

Impact of Some European Court Decisions on Religious Liberty Jurisprudence and Practices

Willy Fautré, *Human Rights Without Frontiers*

In 1948, the United Nations promulgated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Its adoption by almost all the nations of the world has proven to be one of the most important events of the second half of the 20th century.

On November 4, 1950, the 13 member states of the Council of Europe signed the European Convention on Human Rights that came into force on September 3, 1953.

The European Convention represents a collective guarantee at a European level of a number of principles set out in the Universal Declaration and is supported by international judicial machinery making decisions that must be respected by contracting states. Proceedings before the organs created by the Convention cannot be instituted until after all domestic remedies have been exhausted. These organs are the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, which may be called upon to act in cases, which are not brought to the European Court.

The European Court is a unique international institution that allows an individual to lodge a complaint against a state for alleged violation of his/her human rights. It is competent to render a judicial decision that is binding on the parties to the action, on determining whether in a given case the Convention has or has not been violated by a contracting state.

On November 3, 1998, the new European Court was inaugurated. This put an end to the European Commission whose mission was to declare an application admissible or not, to reach a friendly settlement between the parties or to formulate a legal opinion about a case and to refer it to the European Court. In the last 44 years, the European Commission has examined more than 40,000 individual applications and since 1959, the European Court has issued over 900 decisions.

The reform of the European Court is expected to increase the number of cases processed: in 1997, 4,750 cases were registered but already in the first ten months of 1998, 4,791 have been processed.

The jurisdiction of the Court now extends over about 750 million people in 40 member states from Greenland to Cyprus and from Portugal to Russia.

The first decision of the European Court, which is a landmark for religious liberty in Europe, is Kokkinakis case. Since then, Greece has been the main provider of complaints pertaining to religious liberty, but successful complaints were also lodged against Austria and Bulgaria.

The first case I am going to discuss concerns the denying a mother the custody of two children because of her adherence to a so-called cult in Austria. It is the case Hoffmann v. Austria.

Hoffmann v. Austria

The Facts and the Proceedings

In 1980, Mrs. Hoffmann got married with Mr. S., a telephone technician. At that time, they were both Roman Catholics. Two children were born to them: a son, Martin, in 1980, and a daughter, Sandra, in 1982. They too were baptized as Roman Catholics.

Later on, Mrs. Hoffmann left the Roman Catholic Church to become a Jehovah's Witness. On October 17, 1983, she instituted a divorce proceeding and in August 1984, she left her husband, taking the children with her. The divorce was pronounced on June 12, 1986.

As a result of their separation, an application for custody of the children was submitted to the Innsbruck District Court (Bezirksgericht).

The father argued that if the children were left in the mother's care, there was a risk for them to be brought up in a way that would do them harm. He claimed that the educational principles of the religious denomination to which Mrs. Hoffmann belonged were hostile to society, in that they discouraged all intercourse with non-members, all expressions of patriotism (such as singing the national anthem) and religious tolerance. According to him, all this would lead to the children's social isolation. In addition, the Jehovah's Witnesses' ban on blood transfusions might give rise to situations in which their life or their health was endangered. With regard to the son, the father noted that he would eventually have to refuse to perform military service or even the civilian service exacted in its stead.

Mrs. Hoffmann claimed that she was in a better place to take care for the children since she was able to devote herself to them completely and to provide them with the necessary family environment. She alleged that the father did not even provide for their maintenance, as he was both legally and morally bound to do. She acknowledged, however, that she intended to bring the children up in her own faith.

After hearing both parties, the youth office of the Innsbruck District Authority expressed a preference for granting parental rights to the mother (Decision of January 8, 1986).

The father appealed against this decision to the Innsbruck Regional Court (Landesgericht) but he was nonsuited by decision of March 14, 1986.

He then appealed to the Supreme Court (Oberster Gerichtshof) which by decision of September 3, 1986 overturned the judgment of the Innsbruck Regional Court and granted parental rights to the father instead of the mother. The main reason put forward for changing the custody right was that if living with their mother, the children would have to change their religion. The legal basis referred to was Article 2 § 2 of the 1921 Federal Act on the Religious Education of Children, which says that during the existence of the marriage neither parent may decide without the consent of the other that the child is to be brought up in a faith different from that shared by both parents at the time of the marriage. Moreover, the Supreme Court shared the father's grievances pertaining to the alleged harmfulness of the teaching and the practices of the Jehovah's Witnesses.

