

BYU Law Review

Volume 2002 | Issue 2


Article 3

5-1-2002

The Attitude of Belgian Authorities Toward New Religious Movements

Adelbert Denaux

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/lawreview>

 Part of the [Comparative and Foreign Law Commons](#), [New Religious Movements Commons](#), and the [Religion Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Adelbert Denaux, *The Attitude of Belgian Authorities Toward New Religious Movements*, 2002 BYU L. Rev. 237 (2002).
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/lawreview/vol2002/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Brigham Young University Law Review at BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in BYU Law Review by an authorized editor of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu.

The Attitude of Belgian Authorities Toward New Religious Movements

*Adelbert Denaux**

I. LEGAL FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN BELGIUM

The Belgian Constitution of 1831 guarantees the freedom of worship and the freedom to practice one's religion in public.¹ These freedoms impliedly extend to those who choose not to believe in or practice any religion: "No one can be obliged to contribute in any way whatsoever to the acts and ceremonies of a religion, nor to observe the days of rest."² The only restriction on religious liberty in Belgium is that one cannot commit offenses under the guise of exercising one's right to worship.³

Belgium also protects the freedom of religion and belief through its ratification of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 1950.⁴ Similar to the Belgian Constitution, the Convention provides that "[e]veryone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom . . . to change his religion or belief and freedom, to manifest his religion or belief, in worship, teaching, practice and observance."⁵ The Convention's right to religion is limited by language similar to that of the Belgian Constitution:

Nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and free

* Professor Bible Department, Faculty of Theology, Catholic University, Leuven (Belgium).

1. *See* BELG. CONST. art. 19.

2. *Id.* art. 20.

3. *See id.* art. 19.

4. *See* BARRY E. CARTER & PHILLIP R. TRIMBLE, INTERNATIONAL LAW: SELECTED DOCUMENTS 472 (1999–2000 ed. 1999).

5. European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, *opened for signature* Nov. 4, 1950, art. 9, para. 1, 213 U.N.T.S. 222.

doms set forth herein or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in the Convention.⁶

These fundamental legal sources constitute the foundation for freedom of religion in Belgium. Belgium's recent initiatives regarding New Religious Movements ("NRMs") are not intended to challenge these fundamental rights in any way, nor should they be interpreted as such.

Part II of this article discusses the actions Belgium has taken regarding NRMs, including the establishment of the Information and Advice Center Concerning Harmful Sectarian Organizations ("Center"). Part III clarifies the meaning of the controversial term "harmful sectarian organization." Part IV describes the functions of the Center, and Part V provides an example of the Center's work by describing its research and recommendations regarding the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Part VI concludes that Belgium has made some noble efforts in regards to NRMs, one of which is the creation of the Center.

II. ESTABLISHMENT AND LEGAL STATUS OF THE INFORMATION AND ADVICE CENTER CONCERNING HARMFUL SECTARIAN ORGANIZATIONS

Following the mass suicide of seventy-four members of the "Temple Solaire," a sect that included Doctor Luc Jouret, a Belgian citizen and one of two Temple Solaire leaders, Belgian authorities decided that it was their duty to protect Belgian citizens from the dangers associated with sectarian organizations.

A. Belgium's Actions Regarding Religions: The Creation of the Center

In 1996, authorities instigated a Parliamentary Commission of Investigation to scrutinize sects and NRMs in Belgium. The report of this parliamentary investigation ("Report") was presented to the Federal Parliament during the ordinary session of April 28, 1997.⁷ A

6. *Id.* art. 17.

7. *Enquête parlementaire visant à élaborer une politique en vue de lutter contre les pratiques illégales des sectes et le danger qu'elles représentent pour la société et pour les personnes, particulièrement les mineurs d'âge, Rapport Fait au nom de la Commission D'Enquete par MM. Duquesne & Willems*, Chambre de Representants de Belgique, Session Ordinaire 1996-1997, 49th Legislature (28 Avril 1997) [hereinafter *Enquête Parlementaire*]. This work reports the investigation into the "Temple Solaire," led by M. Bulthé, dean of the examining magistrates

synoptic list of all groups that were dealt with during the discussions, without judging their sectarian or harmful character, was added as an appendix to the Report. Perhaps without understanding the purpose of the synoptic list, the media has greatly publicized and criticized this so-called “list of 189 sects.” However, the introduction to the list explicitly states the following:

This enumeration constitutes neither an acceptance of position nor a value judgment on the part of the Commission. Hence, the fact that a group appears in the list, even on the initiative of any state authority, does not mean that the Commission supposes it to be a sect or, *a fortiori*, to be harmful.⁸

Nonetheless, it must be admitted publishing such a list was imprudent and could give rise to interpretations that the listed organizations were dangerous, an interpretation not intended by the Report’s drafters.⁹

The Belgian Parliament did not intend to target specific sects by providing a synoptic table. In fact, in its ordinary session of May 7, 1997, the Belgian Parliament accepted the following motion: “The House of Representatives . . . approves the ‘Conclusions and Recommendations’ of the Commission of Investigation . . . [and d]ecides that the ‘Synoptic Table’ is not part of these conclusions

of the Court of First Instance of Brussels. *See 2 id.* at 5–50.

8. *2 id.* at 227. The original French text reads as follows:

Cette énumération ne constitue donc ni une prise de position, ni un jugement de valeur de la part de la commission. Ainsi, le fait pour un mouvement d’y figurer, même si c’est à l’initiative d’une instance officielle, ne signifie pas que pour la commission, il soit une secte, et *a fortiori* qu’il soit dangereux.

2 Id.

9. The author of this paper was invited by the Commission as an academic expert who warned, *in tempore non suspecto*, against the publication of such a list:

Professor Denaux is not personally favourably disposed to the establishment of a list of sects, such as exists in France. He fears that this would rapidly degenerate into a witch hunt, because once placed on the list, the religious grouping will often be considered *a priori* as a sect and could not but with difficulty, prove the opposite.

1 *Enquête Parlementaire, supra* note 7, at 76.

The original French text reads as follows:

Le professeur Denaux n’est personnellement pas favorable à l’établissement d’une liste de sectes, telle qu’elle existe en France. Il craint que cela ne dégénère rapidement en une chasse aux sorcières, parce qu’une fois sur la liste, le groupement religieux sera souvent considéré *a priori* comme une secte et ne pourra que difficilement apporter la preuve de contraire.

