

## THE TANDEM PROJECT

<http://www.tandemproject.com>.

### UNITED NATIONS, HUMAN RIGHTS, FREEDOM OF RELIGION OR BELIEF

#### UNITED NATIONS HISTORY – FREEDOM OF RELIGION OR BELIEF

---

The excerpts in quotation marks on the work of the United Nations on Human Rights and Freedom of Religion or Belief, are from a Commentary, *Freedom of Religion or Belief: Ensuring Effective International Legal Protection*. Bahiyyih G. Tahzib, Kluwer Law International, The Hague, September 1995.

---

**1948:** The First Preamble to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) declares: “*Whereas* recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.” This is the core principle underlying international human rights norms and standards.

Article 18 of the 1948 UDHR reads: “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.”

**1952:** In his address of October 7, 1952, before the fifth session of the Sub-Commission, Lewin, the representative of the Agudas Israel World Organization suggested that a world-wide study of discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices be undertaken. This suggestion resulted in the Sub-Commission adding the area of religious discrimination to its series of projected studies of discrimination in various fields.”

**1954:** The Halpern Preliminary Study of Discrimination in the Matter of Religious Rights and Practices. Halpern was a member of the Sub-Commission. The Sub-Commission, with the approval of the Commission and ECOSOC decided to go ahead with a major study by one of its own members.

**1960:** “As instructed by the Sub-Commission, Special Rapporteur Arcot Krishnaswami of India initiated the work on his study by first collecting, analyzing, and then verifying material relating to discrimination in the matter of religious rights and practices. Krishnaswami presented the study to the Sub-Commission at its twelfth session (1960). In the Sub-Commission, the Special Rapporteur was praised for having successfully carried out, ‘with great skill and painstaking care, an exceptionally comprehensive and constructive study which probably would remain for many years as the classic work in an extremely delicate and controversial field, and which would serve as a guide for action by governments, non-governmental organizations and private individuals.’”

“In transmitting the sixteen draft principles with the Krishnaswami study to the Commission, the Sub-Commission expressed the belief that the adoption by the United Nations of recommendations to its Members, based upon these principles, would be a fitting culmination to its study.”

**1962:** “The General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting ECOSOC to ask the Commission to prepare a draft declaration and a draft convention on the elimination of racial discrimination. It also adopted a similarly worded resolution requesting ECOSOC to ask the Commission to prepare a draft declaration and a draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious

intolerance. Both resolutions referred in their respective preambles to the desire to ‘put into effect the principle of equality of all men and all peoples without distinction as to race, color or religion. The General Assembly set deadlines for submission of the special instruments on religious intolerance: its eighteenth session (1963) for the draft declaration and its twentieth session (1965) for the draft convention.’”

**1963:** “The decision to separate the instruments on religious intolerance from those on racial discrimination constituted a compromise solution designed to satisfy a number of conflicting viewpoints. Western states insisted on addressing both matters in a joint instrument. Communist states were not anxious to deal with religious matters. African and Asian states considered the question of religious intolerance a minor matter compared with racial discrimination.” “In contrast to the religious intolerance matter, international instruments on the elimination of racial discrimination were adopted fairly swiftly, in 1963 and 1965 respectively.”

**1964:** “The Commission held a preliminary general debate on the General Assembly’s resolution regarding special instruments addressing religious intolerance. As the outcome of the debate the Commission asked the Sub-Commission to undertake a project on preparing instruments specifically pertaining to religious intolerance. The sequence of the draft declaration and the draft convention to be submitted to the General Assembly obviously prompted the Commission to request the Sub-Commission to accord priority to preparing a draft preliminary declaration.”

“While the Commission’s session working group was revising its original draft declaration, the Sub-Commission began to work on a draft convention on the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance. The Sub-Committee set up an informal open-ended working group to combine three suggested draft conventions into a single joint text to serve as a basis for further discussion.”

