

# **The Oslo Coalition for Freedom of Religion or Belief: Ground Rules for Missionary Activities**

By Ingunn Folkestad Breistein

## **1. Introduction**

How should mission be carried out in a pluralistic society without causing tension and strife? This issue was the background for the Oslo Coalition on Freedom of Religion or Belief<sup>i</sup> as it in 2005 started working with a document on ethical guidelines for missionary activities. The aim of the project was to contribute, on the basis of human rights, to the prevention of conflicts arising from missionary activities. The project also aimed at contributing to increased knowledge among those who carry out missionary activities on what UN conventions and declarations, the UN Human Rights Committee, the European Court of Human Rights and other regional human rights courts and commissions say about missionary activities. Missionary activity have many times and many places given rise to conflicting views. Some times, missionary activities are unduly hindered by state measures. Other times, missionary activities in some cases violate the human rights of the target group.<sup>ii</sup>

“Ground Rules for Missionary Activities”<sup>iii</sup> was printed and launched in December 2009, after a process of several years which has involved people from different religions and world views and from different countries. This article will focus on the process of developing the Ground Rules, and go on to describe and discuss the Ground Rules themselves. The main question of the article will be: What were the main issues discussed in the process of writing the Ground Rules? This question involves several minor questions like: What were the guidelines for the work? Who were involved in the discussions and in the editing process? Which issues were controversial? What is the content of the final Ground Rules? How has the reception of the document been?

## **2. Guidelines for the work**

### **2.1. Participants in the process of developing the Codes of Conducts**

Members of the Oslo Coalition (OC) focusing on issues concerning Missionary Activities and Human Rights started the work towards a Codes of Conduct (CoC) for Missionary Activities in 2005. Whereas other Codes of Conduct often represent one interest group (for example a Missionary Society, a church), or several interest groups (ecumenical CoC involving several churches or two parties), the CoC of the OC was to be developed in a process involving different faiths and world views. Therefore, people from different religions and world views, and from different countries, were invited to take part in the discussions and the development of the Code.

## **2.2. The sources of the international freedom of religion or belief**

The sources of the international freedom of religion or belief are referred to in the final document, as well as in an appendix that has not yet been printed together with the Ground Rules, but are available at the web site of the Oslo Coalition.<sup>iv</sup> The most important international legislation on the freedom of religion or belief is article 18 in the United Nation's International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR) that affirms the right to “manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching”.<sup>v</sup> About 160 states have ratified CCPR, and the freedom of religion or belief has generally a wide recognition. Thus, there are good reasons for stating that the basic elements of the freedom of religion or belief as expressed in article 18 are international customary law. This means that the states are legally obliged to respect this freedom, regardless of the ratification status of the different conventions.<sup>vi</sup>

Four themes were addressed in connection with the right to freedom of religion or belief: the right to receive information on one's own and others' religions, the right to bear witness to and inform on one's own religion, the right to convert to another religion and the right to not be exposed to unwarranted pressure from missionary activities and humanitarian work.

## **2.3. The different parties of interest: To whom should the Code be directed?**

During the process, several parties of interest were identified: One was the actor of the missionary activity: This may be a single person, a congregation, a missionary society etc. It may be a foreigner or an inhabitant of the actual state. Another party was the object of the missionary activity: This may be a single person, or a group of persons. A third party was the social or/and religious group to which the object is affiliated: This may be his or her family, working place, neighborhood, congregation/organization, ethnic/religious society etc. A fourth party was the governmental authorities of the state in which the act of missionary activity is performed.

During much of the process, the idea was that the Codes of Conduct was to be written to all of these parties of interest. However, in the end, the Ground Rules focused on two (three) of the groups. Most of the content in the Ground Rules is directed towards the actor of the missionary activities, such as Missionary Societies, religious groups and missionaries. A smaller part of the Ground Rules is directed towards the object(s) of missionary activities, both individuals and groups. It was decided not to direct the Ground Rules to the authorities, although the GR recognizes that the state is obliged to respect and ensure the right of the individual to have religious freedom. The role of the state is therefore to secure the human rights, and to weigh the different rights and freedoms against each other.

This meant that the GR was directed towards individuals and groups that were not to be bound by them, but could be inspired by them to make their own Codes of Conduct, and that the document could appeal to “the conscience of faithful people, so that they see their obligation for other faiths”.<sup>vii</sup> One of the concerns for GR is that authorities could hold it against missionary societies, religious organizations and individuals if the authorities can prove that a group or individuals do not stick to the principles developed in the Ground Rules.