Mrs. Hoffmann applied to the European Commission on February 20, 1987. She complained that she had been denied custody of the children on the basis of her religious convictions. She invoked her right to respect for her family life (Article 8), her right to freedom of religion (Article 9) and her right to ensure the education of her children in conformity with her own religious convictions. She further claimed that she had been discriminated on the ground of religion (Article 14).

Her application (no 12875/87) was declared admissible on July 10, 1990. In its report of January 16, 1992, the Commission expressed the opinion by eight votes to six that there had been a violation of Article 8 read in conjunction with Article 14.

Article 14 says: "The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in the Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, color, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status."

In its reasoning, the European Court stressed that the Supreme Court was entitled to protect the health and the rights of the children, but it had introduced a new element, namely the Federal Act on the Religious Education of Children, which was decisive in overturning the decision of the lower courts.

The European Court therefore recognized that there had been a difference in treatment and that this difference was on the ground of religion; this conclusion was supported by the tone and phrasing of the Supreme Court's considerations regarding the practical consequences of the mother's religion.

Consequently, the European Court held by five votes to four, on June 23, 1993 that there had been a violation of Article 8 in conjunction with Article 14.

The decision of the European Court said "Such a difference in treatment is discriminatory in the absence of an 'objective and reasonable justification', that is, if it is not justified by a 'legitimate aim' and if there is no 'reasonable relationship of proportionality between the means employed and the aim sought to be realized'". It also stressed that the Austrian Supreme Court did not rely solely on the Federal Act on the Religious Education of Children but assessed the facts differently from the lower courts, whose reasoning was moreover supported by psychological expert opinion, and made a distinction based essentially on a difference in religion alone.

Some Comments

In the case Hoffmann v. Austria, the combination of Article 8 with Article 14 is rather fictitious and was conditioned by the family dimension of the issue. In fact, any reference to an act of discrimination based on religious convictions should logically lead to reasoning based on a combination of Articles 9 and 14.

This case highlighted that the freedom to convert to a minority religion was jeopardized by the Austrian Supreme Court's decision. This freedom will continue to be jeopardized if national jurisdictions treat people on the ground of their specific religious adherence unfavorably.

In the Hoffmann case, the dissenting opinion of Greek judge Valticos raised the issue of “proselytizing one’s own children”. According to his reasoning, a Jehovah’s Witness sharing his/her faith with his/her children is proselytizing them and should not be allowed to do so. This means that for some minority religions labeled as cults, their members should not be entitled to enjoy a substantial part of the rights guaranteed by Article 9 of the European Convention.

Considering that various opinions voiced all along the proceedings have highlighted potential deviations from the rights guaranteed by Article 9 of the European Convention and that divorce is a widespread phenomenon all over Europe, the decision taken by the European Court in this issue is of utmost importance. This jurisprudence should condition any decision taken in similar cases in the member states of the Council of Europe from now on.

However, two recent cases, among others in Belgium, will highlight a new dimension of the issue that ruins the expected effects of the European Court.

Court Decisions about Child Custody in Divorce Cases in Belgium

The first case involves a member of the Sahaja Yoga, Lieve Van Roy, her 5-year son Yorick and his father Peter Mariën, a former member of Sahaja Yoga. The case cannot be separated from the more global context pertaining of the “cult” issue, including the report drafted by the Belgian parliamentary commission on sects and to the setting up of an Observatory on sects.

Peter Mariën was already an active member of Sahaja Yoga when he met Lieve Van Roy. In 1991, they started living together. In 1993, they got a son, Yorick but because of Peter Mariën's persistent drug addiction and other shortcomings, Lieve Van Roy separated from Peter. She first went to an ashram near Rome where she spent three months. Yorick attended the ashram's kindergarten open to 3-6 year-old kids. Children from all over the world usually spend two or three months there with or without their parents. English is the communication language. Peter was familiar with life at the kindergarten because his two daughters from a former marriage to another member of Sahaja Yoga had spent some time at the ashram in Rome and so had he.

