gender Movement Spread Across Europe, 2000–2025* (printed p. 307; PDF p. 309), I submit our formal right of reply. We request that the statement below be published **in full and without alterations** in the publication's Right of Reply section.

OFFICIAL STATEMENT FOR PUBLICATION

We are not a contamination of Europe. We are European citizens.

The Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements categorically rejects the stigmatising language of *The Hate Review*. The report describes the presence of a movement that includes lawful pro-life organisations as "contamination", compares its spread to a "viral load" and calls its persistence a "chronic infection". Its conclusion sets out the "decontamination of Europe" as a long-term goal and calls for the "patient dismantling" of the movement's actors, mobilisation and narratives.

These are not accidental expressions. The language of contamination is built into the report's methodology and its proposed response. Our Federation is explicitly listed among the organisations making up the movement thus described, yet the passage concerning our Federation offers **no allegation of violence, incitement to hatred or unlawful conduct** on our part.

Defending the right to life of every human being, including children before birth, is not a disease. Peaceful civic advocacy, participation in legislative debate and freedom of association are not symptoms of a social infection. **Disagreement over abortion does not constitute hatred.**

Europe has profound historical reasons to treat metaphors of disease, infestation and the cleansing of society with utmost seriousness. Such imagery has been used to stigmatise human beings and entire communities. We are not equating the authors of this report with the perpetrators of historical atrocities. We are insisting that **Europe must never normalise language that casts its own citizens as a contamination to be removed.**

In **2012 the European Parliament awarded our Federation the European Citizen's Prize**, as recorded in the Official Journal of the European Union. Fourteen years later, a report presented within the same Parliament includes our Federation in a movement framed through the language of infection and decontamination. **Our mission has not changed: we continue to defend human dignity and the right to life.**

We accept scrutiny, criticism and disagreement. What we reject is the portrayal of lawful organisations as a biological threat simply because they hold and defend different convictions. A democratic Europe must have room for all citizens, including those who defend unborn human life.

Europe does not need to be "decontaminated" of pro-life organisations. It needs respect for the dignity of every human being.

Please confirm receipt of this submission and the date on which the above statement will be made publicly available under your Right of Reply procedure. This is our Federation's formal exercise of that procedure.

Yours sincerely,



Jakub Bałtroszewicz
President
Polish Federation of Pro-Life Movements

References: V. Reillon, *The Hate Review* (2026), printed pp. 4–5, 29 and 307; European Parliament, *European Citizen's Prize – 2012 laureates*, Official Journal C 208, 14 July 2012.

Received on 13 October 2026.

3. Alliance Defending Freedom International (2)

ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM

That all might be free

Rémy Bonny
Forbidden Colours VZW
Rue des Grands Carmes 22
1000 Brussels
Belgium

Dear Mr. Bonny,

Thank you for your prompt response.

We have observed the amendments made in light of our previous communication. However, we have found that they are inadequate and fail to address the falsehoods and reputational damage caused by the report.

In the first place, we note that you did not include the statement from the ADF spokesperson in the report itself, as we requested, but instead relegated it to a separate "Right of Reply" document, uploaded via a distinct link. This fails to remedy the reputational damage to our organisation, as the report will likely still be circulated separately without our statement.

Furthermore, the corrections included in the report (summarised on p. 455) remain inaccurate and, in some cases, exacerbate the report's misrepresentation of our work. For example, an amendment on page 424 states that "in September 2025, ADF UK orchestrated Nigel Farage's appearance before the US Congress", yet the term "orchestrated" is unsupported and cites a like-minded article written in the same style as *The Hate Review*. The corrections table on the last page of the document is also counter-productive, giving visibility to the original incorrect text and the misleading narratives it perpetuates.

We therefore ask that you correct all outstanding factual errors as per the annex to this letter, and that you eliminate the current corrections table from the end of the report.

Forbidden Colours' failure to properly address these points is indicative of the fundamentally flawed methodology used in the report, which we outline below and list more comprehensively in the annex to this letter. The citations added in response to our comments alone suggest that superficial research has been misrepresented to shore up the report's egregiously false claims. This form of research cites sources that are irrelevant to the claims made and presents them as "evidence".