## 2.4. What is meant by “Missionary Activities”?

During the work with the CoC and the discussions in the conferences, it became clear that the document should not discuss whether or not missionary activities are right or wrong, or give a thorough explanation what mission means. In the final Ground Rules, it is simply stated that “by the term “missionary activities” this document understands the *activity of communication a religion or world view through verbal communication or through various related activities as an invitation to others to adopt the religion or world view*”.<sup>viii</sup> The Ground Rules are ethical guidelines to people engaged in missionary work, and to people who are targets/receivers of missionary works. The terms “mission” and “missionary work” were chosen instead of the term “proselytism” or “propagating religion or belief” because these last terms often give negative associations. The concept of Mission arose in Christian environments, but is now also used as a religious science category.<sup>ix</sup>

However, the concept of mission is often linked to Christian mission, whereas other religions use other terms to explain the work of spreading their faith to other people. One of the conferences held during the work with the CoC/GR, had Mission as its topic, and was focusing on the concept of Missionary Activity seen from the perspective of different religions. Four articles were written as an appendix to the Code: “What is Islamic Mission?”, “What is Christian Mission?”, “Proselytizing and the Hindu Traditions”, and “What is Buddhist mission?”<sup>x</sup>

The Ground Rules states that “the right to have or adopt a religion or belief of his choice” (CCPR, article 18) and “the freedom to change his religion or belief” (UDHR, article 18) is the most fundamental of all human rights connected with freedom of religion. The document simply takes for granted that missionary activities (conducted within ethical boundaries) are allowed according to the Human Rights. Therefore, both in the discussions and as expressed in the final draft, it was said that individuals or groups that would not acknowledge people’s rights to choose a religion, or change their religion (or keep their religion), were not the targets of the Ground Rules. “Without genuine consensus regarding this point any further discussion on the topic of missionary activities will be flawed from the very beginning”.<sup>xi</sup>

However, the main purpose of the Ground Rules was not (only) to state that Missionary Activities could be conducted with support from the Human Rights, the main issue was to say that Missionary Activities have to be conducted in a way that must be according to ethical standards respecting people’s rights to remain faithful to their religion, or not to have a religion. Therefore, Missionary Activities may be according to Human Rights, or they may not be, if conducted in a manner that is inappropriate or violate other people’s rights.

## 3. The consultative and editing process

In 2006, there were two fact finding missions to Azerbaijan and Sri Lanka. These trips, together with discussions with representatives from minority and majority groups from these two countries, made it visible how difficult it is to make a Code of Conduct with one set of rules supposed to give guiding principles into different situations in different countries. The contexts in which missionaries operate vary enormously and that practices that are acceptable in one context may be deemed unethical in another.<sup>xii</sup>

There were several workshops<sup>xiii</sup> with participants from Azerbaijan, England, Germany, Greece, India, Jordan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, USA, as well as from Norway. The participants belonged to different religions, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, and Life Stance organizations.<sup>xiv</sup> In addition to the working group within the Oslo Coalition, there was also a reference group connected to the project.<sup>xv</sup>

The purpose of the workshops was to facilitate a discussion among academics, missionaries and activists in the field of mission and human rights on how missionary activities relate to the freedom of religion or belief in concrete situation. It was also important to explore whether or how ethical considerations might lead to commonly agreed norms for missionary activities. The goal was to make a voluntary code of conduct for missionary activities.<sup>xvi</sup>

There was an agreement that the Codes were operating in a ethical rather than legal realm, but different opinions as to whether the Codes should address attitudes as well as concrete actions and practices.

### **3.1. The issues debated in the workshops**

Which issues were most controversial during the discussions, and which of the issues seemed to be easier for all participants to agree on?

One main theme that came up during the discussions was the supposition of the whole document: whether or not religious freedom as expressed in the Human Rights Conventions was understood as correlating to the different religious views, or seen as contradicting them. It was pointed out that many Moslem countries have made a reservation in the Human Rights Documents that they mean are in conflict with the Koran. For example, Article 18 concerning Freedom of Religion or Belief is difficult for these countries. Therefore, an important issue is whether or not Islamic Law contradicts the Human Rights, especially the Freedom of Religion or Belief.<sup>xvii</sup> However, it was also pointed out that the issue of Human Rights is also about finding language and a rationale within a religion, especially within Islam. One of the Muslim participants said: “I cannot see anything in the human rights that contradict my faith. I see them as a part of Sharia”.<sup>xviii</sup>

How can people belonging to a religion that means to have the only truth, present their message in a pluralistic world without offending other people? This was an issue that came up several times during the discussions. “Mission will always, directly or indirectly, involve critique of the faith one wants people to leave behind. If a person claims that something is the truth, implicitly, other views are false”.<sup>xix</sup> It was pointed out that the document needed to focus on the individual missionary and his or her attitudes and values: “Which behavior and attitudes are permissive for someone who believes they have the only truth?”<sup>xx</sup>

The Hindu representatives expressed their support to freedom of thought, expression and consciousness, but said that there is no need for conversion: “Conversion would presuppose full knowledge of the old and the new religion and of their social implications... We are against propagating religion. An Indian declaration says that missionary activity may lead to unrest, and that matters of peace, order and moral should take priority. In their eagerness to

convert, missionaries often give negative descriptions of the native religion and thus threaten culture, families and social stability”<sup>xxi</sup>.