1 *Id.*

and is, therefore, not the object of any approval or disapproval of the House.”¹⁰ The careful wording of this motion showed that the House of Representatives did not approve of the entire Report, but only its conclusions and recommendations and that the House clearly excluded the synoptic table from any approval or disapproval.

Unfortunately, the rumor that Belgium had established a list of 189 sects had already spread widely and has been the target of much criticism in reports and statements, both in Belgium and abroad. For instance, some human rights organizations alleged that Belgian authorities were in fact using the synoptic table as a “list of sects” to target NRMs. However, when queried for evidence, these organizations could not verify their assertions. Some NRMs and minority religions also complained that their inclusion in the list has damaged their reputation or made them suspect in the eyes of others. In certain cases, a group’s inclusion in the list has allegedly been a basis for discriminatory treatment against them. In any case, the unfortunate result of the list’s bad publicity was that the rest of the investigative Report did not get the attention it really deserved.

One year after the publication of the Report, the Law of June 2, 1998 (“Law”),¹¹ established an Information and Advice Center

10. DOC. PARL. CH. S-O 1996–1997, 313/9 – 95/96, at 2390. The complete and full text is as follows:

Motion adopted in full session. The House of Representatives, after having heard the presentation of the reporters and the discussion concerning the parliamentary investigation with the goal toward elaborating a political system aimed at fighting against the practices of sects and the danger that they represent for the society and for the person, particularly minors: (1) Takes cognizance of the Report of the Investigating Commission; (2) approves the “Conclusions and Recommendations” of the Commission of Investigation offered in part six of its Report; (3) decides that the “Synoptic Table” is not part of these conclusions and is, therefore, not the object of any approval or disapproval of the House.

Id. The complete and original French text is as follows:

Motion adoptée en séance plénière. La Chambre des Représentants, après avoir entendu l’exposé des rapporteurs et la discussion concernant l’enquête parlementaire visant à élaborer une politique en vue de lutter contre les pratiques illégales des sectes et le danger qu’elles représentent pour la société et pour les personnes, particulièrement les mineurs d’âge: 1. Prend connaissance du rapport de la Commission d’enquête; 2. Approuve les “conclusions et recommandations” telles que reprises dans la sixième partie (des pages 208 à 226); 3. Décide que le “Tableau synoptique” ne fait pas partie de ces conclusions et ne fait donc pas l’objet d’une quelconque approbation ou désapprobation par la Chambre.

Id.

11. The official title of this law is *Loi Portant Creation d’un Centre d’Information et d’Avis sur les Organisations Sectaires visibles et d’une Cellule Administrative de Coordination de*

Concerning Harmful Sectarian Organizations (“Center,” “IACSSO,” or “CIAOSN”)¹² together with the Administrative Agency for the Coordination of the Fight Against Harmful Sectarian Organizations (“Agency”).¹³ This Law is a result of the recommendations of the Parliamentary Commission of Investigation “aiming to elaborate upon a policy created to combat the illegal practices of cults and the danger they represent to society and to the individual, and especially to minors.”¹⁴ The Center is more reflexive in nature, while the Agency is more operational. In establishing those two bodies, the drafters implemented a recommendation of the Parliamentary Commission—to establish an “independent observatory.”¹⁵ However, the legislators consciously avoided the name “observatory” and did not give the Center the capacity to sue.¹⁶ The two institutions are required by the Law to collaborate.

The Center is linked to the Ministry of Justice¹⁷—it relies on the ministry to meet its needs with respect to personnel, location, infrastructure, and daily work. Because the state, through the Ministry of Justice, supports the Center, a need for a level of independence exists. The Law requires this independence as well as objectivity and impartiality.¹⁸ In fact, the Center is functionally independent and is not integrated in the hierarchical structure of the ministry. Specifically, its members are chosen by a two-thirds majority of the House of Parliament, not the Ministry.¹⁹ Additionally, the Center has the prerogative to formulate, on its own initiative, advice and recommendations for the authorities. The Center is also independent in re-

la Lutte Contre les Organisations Sectaires Nuisibles [Law Creating a Center of Information and Advice Concerning Harmful Sectarian Organizations and an Administrative Agency to Coordinate the Fight Against Harmful Sects]. Law No. F. 98-3121, June 2, 1998, C – 98/09893 [hereinafter Law]. This law can be found in MONITEUR BELGE, Nov. 25, 1998, at 37,824. The full text of the Law is provided in the appendix of this article.

12. The official French name of the center is the Centre d’Information et d’Avis sur les Organisations Sectaires Nuisibles (“CIAOSN”) and the Dutch name is Informatie–en Adviescentrum inzake Schadelijke Sektarische Organisaties (“IACSSO”). Law, *supra* note 11, art. 3.

13. The French name of this agency is the Cellule Administrative de Coordination de la Lutte Contre les Organisations Sectaires Nuisibles. *Id.*

14. *See Enquête Parlementaire, supra* note 7.

15. *See 2 id.* at 226.

16. *See* DOC. PARL. CH. S-O 1997–1998, 1198/4 – 96/97, at 8.

17. According to the Law, “[a]n independent center associated with the Justice Ministry . . . will be created.” Law, *supra* note 11, art. 3.

18. *See id.* art. 4, § 2.

19. *See id.* art. 4, § 1.

lation to the sects themselves as well as the anti-cult organizations. It is neither the mouthpiece of the government nor of the pressure groups of any kind.

The mission of the Center is not to fight against the phenomenon of sects but, rather, to study and analyze it.²⁰ The Center forms its own objectives and critical opinions about the phenomenon of sects on the basis of study and reflection and on the basis of exhaustive documentation, which the Center judiciously gathers. The Center does not have the capacity to intervene in the domain of public order; nevertheless, it has the right to communicate its observations concerning the issue of sectarian deviations to the political authorities.²¹ This independence, prescribed by the Law,²² also offers the best guarantee for the Center's objectivity.

B. The Legal Status of the Center

A few months after the Chamber of Representatives appointed the members of the Center, the Belgian Anthroposophical Association (followers of R. Steiner) filed an action in the Arbitration Court, Belgium's constitutional court, to petition the cancellation of the Law. The Association alleged that the Law violated certain principles, rights, and liberties contained in the Constitution. Specifically, the Association claimed that the Law violated principles of equal treatment under the law as well as the principle of nondiscrimination. Moreover, they argued that it violated the freedom of worship; the freedom of opinion; the freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; the freedom of expression; and the freedom of education.