**1965:** “Rather than appointing a working group to consider the preliminary draft declaration, the Commission examined and revised the Sub-Commission’s draft convention during its twenty-first through twenty-third sessions. At its twenty-first session (1965), the Commission adopted the preamble and four articles of the draft convention.”

**1966:** “At its twenty-second session (1966), five additional articles were adopted. The Commission adopted at its twenty-third session (1967) three additional articles.”

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) is adopted. Article 18 of the legally binding ICCPR reads: ‘Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.’”

**1967:** “At the General Assembly’s twenty-second session, the Third Committee had an opening general debate and a line-by-line review of the text of the draft convention. The convention’s most fierce critics were the Soviet Union, other communist states, and several African and Asian States. Since the draft Convention’s definition of “religion or belief” included theistic, non-theistic and atheistic beliefs; there was strong opposition from Islamic states, the Catholic church, and other religious groups.” “At its twenty-third session, the General Assembly decided to defer consideration of the draft convention.

**1968-1972:** From 1968 to 1972 the General Assembly annually postponed discussion of the agenda item “Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance” In 1972, Homer Jack observed that as a result of almost two decades of major differences over drafting international instruments pertaining to freedom of religion or belief, the political confusion was so great that some states, and some non-governmental organizations – some most interested in completing these

instruments – began to have second thoughts. Would the final results be worth the effort? Would religious freedom be set back, or at least not appreciably advanced by the effort? How could there be a new beginning?”

**1972:** “There was a breakthrough when a core group of non-governmental organizations in New York determined to bring about change in the lingering effort to elaborate a special international instrument on freedom of religion or belief.” “The issue was taken up by the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights of the CONGO. A broad cross-section of NGOs was informed of the ‘sorry history’ of the issue and the impasse. It was agreed to send a communication to the President of the 27<sup>th</sup> General Assembly session signed by as many NGOs as possible. A total of 35 NGOs signed the letter which the sub-committee presented to the President on September 21, 1972.”

**1973:** “The General Assembly determined that the ‘preparation of a draft declaration’ required ‘additional study.’ It invited ECOSOC to request the Commission to consider ‘as a matter of priority’ the elaboration of a draft declaration and to ‘submit’ if possible, a single draft declaration to the Assembly at its twenty-ninth session.”

**1974:** “The Commission set up an informal working group open to all members of the Commission. The informal open-ended working group was established by the Commission at each of its sessions from 1974 on in order to speed up the work. The working group considered the draft declaration on the basis of the text prepared by the working group which the Commission constituted in 1964.” “At its first session (1974), the new working group provisionally agreed that the title for the draft declaration should be: Draft Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. It felt the term ‘religious intolerance’ in the proposed title was too vague in that it referred to subjective attitudes rather than determinable activities, and that it also did not cover discrimination on the ground of religion or belief.”

**1977:** “The working group finally completed the draft preamble to the declaration. However not a single operative article had been agreed upon.”

**1978:** “With the involvement of more Islamic states, the working group began the preliminary discussion of the substantive portion of the declaration. The working group was not able to approve, not even tentatively and despite the fact that it had met during three weeks, one additional word to the draft declaration.”

“Except for a few Western governments, only a core group of non-governmental organizations kept insisting on the need for accelerate action to adopt a declaration. The General Assembly noted ‘with regret’ that the Commission had so far adopted only the title and preamble of a draft declaration. Unlike progress by the United Nations in other fields of human rights, the working group had not even reached agreement on basic guidelines. Sixteen years after drafting commenced, no agreement could be reached on using Article 18 of the ICCPR as the basis for Article 1 of the draft declaration. This demonstrates the complexity of the issues involved including the critical problem of defining the limits of the freedom.”

**1979:** “The working group achieved sweeping agreement on several substantive aspects of the first three articles of the draft convention. It was, however, unable to reach consensus on the question of submission of draft articles to the Commission for adoption. The Commission decided at that point to depart from its custom that decisions are made by consensus only. In doing so, a filibuster was prevented that might have blocked the whole undertaking.”