After some time, Lieve returned to Belgium where she stayed for about one year. In 1997, she went back to Rome's ashram and stayed there with her child until May 1998.

First, Peter Mariën did not show any interest and did not contribute financially to the education of the child. In the meantime, he started a new life with another woman. He then asked for the custody of Yorick. Peter Mariën's mother was also interested in seeing her grandson regularly.

In November 1997, the Youth Court of Mechelen granted the custody to the mother citing the bad criminal record of the father. However, Lieve Van Roy was to send Yorick to his father's at her own expenses (!) for the Christmas, Easter and summer holidays. Lieve's attorney then told her that Yorick's father had decided to appeal the judgment, and that therefore, she did not have to abide by the visit right for December 1997. Unfortunately, the interpretation of her young inexperienced attorney proved to be wrong. On April 2, 1998, the Appeal Court of Antwerp surprisingly decided to transfer the custody temporarily to the father and told the mother she had to have a permanent address in Belgium and to leave the Sahaja Yoga before

the next assessment of the situation. The reason for this new decision was the presentation of the Sahaja Yoga as one of the most dangerous cults in Belgium made by the Belgian Parliamentary Commission on Cults. This seemed more important in the magistrate's eyes than Peter Mariën's criminal record.

On May 28, 1998, Lieve Van Roy appeared at the Appeal Court in Mechelen where an evaluation of the former verdict was to be established. She had left her child in Italy because she was afraid that he would be removed from her custody.

At this hearing, it was then stated that she was not living in Belgium, that she was still in a so-called dangerous cult with her child and that she had not effectively transferred the custody of her son to his father. At the end of the court session, she refused to sign a form saying that she was voluntarily giving up the custody. Suddenly, a special anticult unit of the Special Investigation Brigade popped up in the courtroom, arrested her for kidnapping her child and sent her to prison where she spent one month. This is incredible but true and is a first in Belgium's history.

The next weekend (Pentecost), a delegation of the Belgian police was sent to the Belgian embassy in Rome. The Italian police was requested to go to the ashram in order to get back the child. Yorick was handed over to the police without any difficulty and was then repatriated to Belgium where he was put at the disposal of his father. In June, the court of Antwerp confirmed the imprisonment of Lieve Van Roy, then required her to stay permanently in a refuge house in town and forbade her to leave the country. The reason? She remained accused of kidnapping and sequestering her own child in a dangerous sect.

In her refuge house, she was not allowed to receive visits from her Ukrainian husband whom she had met in the ashram in Italy and married in 1997. She was not allowed to have any contact with her son either. Every week, she had to report to the police in Mechelen. From the 500 BEF (about £ 8) she got as subsistence allowance, she had to pay 210 BEF (about £ 3.5) for her train ticket to Mechelen. There, she just said her name. She did not even have to show her passport. Despite the repeated requests of her attorney on the grounds of her pregnancy, she was not allowed to report at the police in Antwerp. On September 8, early in the morning, while she was getting ready to travel again to Mechelen to report to the police, she was rushed to hospital, where she gave birth to a boy, whom called Alix.

Since May 1998, she has been living under a ban on any form of contact with her son: no right to call him, to get his visit or even to see him in a neutral place in the presence of a social assistant. She would like the judgment to be revised but she is still accused of kidnapping her own child and she will have to appear in court before it can be resolved. When interviewed by a journalist, she said "I will ask for my mother's rights and for my religious rights, but surely, the first question will be whether I'm still a member of Sahaja Yoga. If I say yes, there is little chance that I will be allowed to see him again".

The court compels her to make a choice between her faith and her child as if the Hoffmann case had never existed.

In the second case *Evangeline Torres v. Guy Lusine*, the custody of the children had been granted to the father while the mother enjoyed only very limited visitation rights. Four years later, in 1998, the mother, who in the meantime had become a Jehovah's Witness, asked for an extension of her visitation rights. The father's attorney said that there was "a serious

danger for the children due to the influence of the cult of Jehovah's Witnesses to which the mother has seemed to adhere in the meantime". He argued that "the two children have problems with regard to the – unrequested - influence of the Jehovahist environment in which the mother is living". "It is not suitable that children of such an age have to face the unrequested and unwanted influence of some sectarian beliefs and ways of life". And he asked for the suppression of her visitation rights if she did not keep them away from the Jehovah's Witnesses.