For example, the source cited to support the claim of "ties" between ADF and SALL is an article that merely lists the two organisations as both being present at an event. Similarly, the report's claim that ADF is engaged in "parliamentary lobbying" in Germany cites an article in which ADF is described as "looking for allies in German politics to support persecuted Christians", and in which the leader of the small parliamentary sub-group in question is stated as commenting that they are "prepared to support the organisation [Alliance Defending Freedom]

in concrete cases of persecuted Christians. However, a strategic cooperation with the organisation is not planned".

One of the major flaws of the report is that it self-consciously "adopts a deliberately broad and functional conception" of what it terms the "anti-gender movement", preferring to liken this movement to a "nebula" than to "impose" what it describes as "false precision" – despite precision being a key ingredient of any credible, well-researched publication. Furthermore, despite the publication's title suggesting that the report is a "review" of "hate", no definition of "hate", "hate crime" or "hate speech" is given.

The closest to a definition of the "anti-gender movement" provided by the report is that it "comprises all actors which conduct activities to limit or attack reproductive rights and the rights of any person belonging to the LGBTIQ+ communities". The rest of the report reveals this definition to be unscientific and unreliable; conflating legitimate advocacy and policy engagement with an "attack" on "rights," and presupposing a definition of "rights" that is often at odds with binding European and international human rights treaties.

The next sentence further explains that "Actors that attack the rights of one group within these communities — trans people above all — remain anti-gender even where they claim to defend the rights of others". This enables any action Forbidden Colours perceives to be disfavourable to any one of the aforementioned groups to be branded as "anti-gender", and – by extension of its inclusion in a publication entitled "The Hate Review" – hateful.

This biased, overbroad definition is used to demonise hundreds of organisations, indiscriminately smearing vastly different groups as "hateful" to confirm the report's claim that a "heterogeneous… nebula can nonetheless function, again and again and across very different national settings, as a movement."

The rhetoric of "hate" has been frequently and consistently used by your organisation: in a separate 2025 statement, Forbidden Colours called submissions opposing the EU LGBTIQ Equality Strategy (including those raising concerns about "gender ideology") as "hateful contributions". This kind of language is a blatant example of the kind of "framing" that the report frequently denounces in the organisations it targets (the word appears 382 times).

The same is true for the report's use of the word "contamination" (used 134 times), which similarly depicts the actions of legitimate organisations – and the views they share with tens of millions of European citizens – as contributing to the spread of an undesirable disease (e.g. – "Contamination measures how far the anti-gender movement has spread through a country's society" (p. 440); "the data shows that anti-gender contamination behaves like a chronic infection that never clears" (p. 8)).

Forbidden Colours' recently published clarification on its use of the term is a thinly-veiled, ineffectual attempt to distance the organisation from language that the vast majority of readers will immediately interpret as disparaging rather than an "analytical concept". Furthermore, its claim that "contamination" is used only to illustrate a political movement is contradicted by the

report's call for "engaging now in the long-term work of the decontamination of Europe [by] denouncing and opposing the anti-gender movement's actors" (p. 1), which explicitly links targeting "actors" – that is, the individuals and organisations themselves – with achieving so-called "decontamination".

We agree with Forbidden Colours' statement in the clarification that "freedom of expression includes the right of civil society organisations to research, document, criticise and democratically oppose political movements and their activities." However, we lament that this egregious report falls utterly short of this and the integrity expected of a publicly-funded NGO.

Maligning and seeking to discredit one's ideological opponents – rather than participating in open dialogue – is hardly the "democratic engagement" that Forbidden Colours claims to stand for.

To that end, we ask that you publish this letter in full both on your website and in the "Right of Reply" section, add our spokesman's full statement at the beginning of your report, remove the corrections table on page 455 and amend factual inaccuracies as per the aforementioned annex, **by no later than Wednesday, 28 October**. Should you fail to do so, we reserve the right to consider all legal options.

Sincerely,

Adina Portaru
Director, Europe
Alliance Defending Freedom

ANNEX

Methodological and scientific flaws of Forbidden Colours' *The Hate Review: How the Anti-Gender Movement Spread Across Europe, 2000–2025*.