The court rejected the Association's request to cancel the Law and, instead, confirmed that the Law creating the Center and the Agency was in full agreement with the principle of equality among citizens.²³ The court declared:

the competencies attributed to the Center do not, by any means, endanger the freedom of worship, public practice of the latter, as well as freedom to demonstrate one's opinions on all matters guaranteed by article 19 of the Constitution nor the freedom of thought, conscience and religion or the freedom of expression

20. *See id.* art. 6.

21. *See id.* art. 6, § 1(4).

22. *See id.* art. 4, § 2.

23. *See* Arbitration Court [Constitutional Court], M.B. Mar. 21, 2000, n° 31/2000.

guaranteed by articles 9 and 10 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights.²⁴

The court also corroborated its decision by referring to the recommendation of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe on the illegal activities of cults:

It is of prime importance to have reliable information on these groups that emanates neither exclusively from the cults themselves, nor from associations set up to defend the victims of cults, and to circulate widely among the general public, once those concerned have had the chance to comment on the objectivity of such information.²⁵

This significant judgment reinforced the legitimacy of both the Center and the Agency. In the remainder of this article, I will mostly address issues concerning the Center.²⁶

III. OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF “HARMFUL SECTARIAN ORGANIZATION”

Many might ask what the Belgian law means by “harmful sectarian organization” (“HSO”). The Law refers to:

all groups having a philosophical or religious vocation, or making such a claim, which, in their structure or practices, engage in harmful, illegal activities, harm individuals or the society, or violate human dignity.

The harmful nature of a sectarian organization is examined on the basis of the principles contained in the Constitution, the laws, the decrees, and regulations, and the international conventions for the protection of human rights ratified by Belgium.²⁷

The meaning of the term “HSO” should also be ascertained in the light of the discussion held in the parliamentary commission. The commission formulated its conclusion by making a distinction between three types of organizations: “(i) sects in the strict sense[,], (ii) harmful sectarian organizations[, and] (iii) associations of evildo-

24. *Id.*

25. *Id.*

26. The author of this article has been nominated the chair of this commission by the House of Representatives.

27. Law, *supra* note 11, art. 2.

ers.”²⁸ The first category of sects is generally classified under the sociology of religion and commonly calls the sects New Religious Movements. The commission prudently avoided taking a position in the endless discussion about the definition of what constitutes a sect or a cult.²⁹ It gives a rather general description of how it understands the word “sect,” namely a “group having a philosophical or religious vocation.”³⁰ It even mentions the possibility that certain groups may “pose as such,” meaning that there are organizations whose philosophical or religious outlook is but a cover for other purposes.³¹

The third category, “associations of evildoers,”³² falls under criminal law. The second category, called “harmful sectarian organizations,” located somewhere between the two extremes, is also defined according to criminological criteria.

The commission also proposed a set of criteria allowing the Center to qualify a sectarian organization as “harmful” or to present evidence of their harmful behavior.³³ The commission accepted this criminological definition without recommending that the legislature adopt any legal definition of a sect.

Currently the definition of an HSO appears in only two laws: the Organic Law of the Security Services of November 30, 1998—under which an HSO is considered a possible threat to the State or to the democratic order—and the Law of June 2, 1998, which establishes the Center. From this observation, it becomes clear that the legislature has yet to provide a legal definition of “sect.” The legislature was not interested in giving a definition, but rather it was interested in sects only insofar as they are harmful (“harmful” being defined in a criminological sense).

The Report of the Parliamentary Commission of Investigation listed thirteen criteria that aid in determining whether a sectarian organization is harmful.³⁴ According to the Law establishing the Cen-

28. 2 *Enquête Parlementaire*, *supra* note 7, at 99.

29. *See* 2 *id.*

30. 2 *id.*

31. 2 *id.* at 99–100.

32. 2 *id.* at 101.

33. *See* 2 *id.* at 100–01.

34. 2 *id.* The criteria are:

misleading or abusive recruiting methods; the use of mental manipulation; physical or mental (psychological) mistreatment inflicted upon the followers or upon their family members; the deprivation of adequate medical care for the followers or for their family members; violence, especially of a sexual nature, towards the followers,

ter, a determination of harmfulness must be based in “the principles contained in the Constitution, the laws, the decrees and regulations, and the international conventions for the protection of human rights ratified by Belgium.”³⁵

While it is rather easy to identify the principles contained in the Constitution and in the Conventions for the Protection of Human Rights, it is not always so with respect to laws, decrees, and regulations. According to the Law’s intention, only those laws, decrees, and regulations are to be taken into consideration, the disobedience of which constitutes engaging in an “illegal, harmful activity,” which brings harm to individuals and to society or violates one’s human dignity.³⁶ An operational definition of an HSO may result from combining the nonexhaustive criteria for “being harmful” given in the Report of the Parliamentary Commission of Investigation³⁷ with the legal principles enumerated in Article 2 of the Law. This definition functions as a reference definition for the daily work of the members of the Center and of its secretariat. The notions of “dangerousness” and “harmfulness” connote a probability of danger or harm. The investigation of the harmful character of a sectarian organization would thus amount to a risk assessment. Such an evaluation would be based on concrete evidence of harmful behavior as well as on the intrinsic characteristics of the organization when clear evidence is absent.

In reality, all the criteria used to determine whether a sect is harmful describe crimes, delinquencies, or infractions sanctioned by the law. The definition of “harmful” as given in the law is not a legal definition in the proper sense but is a criminological definition.

When using these criteria, one must also take into consideration the fact that “each criterion is weighted differently.” Certain criteria

their families, a third party or even children; the imposed separation of followers from their families, their spouses, their children, their relatives and their friends; the kidnapping or removal of children from their parents; the denial of the liberty to leave the movement; disproportionate financial demands, fraud and misappropriation of funds and possessions to the detriment of the followers; the abusive exploitation of the work provided by the members; the complete separation from democratic society presented as evil; the goal of destroying society to profit the movement; [and] the use of illegal methods to usurp power.

2 *id.*

35. Law, *supra* note 11, art. 2.

36. *See id.*

37. *See 2 Enquête Parlementaire, supra* note 7, at 99–101.

allude to more important infractions than others. In order to put together an opinion about a movement, it is not enough to add up different criteria in the effort to determine its possible harmfulness. Rather, the criteria should be considered as indicators for a global evaluation, a kind of risk assessment.