One of the issues brought up in the discussions, was genuine sensitivity to cultural differences. The difference between sharing faith and talking about faith, a difference how this is perceived in South-East Asia and Europe was mentioned. Lack of sensitivity to cultural differences may turn “dialogue” into “monologue”<sup>xxii</sup>.

Another point in the discussion about cultural sensitivity was that people from the East might understand human rights differently from people in the West. It was pointed out that the freedom of expression should be balanced against freedom of thought. In the in Asian culture, the freedom of thought is seen as very important. It is more easily threatened than in other cultures, because the custom of hospitality makes it impossible to ask missionaries who come to people’s homes, to leave the house. In the case of missionary activity, therefore, applying one person’s rights might mean violation the rights of others: “Freedom of expression is problematic if it is to take place without an invitation. Thought processes are very important and involve all senses; the perception of sound, light etc. If I am to think for myself, it is very problematic if someone comes and presents their views uninvited. They will destroy my process. If someone imparts the wrong views without an invitation, they violate my freedom of thought and interfere with our freedom of religion”<sup>xxiii</sup>.

Also, several of the participants coming from western and Christian background, pointed out that the Codes of Conduct was heavily oriented towards the Human Rights discourse of the West: “What is needed is a large and diverse effort at reassessing the religious and moral tradition of various cultures to reveal more clearly the convergences between their (non-western cultures) and the concerns enshrined in the Human Rights discourse”<sup>xxiv</sup>. One of the findings of the workshops was that mission has to be balanced between the right of the individual, and the right of the group to control the individual. Positive and negative freedom has to be balanced: in the West, freedom is often defined as “freedom from”, whereas in the East, freedom often is defined as “freedom to”.

Another issue that came up was the relationship between religion and power. Several of the speakers from South-East Asia mentioned the connection between western religion and power, and how the issue of religion always is linked to the issue of power. “The Christian NGO’s, with their financial power, are eyed with great suspicion because their programs of secularization, commercialization and emancipation of women are seen as conscious methods used to “capture” Muslims and others to Christianity. Another complication is that certain actors may pretend to have religious motivations when they are in fact motivated by factors of politics, power and trade.”<sup>xxv</sup>

Representatives from the Hindu faith were also concerned for the social stability in India, and pointed out that Indian conversion to Christianity often result in social instability and strengthen social and political division within the country. It was pointed out that the evangelical movement is a global movement and that it views India as containing some of the least reached ethnic groups in the world and therefore as their biggest target. When they do church planting among unreached and disadvantaged peoples, they dismiss eastern

philosophical concepts and Vedic systems. They also pointed out the problematic issue of solidarity organizations supported by state churches: “Highly organized groups of solidarity organizations, such as Care and Church Aid are supported by state churches to do missionary activity. Government funding thus supports missionary activity among these very vulnerable groups. They aim at marginalized people and conduct mass conversions conflicting with Indian laws”<sup>xxvi</sup>.

The issue of vulnerable groups had been taken into the document, but several of the participants meant that the issue of children and missionary activities should be left out of the document. They expressed that they were skeptical of implying that children should be targets for missionary activities.<sup>xxvii</sup>

#### **4. The content of the final document**

In 2009 The Code of Conducts was redrafted in response to the input from the international conference in November 2008. The future of the new edition was discussed at an international editing committee meeting in Oslo on the 18th June 2009, after which it changed form and became the "Missionary Activities and Human Rights: Recommended Ground Rules for Missionary Activities". This edition was finalized by the Board of Directors in August, and published as a booklet in December.

I will now describe and discuss some of the issues that are treated in the final version of the Ground Rules (GR). The largest part is directed to people or an organization involved in missionary activities, the smallest part is directed to those to whom missionary activities are directed.