**1980:** “The working group tentatively adopted the fourth article and the first paragraph of the fifth article. In that same year, the working group was able to report to the Commission that it had completed the draft declaration, consisting of the title, the preamble, and seven articles.”

**1981:** “The 1981 Declaration was passed by the United Nations General Assembly on November 25, 1981. It is not a convention and does not retain the same legal effect of a convention. Yet, it still has legal effect. This is mainly due to the content and language of the 1981 Declaration as well as the evolution it has gone through since its adoption.”

“Both in the Third Committee and in the plenary session of the General Assembly, a number of states, from the former Communist bloc and the Islamic group, declared oral explanations of their votes after the adoption of the 1981 Declaration. Post vote explanations have been classified into the following three groups.” “According to Romania, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the U.S.S.R., the 1981 Declaration gave a one-sided version of freedom of thought, conscience and religion; it did not take sufficient account of atheistic beliefs. In their opinion, the 1981 Declaration disregarded the rights of persons who did not profess any religion or belief. They considered the 1981 Declaration unnecessarily incomplete. This was particularly clear in Article 6 which concentrated one-sidedly on various rights and freedoms that had no importance for a person who had no religion or belief. Article 6 did not contain a complete and systematic list of freedoms. It omitted freedom of thought and conscience, which were mentioned in the first sentence of Article 6.”

“Romania, Syria, Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R. made a general reservation regarding the applicability of any provisions of the 1981 Declaration which were not in accordance with the provisions of their national legislations. Iraq entered a collective reservation on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference as to the applicability of ‘any provision or wording in the Declaration which might be contrary to Islamic law (Shari’a) or to any legislation or act based on Islamic law. Syria and Iran endorsed Iraq’s collective reservation.”

**1984:** The Seminar on the Encouragement of Understanding, Tolerance and Respect in Matters Relating to Freedom of Religion or Belief. Two week seminar in Geneva, Switzerland; called by the United Nations Secretariat. The NGO Committees on Freedom of Religion or Belief created in Geneva and New York.

**1987:** Sub-Commission Study by Ms. Odio Benito; Current Dimensions of the Problems of Intolerance and Discrimination on Grounds of Religion or Belief.

**1986:** The Commission appoints a Special Rapporteur on Religious Intolerance, to report to them annually on the mandate to implement the 1981 U.N. Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination based on Religion or Belief. Since 1986 the Commission has heard annual reports by three Special Rapporteurs: Vidal d’Almedia Ribeiro, Portugal; Abdelfatah Amor, Tunisia; Asma Jahangir, Pakistan.

**1988:** The Van Boven Working Paper on Issues and Factors to be considered before drafting a Legally Binding Instrument. At its forty-fourth session the Commission requested the Sub-Commission to prepare a compilation of provisions relevant to the elimination of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief, and examine relevant issues and factors which should be considered before drafting a special legally binding international instrument on freedom of religion or belief. Theo Van Boven, international legal expert, who subsequently became a United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture, undertook the task.

**1993:** General Comment on Article 18 adopted. Article 18, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UN Human Rights Committee, 20 July 1993 (CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.4): “Article 18: protects *theistic, non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, as well as the right not to profess any religion or belief*. The terms belief and religion are to be broadly construed. Article 18 is not limited in its application to traditional religions or to religions and beliefs with international characteristics or practices analogous to those of traditional religions. The Committee therefore views with concern any tendency to discriminate against any religion or belief for any reasons, including the fact that they are newly established, or represent religious minorities that may be the subject of hostility by a predominant religious community.”

**1998:** The Oslo Conference on Freedom of Religion or Belief recommended a change to the title from United Nations Special Rapporteur on Religious Intolerance, to Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, to reflect the inclusive nature of religion or belief. This was present by the Special Rapporteur to the Commission, and approved by ECOSOC and General Assembly the following year (E/CN.4/1999/58).

**2001:** Twenty year Commemoration of the 1981 U.N. Declaration, Madrid, Spain. This was a UN sponsored Commemoration attended by 800 participants from UN Member States and Non-governmental Organizations.