IV. TASKS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE CENTER

The name of the Center clearly indicates its principal missions: information and official advice—information for the public and advice for the authorities.³⁸ The specific tasks assigned to the Center are:

1. To study the phenomenon of harmful sectarian organizations in Belgium as well as their international connections;
2. To organize a Documentation Center accessible to the general public;
3. To ensure that the public has access to the Center and its resources; and to inform all those who approach the Center about their rights and duties, and about the ways in which they can pursue their rights; and
4. To provide, on its own initiative or at the request of any public authority, advice about the phenomenon of harmful sectarian organizations and, more specifically, about government policy concerning the protection of the public against the dangers of such organizations.³⁹

Further, the Center provides both support and guidance to Belgian institutions, organizations, and legal advisors as requested by the Law.⁴⁰ In short, the missions of the Center are study and reflection, documentation and information, legal help to the general public, and advice and recommendations to the authorities.

The Center is also limited in some respects. For instance, it is not entitled to counsel or give psychological help (it can, of course, refer individuals to specialized services), nor can it sue someone, take a

38. For more information, see CIAOSN RAPPORT BISANNUUEL ANNÉES 1999–2000, (Brussels 2001).

39. See Law, *supra* note 11, art. 6, § 1.

40. See *id.* art. 6, § 2(4).

matter to court, or give NRMs a certificate of good conduct.⁴¹

The Center's administrative body consists of twelve effective members and twelve substitute members who come from academic, political, and legal fields and relevant organizations. These members possess a renowned knowledge in the area of religion and sects.⁴² The House of Representatives nominates the members from lists submitted by the government and by the House. The House then chooses the president of the Center, as well as his/her substitute, from the nominated members.⁴³ The originality of the system is that the members represent, by the diversity of their professional, academic, and socio-cultural background, the different components of civil society. Their intellectual approach is therefore rich, and their opinions are formulated on a much broader basis.

A secretariat, in Brussels, is attached to the Center. The secretariat's team is currently comprised of eight full-time employees, including a director.⁴⁴ The secretariat's main task is to implement the decisions and orientations of the Center and to assist the Center in the fulfilling its missions. The Secretariat is made up of people possessing academic degrees from diverse fields, such as law, political science, sociology, theology, criminology, and psychology. Each member is recruited according to his or her specific credentials relating to the subject in question. Here also, the diversity of the members' training is another benefit leading to a responsible and scientific approach towards the phenomenon of sects.

The Center has created a library containing specialized works and periodicals, including computer and audiovisual support, in order to make it a reference library specializing in NRMs for the Western Europe. The legal and jurisprudential aspect is particularly studied. The purpose of establishing a library is to create a reference center for researchers and for scholars who train educators and future teachers who themselves the public as a whole. The Center's library and its documentation are also directly accessible to the public, ena-

41. *See id.* art. 6, § 2(5); DOC. PARL. CH. S-O 1997-1998, 1198/4 - 96/97, at 8.

42. *See Law, supra* note 11, art. 4, § 1.

43. *See id.*

44. The secretariat may be reached at the following address: IACSSO/CIAOSN (Belgium), 139 rue Haute, 1000 - Bruxelles, Belgique // Hoogstraat 139, 1000 Brussel, België; tel.: +32/(0)2/ 504.91.68; fax: +32/(0)2/ 513.83.94; direction: +32/(0)2/504.91.66; e-mail: CIAOSN@just.fgov.be; Chair: Adelbert Denaux; Supplying Chair: Henri de Cordes; Director Secretariat: Eric Brasseur.

bling them to form critical opinions based upon a wide range of pertinent references. The Center is currently drafting leaflets providing objective information concerning NRMs as well as addressing problems that could be related to some of these groups. Meticulous documentation is, of course, the indispensable means by which the Center carries out its missions of providing information and advice. The Center also maintains a confidential system of documentation with files that are inaccessible to third parties.

Because Belgium has traditionally been a country with only one majority religion—namely Roman Catholicism—there is a considerable lack of knowledge of other world religions and of NRMs among common people and even among some authorities. Moreover, the phenomenon of NRMs or sects, whether harmful or not, is a complex, diverse, and ever-evolving reality. In fact, from July 2000 to September 2001, the secretariat received requests for information concerning 154 different groups or religious movements.

The issue of sects is a controversial one. There are various, sometimes diametrically opposed, opinions about sects. Thus, there is a great need for reliable, objective, and vital information about NRMs—a need that the Center can meet. In order to gain as much objectivity as possible, the Center tries to build a network of contacts with all parties involved. Such contacts comprise the general public and include parents or friends of members of NRMs, official authorities in Belgium and abroad, the Administrative Coordination Agency, academia (representing varied approaches), comparable official centers abroad, the NRMs at issue, cult-watching groups, human rights groups, and the media. The Center tries to listen to all these voices, believing that no single voice holds the complete truth.

In September 2000, the secretariat began the tasks of building its infrastructure, organizing its research work, and fulfilling its mission to provide information. The secretariat has given priority to answering the public's requests and is contacted daily by the public, requesting information about specific movements. Generally, citizens have questions about groups that have attracted attention because of the group's questionable activities or because the citizen has relatives or friends that joined a group that the citizen considers dangerous. By providing answers to these individuals, the Center is able to prevent misunderstanding.

It should be noted that the Center is only allowed to give formal advice about the harmfulness of a NRM to the authorities, at its own

initiative or at the request of the authorities. To private citizens seeking information, the secretariat provides an objective dossier⁴⁵ about the group in question as well as a set of criteria that one can use to assess the possible dangers of the group.

The Center collects information about NRMs according to set criteria.⁴⁶ The Center offers the private citizens the information needed to make an informed personal judgment.

Given the fact that there are hundreds of NRMs or minority religions, it is not possible to say a priori whether a group is or is not dangerous. Such a determination is only possible on the basis of a documented dossier and an evaluation of all aspects of the NRM. Hence, it makes no sense to ask the Center for a list of sects that are or are not dangerous. In fact, the Law explicitly prohibits drawing up a list of harmful sects.⁴⁷

In most cases, those seeking information about NRMs are either sincerely interested in learning more or are in a situation of distress. However, the secretariat has recently observed that some people are trying to use its services for personal purposes: to obtain information to use in legal proceedings, mainly in divorce and child custody cases. Additionally, some groups that, rightly or mistakenly, feel targeted by the Center's efforts ask formal questions of the Center about their group in order to create a preliminary case file for possible hostile action against the Center.