In essence, the authors put together a "sham" scientific report, wasting donor funding to present their opinion and advocacy goals as so-called "evidence". The gist of the report is that *Forbidden Colours* does not agree with those it grouped as "anti-gender" and wants to have their voices removed from public discourse. Here are only a few of the reasons why this report is unscientific:

1. The key measures used (such as the definition of "anti-gender" and their "actions") are the authors' own judgments, recorded and scored from the subjective perspective of *Forbidden Colours* and their advocacy goals.
2. Consequently, such opinions and advocacy goals are turned into numbers and scoring measures to make it look more objective. Yet, there are serious weaknesses in independence, definitions, data selection, measurement reliability, and causal claims in the research.
3. The review states that it "began from a conviction" and sets out to test a "suspicion" and that the evidence "bears that suspicion out". Nothing in the design could have produced a result against that suspicion, and the scoring was not done blindly. In other words, the methodological design was tailor-made and built in line with the conviction and set-up to prove that conviction. Nothing in it provided a counterbalance to investigate the possibility that the "conviction" or "suspicion" might be just that — a mere conviction and/or suspicion.
4. The report has no conflict-of-interest disclosure.
5. The report provides, as "evidence", sources that do not prove the claims made and sources that make false claims.
6. Events are recorded "anti-gender" if they involve completely unrelated topics, merely because they form part of the actions of one of the organisations arbitrarily labeled as "anti-gender". Therefore, any action, whether part of a legal democratic process or not, is considered "anti-gender". Intent is also not necessary.
7. Where it suits the narrative of the report, outcomes of cases and information are left out.
8. Motives are asserted to organisations and individuals where they cannot be proven.
9. Unproven associations between organisations and entities are made. Where sources are given, the sources do not prove the claims made.
10. "Hate" is not defined. The title suggests that it reviews "hate" (*The Hate Review*), but there is no definition of "hate", "hate speech" or "hate crime". Peaceful and legal activity is then grouped under a "hate" label without having any definition of what it means.

11. The loaded vocabulary ("contamination", "viral load", "chronic infections") already builds the conclusion into the terms of measurement.
12. The actions of the so-called "anti-gender movement" are provided without a matching record of opposing proposals and actions. In other words, a rise in the "anti-gender movement" may well be due to a rise in counterpart data (which is never stated).
13. The claimed rise in success rates by the "anti-gender movement" comes only from events that the researchers chose to record (there are no objective parameters as to why and how these events were chosen). Researchers just picked the "significant events" – the ones they deemed "significant".
14. There were very weak controls on the information collected. Twenty volunteers gathered the first set of data for the countries. Thereafter, an AI tool was used to collect event data and draft text. Only "most" country chapters were peer-reviewed; some contributors are anonymous, and there is no information on how independent the reviewers were.
15. The five color levels assume equal distances between categories that are only ranked. No sensitivity analysis checks whether rankings changed under other weights.
16. The method says that each score measures activity within one period, "not of a cumulative state." Yet the analysis treats contamination as an accumulated "load" that "does not decay". Therefore, the report contradicts itself.

A *selection* of the incorrect/false sections concerning ADF and ADF International

A *selection* of the incorrect/false sections	**Explanation**	**Requested Amendment**
There is no correct descriptor of ADF in the text.	Please add the following in the main body of the text of the review (at the first reference to ADF and ADF International) and not only in a separate file under the "right of reply" section.	Add in the main text, at the first reference to ADF and ADF International. "Alliance Defending Freedom is a faith-based legal advocacy organisation with expertise in international law. We are a non-profit, non-partisan organisation working to advance the right to live and speak the truth of every person, focused on protecting the sanctity of life, marriage and the family, parental rights, religious freedom, and freedom of speech. We strongly contest