**2006:** Twenty-Five year Commemoration of the 1981 U.N. Declaration, Prague, Czech Republic. 300 participants with speakers from the Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights, UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief and Non-governmental Organizations.

UN General Assembly by resolution (A/60/L.48) on 3 April 2006 establishes a United Nations Human Rights Council to replace the UN Commission on Human Rights. The Human Rights Council under 60/251 is to be composed of 47 Members elected by the UN General Assembly in staggered terms.

**2007:** Resolution 5/1 establishes a mechanism for Institution Building of the United Nations Human Rights Council. The mechanism establishes the: Universal Periodic Review; Special Procedures; Advisory Committee; Complaint Procedure; Special Sessions; Observers of the Council and Rules of Procedure. Universal Periodic Review Recommendations and Conclusions are made by the UN Human Rights Council during the Outcome and Adoption process. Rule 36 of the Universal Periodic Review states the international community can assist in implementing the recommendations and conclusions regarding capacity building and technical assistance, in consultation with, and the consent of, the country concerned.

Non-governmental organizations and others producing recommendations for follow-up to a Universal Periodic Review will do so outside this process. It becomes a challenge when a Universal Periodic Review country does not mention Article 18 of the ICCPR of the 1981 UN Declaration in their National Report or have Outcome Recommendations from UN Human Rights Council members for follow-up that do not include freedom of religion or belief.

**2008:** The UN General Assembly in 2008 begins the Universal Periodic Review. Between 2008 and 2011 all United Nations Member States will have a Universal Periodic Review before the U.N. Human Rights Council on progress to fulfill their human rights responsibilities and obligations. First three Universal Periodic Review sessions are held by the UN Human Rights Council, 48 countries have their Universal Periodic Review. Stakeholders submit letters for each Universal Periodic Review country that are compiled by the UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights and published in advance of each Review.

**2009:** The Tandem Project has called for the UN Human Rights Council to establish a Working Group for a Convention on Freedom of Religion or Belief, deferred since 1968.

The objections to a UN Working Group is the danger of restricting or derogating gains already made in rights-based law on freedom of religion or belief, especially when no consensus currently exists by UN Member States on these core ideological issues; apostasy, defamation, blasphemy, conversion, proselytism and freedom of opinion and expression.

Do advantages of a UN Working Group outweigh the disadvantages? Deferral of a Convention on Religious Intolerance in 1968 downgraded its intent as a core international treaty-based human rights instrument to a declaration. This action demonstrated that freedom of religion or belief is one of the most complex and sensitive of all human rights instruments in ethnic, cultural and political affairs. It has led to division of responsibility on issues in matters of religion or belief to other treaty-based committees, working groups and sub-committees, diluting the focus of religion or belief to stand alone as it was originally intended, as one of the key core international treaty-based human rights instruments anchoring the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Until Freedom of Religion or Belief achieves treaty-based convention status, at a level with other foundational treaty-based conventions, the UN human rights system will be incomplete. Now is the time to renew the UN Working Group as a paradigm breakthrough.

The challenge is to reconcile international human rights standards on freedom of religion or belief with the truth claims of religious and non-religious beliefs.

The Human Rights Council passed a resolution on Combating Defamation of Religion (A/HRC/10/L.2.Rev1). UN Watch director Hillel Neuer speaking about the resolution said; “Ultimately, the very notion of individual human rights is at stake, because the sponsors of this resolution seek not to protect individuals from harm, but rather to shield a specific set of beliefs from any question, debate, or critical inquiry. The very term ‘defamation of religion’ is a distortion. The legal concept of defamation protects the reputations of individuals, not beliefs. It also requires an examination of the truth or falsity of the challenged remarks—a determination that no one, especially not the UN, is capable of undertaking concerning any religion.”

Mr. Imran Ahmed Siddiqui, Pakistan Permanent Mission to the UN in Geneva, speaking at a Parallel meeting sponsored by the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, on “10 years of ‘Defamation of Religions: Is there an alternative?’,” allegedly said; “We are dealing with two worlds that have totally different world views.”