Since its inception, the members of the Center have given one recommendation and two pieces of advice to the authorities. The first formal advice was provided to the Minister of Internal Affairs about the European Federation of Centers for Research on Sectarianism;⁴⁸ the advice proved advantageous to the Federation. The sec-

45. The following sources are used to compose a dossier in response to questions: (1) if possible, a dossier already present in the Secretariat; (2) official reports from different countries; (3) published literature from or about the group in question; (4) jurisprudence about the group on national and international levels; (5) the *Moniteur Belge* (e.g., statutes of societies without purpose for gain); (6) data on Internet; and (7) information coming from the NRM (at the Center's request).

46. For each group we gather data about: (1) history; (2) doctrine; (3) ethics; (4) rituals; (5) organization; (6) daily life; (7) profile of members; (8) method of recruiting; (9) relations with the outside world; (10) problems and/or criteria of harmfulness; (11) useful addresses; and (12) bibliography.

47. See Law, *supra* note 11, art. 6, § 4. The information given by the Center at the request of the public is based upon the documentation that is at the Center's disposal and may not be presented in the form of lists of systematic surveys of HSOs. See *id.*

48. The French name of the organization is Fédération Européenne des Centres de Re-

ond advice was given to the Service of Foreigners and concerned the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the text of which will be quoted hereafter. Additionally, the Center has recommended the inclusion of new legal dispositions in the penal code that would punish individuals who take advantage of people in a situation of physical or psychological weakness.⁴⁹

Finally, it must be remembered that the Center is required to actively collaborate with the Administrative Agency for Coordination of the Fight Against Harmful Sectarian Organizations. This Agency brings together representatives from various departments that deal in some way with the issue of harmful sectarian organizations.⁵⁰

cherches et d'Information sur le Sectarisme ("FÉCRIS"). The advice was given on June 20, 2000.

49. This suggestion was made on December 18, 2000.

50. Lois, Decrets, Ordonnances et Reglements, F.98-3277, s-c- 98/09981, (Nov. 8, 1998), art. 1 [Royal Decree]. The decree established the composition, the functioning, and the organization of the Administrative Coordination Agency. It defines the composition as such:

La Cellule administrative de coordination créée par l'article 13 de la loi du 2 juin 1998 est composée de la manière suivante: un représentant du Collège des procureurs généraux; un magistrat national; un représentant de la Gendarmerie; un représentant de la Police judiciaire; un représentant de la Police générale du Royaume du Ministère de l'intérieur; un représentant du Ministère de la Fonction publique; un représentant de l'administration de la Sûreté de l'Etat; un représentant de la Direction générale de la Législation civile et des Cultes du Ministère de la Justice; un représentant de la Direction générale de la Législation pénale et des droits de l'homme du Ministère de la Justice; un représentant du Service de la Politique criminelle du Ministère de la Justice; une représentant du Ministère de l'Intérieur; un représentant du Ministère des Finances; un représentant du Ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail; un représentant du Ministère de la Défense Nationale.

Id.

The English translation is as follows:

The Administrative Agency for the Coordination of the Fight against Harmful Sectarian Organizations established by Article 13 of the Law of June 2, 1998 will be composed as follows: a representative of the General State Attorney's Office; a national judge; a representative of the gendarmery; a representative of the criminal police; a representative of the General Police of the Kingdom with the Ministry of the Interior; a representative of the Ministry for Civil Service; a representative of the State Security Administration; a representative of the General Directorate of Civil Legislation and Culture of the Ministry of Justice; a representative of the General Directorate of Criminal Legislation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Justice; a representative of the Department of Criminal Police of the Ministry of Justice; a representative of the Ministry of the Interior; a representative of the Ministry of Revenue; a representative of the Ministry of Employment and Labor; a representative of the Ministry of National Defense.

Id.

V. A CONCRETE CASE: ADVICE CONCERNING THE CHURCH
OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

The Center's advice to Belgian authorities concerning the Church of Jesus Christ of Later-day Saints provides one of the most significant illustrations as to how the Center works. The advice was given at the request of the Ministry of Internal Affairs concerning the possible risks or danger that could emerge by granting visas to missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Before drafting its advice, the Center studied the issue by reviewing many documents. The Center also sent an inquiry to Latter-day Saint (also known as Mormon) officials in Belgium, requesting information to help clarify certain matters. Although the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints did reply to the inquiry, the response was received too late and therefore not included in the formal advice given to the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The full text of the Center's advice ran as follows:

Considering principally that:

1. the official reports from the investigating commissions on cults in Belgium, France, Switzerland, Germany, Canada do not contain negative elements against the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints;
2. in European countries, to the knowledge of the CIAOSN, there is no published court order which condemns the movement for one or other infraction of the law;

[C]onsidering that, on the particular matters that have been subject to certain public controversies:

3. the social and religious control do not appear to be of such a nature that would force all the young members to fulfill a missionary internship for two years. Statistics show that only 33% of the young men and 5% of the young women practice that function. According to Mormon websites, the choice is free;
4. the founding texts of the Church contain affirmations that may qualify as racist. But in practice we see that these affirmations are not in use anymore (i.e., regarding the "blacks");
5. the attitude towards women does not fit the European and in-

ternational evolution in matters of equality between men and women;

6. regarding the subject of polygamy, in its infancy, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints accepted and promoted the practice of it and that, after some conflicts (sometimes violent ones) against American States, the Church has officially given up polygamy (and its practice) and in fact has made of it a reason for excommunication. Nevertheless, some individuals or dissident movements remain attached to that practice now condemned by the Church;

7. although, at first, the movement promoted a clearly theocratic model, through time the movement has adapted to and integrated the democratic system of the USA, and other democratic countries;

8. the official doctrine applies a fundamentalist reading of the founding texts, without accepting a historical critical approach to the sources (i.e. their view on the origins of the world – the refusal of evolutionism – and on the origin of the movement; the exclusion of certain historians from the movement).

On the basis of these depositions, the Center for Information and Advice on Harmful Sectarian Organizations estimates that, in the actual circumstances in Belgium, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints does not present any of the particular risks according to the “Article 2 of the Law of 2 June 1998” leading to the creation of a Center for Information and Advice on Harmful Sectarian Organizations and of an Administrative Staff for coordinating the campaign against harmful cultist organizations.