In his decision, the judge agreed to extend the mother's visitation rights on the condition that "the children are involved in no way, directly or indirectly, in the mother's activities as a member of Jehovah's Witnesses".

These two examples taken from the Belgian jurisprudence show that judges use the religious adherence of one of the parents to an unpopular minority religion into consideration to deny him/her any right of custody or visitation rights or to restrict it. This form of blackmail is religious discrimination, and it violates the provisions of article 14.

Some Conclusions

"*Human Rights Without Frontiers*" has received more complaints from divorced parents professing other minority faiths in Belgium. Similar cases in France have also been brought to the attention of HRWF. They are not very different. However, it is interesting to examine the reasoning of a judge at the Appeal Court of Montpellier on January 3, 1994 in the case Aimé Lafarge v. Daniela Mann concerning the non-implementation of a joint custody. The judge's declaration is worth quoting "It is not the judge's responsibility", he said, "to substitute himself for the political, legislative or statutory powers, which are the only ones to be entitled to assess if Jehovah's Witnesses threaten public order, their adherents or their adherents' children".

These divorce and child custody cases show several forms of dysfunction and are a source of concern:

- judges go on ignoring Hoffmann's decision purposefully and with total impunity
- judges refer to blacklists of cults supposed to be dangerous drawn up by parliamentary commissions in Belgium and France, to treat unequally majority and minority religions
- judges never ask members of historical religions such as Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Protestantism or Islam to renounce their faith or their right to share their religious beliefs with their children; they never ask them to give up their personal right to practice their religious beliefs during the periods of custody while yet they require that of members of some minority religions called cults
- some judges even blackmail members of minority religions, forcing them to choose between their faith and their children.

These cases are not isolated. It is impossible to have an idea of the extent of such practices at the various levels of the divorce proceedings; but it is sure that with the increase of divorces, with the publication of various parliamentary reports on cults and with the hysterical anticult climate fuelled by the media in countries such as Belgium, France, Germany and Austria, the situation is worsening today and will be go on worsening

With such logic, we can foresee that in the future, members of so-called cults will not be allowed to adopt children. If religion is a basis to deny custody in a divorce proceeding, why not deny married parents custody of their children. There is no reason not to deprive them of their parental right on their children or even the right or even to have children. This may sound like science fiction but in continental Europe, there have already been proceedings against the adoption of children by Jehovah's Witnesses because they refuse blood transfusion and opt for an alternative medical treatment. If they are not considered as fit to adopt children, then why would the very aggressive anticult movements in France not go one step further and ask for the deprivation of their parental rights. The last step would be sterilization of members of minority religions. This may be science fiction but who knows what can happen in 10 years, 5 years or even 3 years in countries like France.

In conclusion, it must be recognized that in Hoffmann case the European court decision is only a short-lived success.

In my closing remarks, I will try to open the way to some remedies to this situation, and in the subsequent debate, I will call upon your suggestions.

Some Cases against Greece

Kokkinakis v. Greece

In the case *Kokkinakis v. Greece*, the European Court was asked if and to which extent the European Convention should impose limitations on proselytism. The answer was clear: by six votes to three, it recognized on May 25, 1993 that there had been a violation of Article 9. The Court ordered that Mr. Kokkinakis be paid 400,000 drachmas for non-pecuniary damages as well as 2,789,500 drachmas for costs and expenses.

On December 15, 1997, the Committee of Ministers issued a declaration saying that it had complied with the decision of the European Court. In an appendix, it also said "This judgment was transmitted on 3 August 1993 by circular letter of the Ministry of Justice to the President and the Public Prosecutor of the Court of Cassation, to the President and Public Prosecutors of the Courts of Appeals as well as to the President and Public Prosecutors of the first instance Courts. Following this dissemination, the prosecutors and the indictment chambers of the courts have adapted their interpretation of Greek legislation to the requirements set by the Court's judgment so that the courts were involved only in very few cases of proselytism and that no conviction has been pronounced in a case similar to the *Kokkinakis* case. Since 1994, there have only been two convictions for proselytism to minors. The Government is of the opinion that, given the direct effect attributed to the Court's judgment, there is no more risk of repetition of that violation".