		this report's gross mischaracterisation of Alliance Defending Freedom as an "anti-rights actor," in addition to any false and misleading characterisations of our advocacy as motivated by anything other than the protection of core human rights. As Christian legal experts dedicated to the defence of fundamental freedoms, we are committed to conducting legal advocacy that benefits everyone, regardless of their beliefs."
P. 228 "Beyond this constitutional role, the Princely House has deployed its private wealth in support of antiabortion activity. In 2006, it founded the Sophie von Liechtenstein Stiftung für Frau und Kind, presided over by Erbprinzessin Sophie, which funds and operates schwanger.li — a pregnancy counselling service with offices in Liechtenstein, the Swiss canton of St. Gallen, and Vorarlberg, Austria. The organisation's stated aim is to enable unintentionally pregnant women to find "a positive life perspective for mother and child," and its affiliated service love.li runs sex education workshops in Liechtenstein schools. The Princely family is also structurally embedded in two of the most powerful international anti-gender organisations. Prince Nikolaus	This is an example of quotation mining and misrepresented evidence by several sources. The claim that the Princely family sits on the ADF International board is a sham reference from EPF quoted as the truth by this Review. This paragraph references p. 42 of the EPF's "The Next Wave" report (hyperlinked from the word "sit"). This EPF report then invents that the Liechtenstein princely family sits on the ADF International Board. This is a false and invented claim. This paragraph should be deleted.	P. 228, please delete from the main text: ~~"Beyond this constitutional role, the Princely House has deployed its private wealth in support of antiabortion activity. In 2006, it founded the Sophie von Liechtenstein Stiftung für Frau und Kind, presided over by Erbprinzessin Sophie, which funds and operates schwanger.li — a pregnancy counselling service with offices in Liechtenstein, the Swiss canton of St. Gallen, and Vorarlberg, Austria. The organisation's stated aim is to enable unintentionally pregnant women to find "a positive life perspective for mother and child," and its affiliated service love.li runs sex education workshops in Liechtenstein schools. The Princely family is also structurally embedded in two of the most powerful international anti-gender~~

and Princess Margaretha of Liechtenstein serve as Royal Patrons of the World Youth Alliance (WYA), a US-based organisation active in anti-gender advocacy at EU level and the United Nations, and members of the Princely family sit on the boards of both the WYA and ADF International, one of the largest anti-gender litigation and advocacy organisations in the world."		~~organisations. Prince Nikolaus and Princess Margaretha of Liechtenstein serve as Royal Patrons of the World Youth Alliance (WYA), a US-based organisation active in anti-gender advocacy at EU level and the United Nations, and members of the Princely family sit on the boards of both the WYA and ADF International, one of the largest anti-gender litigation and advocacy organisations in the world."~~
P. 56. "The case was supported by ADF International and its legal team, who framed the challenge as defending fundamental freedoms in the context of pro-life expression."	The case is not "framed" - it *is* a fundamental freedom case in the context of pro-life expression.	P. 56, please delete, from the main text: "~~The case was supported by ADF International and its legal team, who framed the challenge as defending fundamental freedoms in the context of pro-life expression~~."
P. 72 "ADF International is a transnational organisation originating from the US specialising in legal interventions, litigation support, and advocacy before European and international courts, targeting sexual and reproductive rights, gender equality, and the rights of LGBTIQ+ people."	Delete last part, in the main body of the text, as we do not target sexual and reproductive rights, gender equality, and the rights of LGBTIQ+ people. This is biased framing and not neutral research.	P. 72, please delete from the main text: "ADF International is a transnational organisation originating from the US specialising in legal interventions, litigation support, and advocacy before European and international courts, ~~targeting sexual and reproductive rights, gender equality, and the rights of LGBTIQ+ people~~."
P. 143. "ADF International filed a formal third-party intervention	This is an egregious false claim that misrepresents this case and takes several arguments out of context.	P. 143, please delete the indicated parts from the main

on 1 July 2015, arguing that privacy and anti-discrimination protections under the Convention do not extend to trans people, that member states should retain broad discretion to impose sterilisation requirements, and that "equal dignity does not mean that every sexual orientation warrants equal respect".	We argued for the margin of appreciation.	text and insert the section indicated in bold: "ADF International filed a formal third-party intervention on 1 July 2015 arguing ~~that privacy and anti-discrimination protections under the Convention do not extend to trans people, that member states should retain broad discretion to impose sterilization requirements, and that "equal dignity does not mean that every sexual orientation warrants equal respect"~~ [insert] **in favour of states having the margin of appreciation**."
P. 146. "ADF International provides legal resources, litigation strategy and amicus briefs for anti gender cases across Europe"	A case cannot be "anti-gender" simply because of its factual realities.	P. 146, please delete as indicated from the main text: "ADF International provides legal resources, litigation strategy and amicus briefs for ~~anti gender~~ cases across Europe"
P. 168 "ADF International, the transnational Christian legal organisation founded in the United States, has invested significantly in European operations and operates in Germany through litigation support, court submissions, and parliamentary lobbying. Its senior European director is the German activist Sophia Kuby."	This is factually incorrect.	P. 146, please delete as indicated from the main text. Please add what is indicated in bold, to the main text: "ADF International, the transnational Christian legal organisation founded in the United States, has invested significantly in European operations and operates in Germany through litigation support, **and court submissions**. ~~court submissions, and parliamentary lobbying. Its senior European director is the German activist Sophia Kuby~~."