This actual opinion does in no mean preset judgement on any ulterior evolution of the movement or of the individuals who form the group.⁵¹

The advice was sent to the addressed requester, as well as to the official representatives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Belgium, and its language is clear. The Center has received no comment in response to this formal advice.

In this respect, I would like to remind the reader that only Belgian authorities can ask for an advice. This can neither be done by

51. MONITEUR BELGE, Nov. 25, 1998, at 37,824.

the general public nor by the NRMs themselves (which are considered a part of the public) nor by their lawyers dealing with cases concerning the NRMs. This concrete example of the Center's approach to the phenomenon of New Religious Movements offers a fair account of what the Center's work involves.

VI. CONCLUSION

I hope to have given a fair description of the real situation regarding the treatment of sects and NRMs in Belgium. Belgium has an original solution to thwarting HSOs. This article outlines Belgium's critical and responsible model, a model without prejudices or unwarranted influences and that can withstand the test of external opinions.

Belgium has not established a slavish copy of what is happening in other European countries regarding NRMs. Belgian laws have their own context and aims. In its approach, Belgium has attempted to avoid two extremes. On the one hand, it does not hold the "angelic" and naive position that there are no problems in the field of NRMs. Hence, it accepts the possibility of sectarian deviations and even the real existence of harmful sectarian organizations (e.g. the Ordre du Temple Solaire). On the other hand, it does not wish to organize a witch-hunt against sects or NRMs, as if everything new and strange in the field of religion were dangerous or harmful.

The existence of the Belgian Information and Advice Center is due to the kingdom's House of Representatives and to the ad hoc Parliamentary Commission of investigation whose Report has been often quoted but, I fear, seldom read. A close examination of the Center demonstrates that most of its daily efforts go toward providing a specialized library through which the Center can inform the public about sects and NRMs. The purpose in providing this information is to enable Belgians to make their own critical judgments about the different sects and NRMs.

Who could, on reasonable grounds, be against such a project?

Appendix

2 JUIN 1998. - Loi portant création d'un Centre d'information et d'avis sur les organisations sectaires nuisibles et d'une Cellule administrative de coordination de la lutte contre les organisations sectaires nuisibles.

ALBERT II, Roi des Belges,
A tous, présents et à venir, Salut.
Les Chambres ont adopté et Nous sanctionnons ce qui suit :

CHAPITRE I. – *Dispositions préliminaires.*

Article 1. La présente loi règle une matière visée à l'article 78 de la Constitution.

Art. 2. Pour l'application de la présente loi, on entend par organisation sectaire nuisible, tout groupement à vocation philosophique ou religieuse, ou se prétendant tel, qui, dans son organisation ou sa pratique, se livre à des activités illégales dommageables, nuit aux individus ou à la société ou porte atteinte à la dignité humaine.

Le caractère nuisible d'un groupement sectaire est examiné sur base des principes contenus dans la Constitution, les lois, décrets et ordonnances et les conventions internationales de sauvegarde des droits de l'homme ratifiées par la Belgique.

CHAPITRE II. – *Centre d'Information et d'Avis sur les organisations sectaires nuisibles.*

Art. 3. Il est institué auprès du ministère de la Justice un centre indépendant appelé "Centre d'Information et d'Avis sur les organisations sectaires nuisibles, dénommé ci-après le Centre."

Le siège du Centre est établi dans l'arrondissement administratif de "Bruxelles-Capitale."

Art. 4. § 1. Le Centre comprend douze membres effectifs et douze membres suppléants désignés par la Chambre des représentants à la majorité des deux tiers. Six membres effectifs et six mem-

bres suppléants sont désignés sur présentation du Conseil des ministres, deux candidats étant proposés pour chaque mandat à conférer.

Aussi bien pour les membres désignés directement par la Chambre que pour ceux désignés sur présentation du Conseil des ministres, la parité linguistique entre les membres d'expression néerlandaise et les membres d'expression française est assurée.

Au moins un membre effectif et un membre suppléant possèdent une connaissance de la langue allemande.

La Chambre des représentants désigne parmi les membres effectifs le président et le président suppléant.

§ 2. Les membres sont désignés pour un terme de quatre ans, renouvelable une fois, parmi les personnalités éminentes réputées pour leur connaissance, leur expérience et leur intérêt pour la problématique des groupements sectaires nuisibles. Ils doivent offrir toutes les garanties leur permettant d'exercer leur mission avec indépendance et dans un esprit d'objectivité et d'impartialité.

Les membres effectifs et les membres suppléants peuvent être relevés de leur mandat par la Chambre des représentants, en cas de manquement à leurs devoirs ou d'atteinte à la dignité de leur fonction.

§ 3. Pour être désigné et rester membre effectif ou suppléant, les candidats doivent remplir les conditions suivantes:

1. jouir de leurs droits civils et politiques;
2. ne pas être membre du Parlement européen ou des Chambres législatives, ni d'un Conseil communautaire ou régional, ni du gouvernement fédéral ou d'un gouvernement communautaire ou régional.

§ 4. Il est interdit aux membres du Centre d'être présents lors de la délibération sur les objets pour lesquels ils ont un intérêt personnel ou direct ou pour lesquels leurs parents ou alliés jusqu'au quatrième degré ont un intérêt personnel ou direct.

§ 5. En cas d'empêchement ou d'absence d'un membre effectif, il est remplacé par son suppléant.

Le membre effectif ou suppléant dont le mandat prend fin avant l'expiration du terme de quatre ans est remplacé, selon la procédure prévue au § 1er, par un membre effectif ou suppléant désigné pour le terme restant à courir.

Le Roi fixe les modalités de l'indemnisation des membres du Centre.

Art. 5. Le Centre établit son règlement d'ordre intérieur dans les deux mois de son installation. Il est soumis pour approbation à la Chambre des représentants.

Art. 6. § 1er. Le Centre est chargé des missions suivantes:

1. étudier le phénomène des organisations sectaires nuisibles en Belgique ainsi que leurs liens internationaux;

2. organiser un centre de documentation accessible au public;

3. assurer l'accueil et l'information du public et informer toute personne qui en fait la demande sur ses droits et obligations et sur les moyens de faire valoir ses droits;

4. formuler soit d'initiative, soit à la demande de toute autorité publique des avis et des recommandations sur le phénomène des organisations sectaires nuisibles et en particulier sur la politique en matière de lutte contre ces organisations.