A vote on resolution (A/HRC/10/L.2.Rev1) Combating Defamation of Religion, introduced by Pakistan on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, was taken in the tenth session of the UN Human Rights Council on 26 March, 2009. It passed the Council with 23 in favor, 11 against and 13 abstaining. The Durban Review Conference is held from 20-24 April in Geneva. Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance will introduce the resolution on Combating Defamation of Religion downgrading the intent of ECOSOC in 1962 to draft to two international human rights treaty conventions on racial discrimination and religious discrimination.

**2010:** is the fifty year anniversary of the seminal 1960 study on freedom of religion or belief by Arcot Krishnaswami of India; *Study of Discrimination in the Matter of Religious Rights and Practices* (E/CN.4/Sub.2/200/Rev.1). See **History: 1960:** The first sentence to the introduction of document reads: “Truly great religions and beliefs are based upon ethical tenets such as the duty to widen the bounds of good-neighborliness and the obligation to meet human need in the broadest sense.” Krishnaswami in the footnote: “In view of the difficulty of defining ‘religion’,

the term 'religion or belief' is used in this study to include, in addition to various theistic creeds, such other beliefs as agnosticism, free thought, atheism and rationalism.”

---

**STANDARDS:** [http://www.tandemproject.com/program/81\\_dec.htm](http://www.tandemproject.com/program/81_dec.htm)

**The Tandem Project:** a non-governmental organization founded in 1986 to build understanding, tolerance and respect for diversity, and to prevent discrimination in matters relating to freedom of religion or belief. The Tandem Project, a non-profit NGO, has sponsored multiple conferences, curricula, reference materials and programs on Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights – Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion - and 1981 United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief.

The Tandem Project initiative is the result of a co-founder representing the World Federation of United Nations Associations at the United Nations Geneva Seminar, *Encouragement of Understanding, Tolerance and Respect in Matters Relating to Freedom of Religion or Belief*, called by the UN Secretariat in 1984 on ways to implement the 1981 UN Declaration. In 1986, The Tandem Project organized the first NGO International Conference on the 1981 UN Declaration.

The Tandem Project Executive Director is: Michael M. Roan, [mroan@tandemproject.com](mailto:mroan@tandemproject.com).

*The Tandem Project is a UN NGO in Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations*

**Goal:** To eliminate all forms of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief.

United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, at the Alliance of Civilizations Madrid Forum said; “never in our lifetime has there been a more desperate need for constructive and committed dialogue, among individuals, among communities, among cultures, among and between nations.” Another writer in different setting said; “the warning signs are clear, unless we establish genuine dialogue within and among all kinds of belief, ranging from religious fundamentalism to secular dogmatism, the conflicts of the future will probably be even more deadly.”

**Challenge:** to reconcile international human rights standards on freedom of religion or belief with the truth claims of religious and non-religious beliefs.

Did God create us or did we create God? This question calls for inclusive and genuine dialogue, respectful and thoughtful responses, discussion of taboos and clarity by persons of diverse beliefs. Inclusive and genuine is dialogue between people of *theistic, non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, as well as the right not to profess any religion or belief*. These UN categories embodied in international law promote tolerance and prevent discrimination based on religion or belief.

Inclusive and genuine dialogue is essential as a first step in recognition of the inherent dignity, equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family, and a foundation for freedom, justice and peace in the world. Leaders of religious and non-religious beliefs sanction the truth claims of their own traditions. They are the key to raising awareness and acceptance of the value of holding truth claims in tandem with human rights standards on freedom of religion or belief.

To build understanding and support for Article 18, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights – Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion - and the 1981 UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. Encourage the United Nations, Governments, Religions or Beliefs, Academia, NGOs, Media and Civil Society to use International Human Rights Standards on Freedom of Religion or Belief as essential for *long-term solutions* to conflicts in all matters relating to religion or belief.