Anti-proselytism laws were introduced in 1938-1939 by dictator Metaxas, without the approval of the Parliament, to protect the dominant Orthodox Church against competing minority religions. Many experts regret that these laws were not condemned as discriminatory by the European Court. Since the enactment of the anti-proselytism laws, about 20,000 Jehovah's Witnesses have been arrested and those sentenced have served over 700 years in various prisons. From 1983 to 1988, over 2,000 known cases of prosecution and 400 convictions on grounds of proselytism were recorded. Since the decision taken in *Kokkinakis* case, the number of complaints has drastically diminished. With regard to Jehovah's

Witnesses only, the major providers of proselytism cases, there have been some twenty acquittals and just one conviction.

In 1997, Dimitris Iliadis, a Protestant evangelist arrested more than a dozen times in his life for his religious activities, was taken to court for holding public evangelism meetings in Thessaloniki but was acquitted.

In another case, a teacher, Eva Androutopoulou was accused of “making frequent references to Buddhism and to the religious beliefs of the Orient” during a German language class she gave at a private school in Komotini in May 1995. On June 18, 1998, a court in Thessaloniki pronounced her non-guilty.

Apart from the case of Larissis and others v. Greece that started in 1986 and involved three Pentecostal air officers, no other case has been taken to or is pending in Strasbourg. In Larissis v. Greece, the European Court held on February 24, 1998 that there had been a violation of Article 9 in respect of measures taken against Larissis and others for proselytizing civilians but not for proselytizing other airmen.

Despite these court decisions, a number of obstinate Orthodox clerics are persisting in lodging complaints against faithful of minority religions on grounds of proselytism. On November 6, 1997, a Three-Member Magistrates' Court of Athens sentenced Andrew David Leese, a British citizen and the leader of a Hare Krishna group in Athens, to 2 years in prison for the practice of proselytism, and to another three months for operating a house of prayer without a proper license delivered by the authorities. Yet, Mr. Leese did not serve his term as he was already abroad.

Apart from these isolated cases, the developments of Kokkinakis case in Greece can be considered quite positive. As there are no anti-proselytism laws in the countries that signed the European Convention, only Greece is affected by this decision. Tomorrow, however, the parliaments of other countries where the Orthodox Church is dominant or where there is a State Church might vote or be tempted to vote similar laws, especially under the guise of anticult legislation. Regarding this, the Kokkinakis case should have a deterrent effect on adversaries to religious pluralism and equality between religions.

Titos Manoussakis and others v. Greece

In the case Titos Manoussakis and others v. Greece, a group of Jehovah's Witnesses were denied the right to open and operate a place of worship in Heraklion (Crete) by the local public authorities on the basis of a negative opinion from the local Orthodox hierarchy. On September 26, 1996, after 13 years of legal battles, the European Court ruled unanimously that the condemnation of the plaintiffs had infringed Article 9 of the European Convention guaranteeing religious freedom and that the Greek State was to pay 4,030,000 drachmas to cover the costs and expenses incurred in the proceedings. However, the European Court did not condemn the law, which remains in force, and therefore left the door open to more complaints.

The Orthodox Church fully enjoys freedom of worship. For decades, all the other minority religions have been facing the Law of Necessity 1672/1939 which provides that the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs can ask for the advice of the Orthodox Church for any application introduced by another religion to open, rent, build and operate a place of worship.

Although this advice is theoretically not binding, it fully influences the minister's decision. In most cases, the Orthodox Church gives a negative answer about the competing religion or the Ministry does not reply. Muslims, Protestants and Jehovah's Witnesses are among the minority religions, that were most often sentenced by courts.

Since Manoussakis case, there have still been several condemnations. In the town of Kimeria (region of Xanthi, Western Thrace), 17 Muslims were arrested for adding a minaret to their mosque and were sentenced to 4 months in prison in January 1997. In June 1997, the appeal court reduced the sentence to 2 months with a 3-year suspension period. The renovation work of the mosque was interrupted but could be resumed in October.

On the island of Zakynthos, Mr. Korianitis, a Greek-American evangelical believer, has been harassed by the local Orthodox clergy since 1997. He is accused of proselytism and of operating a church without a license.

In Larissa, the municipality still refuses to issue a building permit for the construction of a Kingdom Hall. The case is pending at the Council of State. The hearing fixed on May 19, 1998 was postponed.