§ 2. Pour l'accomplissement de ses missions, le Centre est habilité:

1. à rassembler toute information disponible;

2. à effectuer toutes les études ou recherches scientifiques nécessaires à l'exécution concrète de ses missions;

3. à recueillir tous fonds d'archives ou de documentation dont le sujet correspond à l'une de ses missions;

4. à assurer un soutien et une guidance à des institutions, organisations et dispensateurs d'aide juridique;

5. à consulter ou inviter à ses séances des associations et des personnes qualifiées dont l'audition lui paraît utile.

Pour l'accomplissement de ses missions, le Centre travaille en collaboration avec la Cellule administrative de coordination.

§ 3. Le Centre est pour l'accomplissement de ses missions visées au § 1er, 1 et 3, habilité à traiter des données à caractère personnel relatives aux opinions et aux activités philosophiques et religieuses visées à l'article 6 de la loi du 8 décembre 1992 relative à la protection de la vie privée à l'égard des traitements de données à caractère personnel.

Le Roi précise dans un arrêté délibéré en Conseil des ministres les garanties relatives à la confidentialité et à la sécurité des données à caractère personnel, le statut et les tâches d'un préposé à la protection des données au sein du Centre et la façon dont le Centre devra faire rapport à la Commission de la protection de la vie privée sur le traitement de données à caractère personnel.

§ 4. Les informations fournies par le Centre en réponse à une demande du public se fondent sur les renseignements dont il dispose et ne peuvent être présentées sous forme de listes ou relevés systématiques des organisations sectaires nuisibles.

Art. 7. Les avis et les recommandations du Centre sont motivés.

Les avis sont publics sauf décision contraire du Centre dûment motivée.

Art. 8. § 1er. Le Centre ne peut délibérer valablement que si la majorité de ses membres au moins est présente. Il décide à la majorité absolue. En cas de parité des voix, la voix du président, ou en cas d'empêchement, de son suppléant, est prépondérante.

Les avis adoptés reproduisent les divers points de vue exprimés.

§ 2. Le Centre peut disposer du compte rendu sténographique intégral des auditions publiques de la commission d'enquête parlementaire de la Chambre des représentants visant à élaborer une politique en vue de lutter contre les pratiques illégales des sectes et le danger qu'elle représentent pour la société et pour les personnes, particulièrement les mineurs d'âge.

Art. 9. Pour l'accomplissement de toutes ses missions, le Centre peut requérir le concours d'experts.

Le Roi fixe les modalités d'indemnisation de ces experts.

Art. 10. L'ensemble des personnes traitant des données confidentielles recueillies par le Centre est soumis au respect du secret professionnel tel que visé à l'article 458 du Code pénal. Cette obligation s'impose également à toute personne extérieure au Centre intervenant en qualité d'expert, d'enquêteur ou de collaborateur.

Art. 11. Le Centre présente tous les deux ans un rapport de ses activités. Ce rapport est adressé au Conseil des ministres, aux Chambres législatives et aux Conseils et Gouvernements des Régions et des Communautés.

Art. 12. Le Centre dispose d'un secrétariat.

Le personnel est mis à disposition par le ministre de la Justice, après avoir recueilli l'avis préalable du Centre.

Le personnel est mis sous l'autorité directe du président du Centre.

Les frais de fonctionnement du Centre sont à charge du budget du ministère de la Justice.

CHAPITRE III. – *Cellule administrative de coordination de la lutte contre les organisations sectaires nuisibles.*

Art. 13. Une Cellule administrative de coordination de la lutte contre les organisations sectaires nuisibles est créée auprès du Ministère de la Justice.

Art. 14. La Cellule administrative de coordination est présidée par le ministre de la Justice ou par son délégué.

Le Roi détermine la composition de la Cellule administrative de coordination par un arrêté délibéré en Conseil des ministres.

Art. 15. La Cellule administrative de coordination est chargée des missions suivantes :

1. Coordonner les actions menées par les services et autorités publics compétents;
2. Examiner l'évolution des pratiques illégales des organisations sectaires nuisibles;
3. Proposer des mesures de nature à améliorer la coordination et l'efficacité de ces actions;
4. Promouvoir une politique de prévention du public à l'encontre des activités des organisations sectaires nuisibles en concertation avec les administrations et services compétents;
5. Etablir une collaboration étroite avec le Centre et prendre les mesures nécessaires afin d'exécuter les propositions et recommandations du Centre.

Art. 16. Le Roi détermine les modalités relatives au fonctionnement et à l'organisation de la Cellule administrative de Coordination par un arrêté délibéré en Conseil des ministres.

Promulguons la présente loi, ordonnons qu'elle soit revêtue du sceau de l'Etat et publiée par le *Moniteur belge*.

Donné à Bruxelles, le 2 juin 1998.

ALBERT

Par le Roi :

Le Ministre de la Justice, T. VAN PARYS

Scellé du sceau de l'Etat :

Le Ministre de la Justice, T. VAN PARYS

The English translation is as follows:

June 2, 1998. - *Law for the creation of an Information and Advice Center Concerning Harmful Sectarian Organizations and an Administrative Agency for the Coordination of the Fight Against Harmful Sectarian Organizations.*

ALBERT II., King of the Belgians,
To all present and future, Our greetings.
The following has been accepted from the
chambers and is approved by Us.

CHAPTER I. – *Preliminary Determinations.*

Article 1. This law regulates a subject area earmarked by Article 78 of the Constitution.

Article 2. In the sense of this law, “harmful sectarian organization” means all groups having a philosophical or religious vocation, or making such a claim, which, in their structure or practices, engage in harmful, illegal activities, harm individuals or the society, or violate human dignity.

The harmful nature of a sectarian organization is examined on the basis of the principles contained in the Constitution, the laws, the decrees and regulations, and the international conventions for the protection of human rights ratified by Belgium.

CHAPTER II. – *Information and Advice Center Concerning Harmful Sectarian Organizations.*

Article 3. An independent center associated with the Justice Ministry with the designation of “Information and Advice Center Concerning Harmful Sectarian Organizations,” hereinafter referred to as “the Center,” will be created.

The main office of the Center will be established in the “Brussels Capital City” administrative district.