P. 203 "Separately, as the hate speech bill moved through the Oireachtas, CitizenGO staged a protest outside Leinster House in May 2024. On 18 June 2024, Free Speech Ireland and ADF International co-organised the Ireland Free Speech Summit at Trinity College Dublin, bringing together Senators Mullen and Keogan, The Countess founder Laoise de Brún, Genspect director Stella O'Malley, and British so-called "gender-critical" campaigner Graham Linehan alongside international figures including journalist Michael Shellenberger."	Your own definition of "anti-gender" is unscientific and methodologically flawed – see explanation above. This was a free-speech event. ADF's free-speech and religious-liberty cases also count as "anti-gender" by your definition even if it has nothing to do with gender. This is methodologically unsound.	P. 203, please delete from the main text: "Separately, as the hate speech bill moved through the Oireachtas, CitizenGO staged a protest outside Leinster House in May 2024. ~~On 18 June 2024, Free Speech Ireland and ADF International co-organised the Ireland Free Speech Summit at Trinity College Dublin, bringing together Senators Mullen and Keogan, The Countess founder Laoise de Brún, Genspect director Stella O'Malley, and British so-called "gender-critical" campaigner Graham Linehan alongside international figures including journalist Michael Shellenberger~~."
P. 316. The word "affiliate" was dropped with reference to SALL but p 316 still states that ADF is the "parent organisation". This is false.	Claim is false.	P. 316. Please delete as indicated: "The ruling is still pending. SALL's model — commissioning legal opinions, building public pressure, and petitioning the Provedoria rather than filing directly, given that SALL lacks standing before the Constitutional Court — mirrors the approach of ~~its parent organisation~~ Alliance Defending Freedom in other European countries, where legal challenges are used as both practical tools and communications instruments ~~to delegitimise progressive legislation~~."

On the Mortier v. Belgium case. P. 70. "Although the Court's October 2022 judgment did not find a violation of the Convention, it scrutinised aspects of Belgium's oversight system and called for improvements to the control procedure. Anti-rights actors presented the ruling as a victory and as validation of their broader critique of progressive bioethical legislation."	It is stated on P. 70 that the judgment did not find a violation of the Convention and it only scrutinised aspects of Belgium's oversight system. This is an incorrect interpretation of the decision. The ECHR did find a violation of Article 2. The ground was that Belgium's after-the-fact review commission was not independent enough – which is a procedural and independence issue causing a violation of Article 2. This ruling is "a victory" and "a validation of broader critique of progressive bioethical legislation" especially concerning the lack of safeguards.	P. 70, please delete from the main text and insert the section in bold: "Although the Court's October 2022 judgment ~~did not find a violation of the Convention, it~~ scrutinised aspects of Belgium's oversight system and called for improvements to the control procedure – **finding a violation of Article 2 of the Convention**. ~~Anti-rights actors presented the ruling as a victory and as validation of their broader critique of progressive bioethical legislation~~"
P. 362. ADF International "provided financial and legal support" to Slovakia's Alliance for Family referendum campaign.	There is no funding source provided.	P. 362, please delete from the main text: "~~provided financial and legal support~~"
P. 424. "in September 2025, ADF UK orchestrated Nigel Farage's appearance before the US Congress to present UK buffer zone and prayer prosecutions as evidence of religious persecution."	"Orchestrated" is unsupported and merely refers to a source written in a like-minded fashion.	P. 424, please delete from the text: "~~in September 2025, ADF UK orchestrated Nigel Farage's appearance before the US Congress to present UK buffer zone and prayer prosecutions as evidence of religious persecution~~."
P. 136.	The wrong section was amended rather than the bit	P. 136, please delete in the main text:

"The third register is religious freedom: the prosecution of Päivi Räsänen and Bishop Juhana Pohjola, coordinated and funded internationally by ADF International, has been systematically repackaged as a free speech and religious liberty case. Räsänen appeared before the US House Judiciary Committee on 4 February 2026 to testify on European censorship with ADF International legal counsel testifying alongside her"	under "Narratives and Media" on P. 136 We did not fund or coordinate the *prosecution*. We also did not coordinate the case. Furthermore, it *is* a free speech and religious liberty case and not repackaged as such.	"The third register is religious freedom: the prosecution of Päivi Räsänen and Bishop Juhana Pohjola, ~~coordinated and funded internationally by ADF International~~, ~~has been systematically repackaged as a free speech and religious liberty case~~. Räsänen appeared before the US House Judiciary Committee on 4 February 2026 to testify on European censorship, with ADF International legal counsel testifying alongside her"

Received on 23 October 2026.

4. Genspect Portugal

GENSPECT PORTUGAL

Formal objection to the report *The Hate Review*

To the Board of Forbidden Colours

Dear Sir or Madam,

Genspect Portugal rejects the inclusion of Genspect in *The Hate Review*, published by Forbidden Colours, and the association of our work with an alleged movement of hate and a threat to human rights.

We regard this characterisation as false, defamatory and discriminatory.

Genspect promotes scientific scrutiny of medical interventions related to gender identity, clinical caution, the protection of minors and recognition of the biological reality of sex.

Forbidden Colours turns these positions into manifestations of political extremism. It portrays cooperation between civil society organisations as an organised threat and the exercise of democratic rights as an assault on human rights.

The report does not merely investigate organisations. It classifies them ideologically, ascribes motives to them and presents those classifications as scientific findings.

The methodology employed compounds this problem. The indices of "contamination" and "impact" are constructed from qualitative assessments, converted into scores that lend an appearance of scientific objectivity to political classifications.

Forbidden Colours is an advocacy and lobbying organisation that uses this report to advance its institutional objectives. Presenting ideological assessments as scientific findings raises serious questions about independence, transparency and methodological rigour.

More seriously still, the report uses the language of "contamination" to describe the presence of these organisations in European society and presents their "decontamination" as an objective.

It is extraordinary that an organisation claiming to defend human rights should use the language of contamination and elimination to describe the participation of citizens, professionals and organisations in democratic life.

Scientific disagreement is not hate. Criticism of legislation is not extremism. Democratic participation is not a threat to democracy.

Forbidden Colours cannot replace these distinctions with an ideological classification and then present the results of that classification as evidence of a social threat.

Moreover, Forbidden Colours benefits from public funding, including support from European programmes. The use of public resources by an organisation that produces and disseminates stigmatising classifications of other participants in democratic debate raises serious questions of institutional accountability, independence and transparency regarding the specific funding of this report.

The association of Genspect with a report on hate, presented at the European Parliament and circulated among policymakers, journalists and public institutions, causes serious and foreseeable reputational harm.

Accordingly, we demand:

1. **A public retraction** of the allegations linking Genspect to hate movements and threats to human rights.
2. **Correction** of the false characterisations of Genspect's work and the organisations with which it collaborates.
3. **Disclosure of the assessors** responsible for the classifications relating to Portugal, their assessment criteria and institutional affiliations.
4. **Clarification of the sources of funding** used in the preparation and dissemination of *The Hate Review*, including any European public funds.
5. **Publication of this response in full** and communication of the corrections to the institutions to which the report was presented.

We request a written response within 14 days and reserve the right to pursue appropriate legal remedies to protect our reputation.

The defence of human rights does not give any organisation the power to determine which citizens may participate in public debate, which scientific positions may be defended, or which legislative proposals may be put forward.

The attempt to exclude from democratic life those who disagree with a particular political agenda is itself profoundly contrary to the pluralism on which a free society rests.

Yours faithfully,

Francisca Silva Zacarias
Director, Genspect Portugal

Received on 4 November 2026