However, these are only isolated cases and Greek Jehovah's Witnesses report that since 1996, the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs has granted them almost all the building permits they have requested.

Manoussakis case only concerns Greece, as there are no other such laws in countries that have signed the European Convention. However, the Pasok government has drawn the lesson from this decision and other ones in religious matters and is changing its policy. In another case of vital importance declared admissible by the European Court of Human Rights (Gabriel Tsavachidis v. Greece/ Case n° 117/1997/901/1113), the Greek State, which was anxious to avoid a new public condemnation in Strasbourg, asked Tsavachidis to conclude a friendly settlement. The case concerned allegations that Gabriel Tsavachidis, who was a Jehovah's Witness, had been placed under secret surveillance by the National Intelligence Service in the context of criminal proceedings against him for operating a church without the necessary permit in Kilkis.

Christian Association Jehovah's Witnesses v. Bulgaria

In the case **Christian Association Jehovah's Witnesses v. Bulgaria**, the European Commission held on July 3, 1997 that the de-registration and the subsequent banning of their association decided in 1993 by a government dominated by neo-communists was a breach of Article 9 of the European Convention. Consequently, the next government based on an alliance of democratic forces considered that a condemnation by the European Court would jeopardize its chances for entry into the European Union. On March 9, 1998, they concluded a friendly settlement with the Bulgarian Jehovah's Witnesses through which they were granted the status as a recognized religion.

Such a decision should deter any other country from de-registering not only Jehovah's Witnesses, but also other minority religions as well. Unfortunately, this is not the case in a number of former communist countries. In Armenia, in Uzbekistan, in Tajikistan, in

Kazakhstan, in Latvia, in Estonia and other former Soviet Republics, the tendency is to de-register minority religions under cover of revision in religious legislation but it is in Russia that the situation is the most serious. A Lutheran congregation in the Republic of Khakassia and a Protestant group have been de-registered while a trial aiming to ban the congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses in Moscow is pending. If they lose their battle in Moscow where they claim 10,000 members, then the door will be open to the banning of the 250,000 Jehovah's Witnesses throughout Russia first and followed by other minority religions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In the aftermath of each of the above decisions made in Strasbourg, no domestic law was abolished or reformed. Some experts regret that the European Court condemned only the implementation of some controversial laws such as Dictator Metaxas' Laws of Necessity with regard to proselytism and the construction of non-Orthodox places of worship but it did not condemn such laws outright. Consequently, these laws remain in force and similar laws could be introduced in other European countries where they do not exist yet. From this point of view, the European Court decisions may be considered too timid and too weak. However, the psychological effect should not be underestimated.

The conservative government of Greece under which the Orthodox Church was untouchable lost all its cases pertaining to religious liberty in Strasbourg. The coming to power of the socialist party coincided with the beginning of a new policy. In the last case Tsavachidis v. Greece, the socialist government even anticipated the decision by proposing a friendly settlement.

In Bulgaria, a country that is applying for membership in the European Union and that takes great care of its image abroad, the change of government after the last elections also meant a change in the religious policy.

The Greek socialist government has at least given a good example of the lessons that should be drawn from verdicts given in Strasbourg: to inform the competent decision-makers about such verdicts and to advise them about the implementation of controversial laws that remain in force. However, the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs should also have taken appropriate measures so that the clergy of the Orthodox Church may be informed and educated as well in the new European mentality. Additionally, human rights organizations should campaign for a moratorium on Metaxas' Laws in Greece until their abolition and should promote the publicity of Strasbourg's decisions about proselytism in other countries such as Russia, where it is an issue and where the propagation of one's religious beliefs might be criminalized.

The condemnation of Jehovah's Witnesses in Bulgaria should also enjoy the same publicity in other member states of the Council of Europe, especially in Central and Eastern Europe.

The decision taken in the Hoffmann case v. Austria has unfortunately not been publicized throughout the 40 member states of the Council of Europe which are all increasingly concerned by that sort of situation. And this raises an important issue: there is no binding European mechanism to inform or to ask the member states to inform their respective relevant institutions and jurisdictions about Strasbourg's decisions. This will be the task of the next millennium.

London, Imperial College
January 6, 1998