Article 4. § 1. The Center will consist of twelve effective mem-

bers and twelve substitute members, who will be appointed by the House of Representatives with a two-thirds majority. Six effective members and six substitute members will be appointed on recommendation by the ministerial Council, whereby two candidates will be recommended for every one position to be filled.

For the members appointed directly by the House as well as those appointed on recommendation from the ministerial Council, language parity between the Dutch-speaking and the French-speaking members will be maintained.

At least one effective and one substitute member will possess a knowledge of German.

The House of Representatives will appoint the chairman and the substitute chairman from the circle of the effective members.

§ 2. The members will be appointed for a term of four years, which can be renewed one time, from a group of prominent persons who are recognized for their knowledge of the problems of harmful sectarian organizations, their experiences therewith and their interest therein. They must offer all guarantees which enable them an independent, objective and unbiased fulfillment of their mission.

In case of non-fulfillment of their duties or transgression of the dignity of their office, effective or substitute members can be relieved of their assignments by the House of Representatives.

§ 3. In order to be appointed and remain effective or substitute members, the candidates must fulfill the following conditions:

1. they must be in possession of civil and political rights;
2. they may be neither a member of the European Parliament, nor of the legislative chamber, nor of a community or regional council, nor of the federal administration or of a community or regional administration.

§ 4. Members of the Center are prohibited from consulting in matters in which they have a personal or direct interest or in which

dependents or relatives of up to the fourth degree have a personal or direct interest.

§ 5. In the incapacity or absence of an effective member, the vacancy will be filled by his substitute. The effective or substitute member whose term ends before the expiration of the four year term will, in accordance with the procedure in § 1, be replaced by an effective or substitute member who will be appointed for the remainder of the term.

The King determines the particulars of the compensation of the Center's members.

Article 5. Within two months of its establishment, the Center will produce a system of doing of business. This will be presented for a vote to the House of Representatives.

Article 6. § 1. The Center is entrusted with the following missions:

1. to study the phenomenon of harmful sectarian organizations in Belgium as well as their international connections;
2. to organize a Documentation Center accessible to the general public.
3. to ensure that the public has access to the Center and its resources; and to inform all those who approach the Centre about their rights and duties, and about the ways in which they can pursue their rights.
4. to provide, on its own initiative or at the request of any public authority, advice about the phenomenon of harmful sectarian organizations and, more specifically, about government policy concerning the protection of the public against the dangers of such organizations.

§ 2. In the fulfillment of these missions, the Center is authorized:

1. to collect all information available;
2. to set up scientific studies or research required in the execution of these missions;
3. to put together any archive or documentation material whose theme relates to its missions;
4. to give support and counseling to establishments, organizations and legal advisors;
5. to consult or invite to its sessions associations and qualified persons whose presence appears useful to it;

In fulfillment of its missions, the Center will work together with the Administrative Agency of Coordination.

§ 3. In fulfillment of its mission in accordance with § 1 numbers 1 and 3, the Center is authorized to handle personally related data on the philosophical and religious opinions and activities in accordance with Article 6 of the Law of 8 December 1992 for the Protection of Private Life with respect to dealing with personally related data.

The King lays down in decree advised by the ministerial council the guarantees regarding the confidentiality and security of personally related data, the status and the mission of a Personal Protection Commissioner in the Center, as well and the style and means of how the Center will report to the Commission for the Protection of Private Life on the handling of personally related data.

§ 4. The information which the Center provides in response to public inquiry will be based on the information it has at hand, and may not be imparted in the form of lists or systematic exhibits on harmful sectarian organizations.

Article 7. Opinions and recommendations are to be founded.

Opinions are public, except when the Center, giving sufficient arguments, decides otherwise.

Article 8. § 1. The Center may make a valid decision only if the majority of its members are present. It makes its decisions with an absolute majority. In case of a tied vote, the vote of the chairman or, in his absence, his substitute, will be the deciding factor.

Accepted opinions display the diversely expressed standpoints.

§ 2. The Center has at its disposal the stenographic records of public hearings by the Parliamentary investigative committee of the House of Representatives aiming to elaborate upon a policy created to combat the illegal practices of cults and the danger they represent to society and to the individual, and especially to minors.

Article 9. In the fulfillment of all of its missions, the Center can call upon experts. The King will determine the compensation for these experts.

Article 10. All persons who deal with confidential, personally related data which the Center has collected will be subject to mandatory nondisclosure in accordance with Article 458 of the Penal Code. This requirement also applies to any outsider who is called upon by the Center as expert, opinion researcher or staff.

Article 11. Every two years, the center will present an activity report. This report will be distributed to the ministerial Council, to the legislative chambers and to the councils and administrations of regions and communities.

Article 12. The Center will have a secretariat at its disposal.

Personnel will be made available by the Minister of Justice, after having heard the preceding advice of the Center.

Personnel are placed under the direct authority of the chairman of the Center.

The Center's operating expenses will be deducted from the budget of the Justice Ministry.

CHAPTER III. – *Administrative Agency for the Coordination
of the Fight Against Harmful Sectarian Organizations
(Coordinating Staff)*.

Article 13. An Administrative Agency for the Coordination of the Fight Against Harmful Sectarian Organizations will be established with the Justice Ministry.

Article 14. The Coordinating Staff will be directed by the Minister of Justice or by one commissioned by him.

The King determines the composition of the Coordinating Staff through decree advised by [the] ministerial council.

Article 15. The Coordinating Staff is entrusted with the following missions:

1. Coordinating measures being carried out by the responsible agencies and offices;
2. Observation of the development of illegal practices by harmful sectarian organizations;
3. Suggesting measures for improving coordination and impact of these measures;
4. Promotion of a policy of warning the public about the activities of harmful sectarian organizations, in accord with agencies and offices responsible;
5. Producing a close cooperation with the Center and comprehension of the measures necessary for the implementation of suggestions and recommendations from the Center.

Article 16. The King determines the particulars of the operation and the organization of the Coordinating Staff by decree under advise of the ministerial council.

We announce this law and instruct that it receive the state seal and is distributed in Belgian Law (Moniteur belge).

237]

Attitude of Belgian Authorities

Given in Brussels on June 2, 1998.

ALBERT

In commission of the King:

The Justice Minister

T. VAN PARYS

sealed with the State Seal:

The Justice Minister

T. VAN PARYS