**Objectives:**

1. Use International Human Rights Standards on Freedom of Religion or Belief as a platform for genuine dialogue on the core principles and values within and among nations, all religions and other beliefs.
2. Adapt these human rights standards to early childhood education, teaching children, from the very beginning, that their own religion is one out of many and that it is a personal choice for everyone to adhere to the religion or belief by which he or she feels most inspired, or to adhere to no religion or belief at all.<sup>1</sup>

**History:** In 1968 the United Nations deferred work on an International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance, because of its apparent complexity and sensitivity. In the twenty-first century, a dramatic increase of intolerance and discrimination on grounds of religion or belief is motivating a worldwide search to find solutions to these problems. This is a challenge calling for enhanced dialogue by States and others; including consideration of an International Convention on Freedom of Religion or Belief for protection of and accountability by all religions or beliefs. The tensions in today's world inspire a question such as:

Should the United Nations adopt an International Convention on Freedom of Religion or Belief?

**Response:** Is it the appropriate moment to reinitiate the drafting of a legally binding international convention on freedom of religion or belief? Law making of this nature requires a minimum consensus and an environment that appeals to reason rather than emotions. At the same time we are on a learning curve as the various dimensions of the Declaration are being explored. Many academics have produced voluminous books on these questions but more ground has to be prepared before setting up of a UN working group on drafting a convention. In my opinion, we should not try to rush the elaboration of a Convention on Freedom of Religion or Belief, especially not in times of high tensions and unpreparedness. - *UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Asma Jahangir, Prague 25 Year Anniversary Commemoration of the 1981 UN Declaration, 25 November 2006.*

**Option:** After forty years this may be the time, however complex and sensitive, for the United Nations Human Rights Council to appoint an Open-ended Working Group to draft a United Nations Convention on Freedom of Religion or Belief. The mandate for an Open-ended Working Group ought to assure nothing in a draft Convention will be construed as restricting or derogating from any right defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the 1981 UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief.

#### *Separation of Religion or Belief and State*

**Concept:** *Separation of Religion or Belief and State - SOROBAS.* The First Preamble to the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads; “*Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.* This concept suggests States recalling their history, culture and constitution adopt fair and equal human rights protection for all religions or beliefs as described in General Comment 22 on Article 18, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UN Human Rights Committee, 20 July 1993 (CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.4):

**Article 18:** protects *theistic, non-theistic and atheistic beliefs, as well as the right not to profess any religion or belief.* The terms belief and religion are to be broadly construed. Article 18 is not limited in its application to traditional religions or to religions and beliefs with international characteristics or practices analogous to those of traditional religions. The Committee therefore views with concern any tendency to discriminate against any religion or belief for any reasons, including the fact that they are newly established, or represent religious minorities that may be the subject of hostility by a predominant religious community.

**Article 18:** permits restrictions to manifest a religion or belief only if such limitations are prescribed by law and necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

**Dialogue:** International Human Rights Standards on Freedom or Religion or Belief are international law and universal codes of conduct for peaceful cooperation, respectful competition and resolution of conflicts.



The standards are a platform for genuine dialogue on core principles and values within and among nations, all religions and other beliefs.

**Education:** Ambassador Piet de Klerk addressing the Prague 25 Year Anniversary Commemoration of the 1981 U.N. Declaration said; “Our educational systems need to provide children with a broad orientation: from the very beginning, children should be taught that their own religion is one out of many and that it is a personal choice for everyone to adhere to the religion or belief by which he or she feels most inspired, or to adhere to no religion or belief at all.”<sup>1</sup>

*1981 U.N. Declaration on Freedom of Religion or Belief*

5.2: Every child shall enjoy the right to have access to education in the matter of religion or belief in accordance with the wishes of his parents, and shall not be compelled to receive teaching on religion or belief against the wishes of his parents, the best interests of the child being the guiding principle.” With International Human Rights safeguards, early childhood education is the best time to begin to build tolerance, understanding and respect for freedom of religion or belief.

5.3: The child shall be protected from any form of discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, and friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood, respect for the freedom of religion or belief of others and in full consciousness that his energy and talents should be devoted to the service of his fellow men.