##### **4.1. Communicating belief ethically in cross-cultural situations.**<sup>xxviii</sup>

The advice for missionary organizations is that they should “focus on their own religion, and not misrepresent or denigrate the faith of others for the purpose of turning followers away from their religion”. However, it is pointed out that criticism of other religions is not prohibited, but that it should be limited to “well-reasoned, persuasive critique and rational comparison between alternative faiths”. The discussion of how a person or an organization should present what they believe to be true, in a pluralistic world, is expressed in a way that does not advise against truth claims, but advice the missionaries to do this in a way that do not ridicule other faiths: “Making truth claims is inherent in missionary activities, but the presentation of these should take into consideration the feelings of others. Hostility and ridicule are unacceptable, but well-reasoned, persuasive critique should never be so”. Another issue from the discussion is mentioned, the right to privacy. The GR states that if an organization is propagating religion by door-to door canvassing (mentioned as a potentially controversial means), it should do so in a way that respect the right to privacy. Communicating belief in cross-cultural situations<sup>xxix</sup>

One of the issues mentioned under this heading, is the issue of contextualization and inculturalization: “The missionary organization should be careful in adopting terminology, rituals and customs from other religions, so as not to create misunderstandings about its identity. It should not attempt to achieve acceptance through adopting the outward appearance

of other religions”. During the discussions, several of the participants expressed that they meant that contextualization could lead to conversions that were not of free will: “To the question of contextualization, I will say there is a room for that in language, habits, sincerity and commitment. I have no problem with it if it leads to a conversion of willingness”.<sup>xxx</sup>

The GR states that “the undertaking of undercover missionary activities is not recommended, and that the laws of a country should be respected. However, when freedom of religion or belief of the target group is seriously violated, such activities should be considered”. This issue has been somewhat controversial in the discussions, because some people and religious groups would never want to defend the undertaking of undercover missionary activities, whereas others would defend it in countries where the authorities forbid the presence or presentation of (other) religions. This point tries to combine the main principle of obeying the laws of a country with the principle of opening up to undercover missionary activities if the country does not abide the Human Rights standards of the religious freedom.

#### **4.2. Communicating belief through education and charity work<sup>xxxi</sup>**

This section treats the issue of missionary activities and educational services as well as missionary activities and charity work. The advice that missionary organizations should not combine charity and preaching in a way that impair the freedom of the recipients to choose whether or not to listen, and the statement that charity should be given without any explicit or implicit religious obligations upon the part of the recipient, has been widely agreed upon during the process. It is stated in the text that the organization helping people in vulnerable situations, should assure themselves that any steps taken to adopt the religion of the organization spring from a non-coerced conversion. However, in spite of the agreement of the people involved in the process of making the Ground Rules that missionary organizations should be careful in promising worldly benefits as a result of joining their religion, and not to use education and charity work to convert people, missionary activities involving education and charity work might be the place where it is most difficult to see how what is not intended (charity in exchange for conversion) might still be the result.

#### **4.3. Communicating belief to vulnerable and/or disempowered groups<sup>xxxii</sup>**

This section focuses on children, women, refugees and asylum seekers. As mentioned above, several of the participants in the discussions did not want this issue to be mentioned in the CoC/GR. However, it is consistent with the idea that the Ground Rules urges people and organizations involved in missionary work to do this in a manner that does not act against the Human Rights, and to be especially careful when it comes to vulnerable groups. The GR mentions the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and says that missionary organizations should respect the rights of parents to give their children an upbringing in accordance with their beliefs. It also says that missionary activities “should not be directed at minors without informed, explicit and voluntary consent by the children themselves and their parents/guardians”.

There was a discussion whether or not women should be seen as a disempowered/vulnerable group. The text included gender perspectives, but says that missionary organizations should acknowledge that women *may* be disempowered in many cultures and religions, that is, this is

not always the case. The text emphasizes that the missionary organization should recognize the right of the woman to have, adopt or change her belief according to her choice, but also underlines that it is important that the missionary work do not endanger the woman's situation within the family: "Missionary organizations should act with care in cases where they know that there is a danger that a woman will come into conflict with her family (husband/father) if she should choose to convert as result of their activities".

The third group mentioned in the GR as vulnerable, is refugees and asylum seekers living in temporary camps. The advice given to the missionary organizations is that they should be aware of the difficulties it might create for an asylum seeker if he or she converts and is returned to his or her home country. Missionary organizations should also reflect on how their message is understood, so "that it is not perceived as a promise of residence permission or other benefits".

#### **4.4. Those to whom missionary activities are directed<sup>xxxiii</sup>**

Those to whom missionary activities are directed are called "target groups" in the document. There was a discussion whether they should rather be called "receivers" of missionary activities, but this might imply a positive welcoming of a new religion or belief. Therefore, it was decided to keep the word "target groups". Target groups are asked to recognize the right people have to have or adopt a religion of his/her choice, and the right to change his/her religion or belief.

If a target group considers the means of missionary organizations as unethical, the community members are asked to solve the issue by direct contact with those involved. If this does not work, the community members should bring the problem to the attention of leaders of the missionary organization. The Ground Rules also recommend the establishment of broadly based inter-religious councils. Community members are finally asked to appeal to legal measures if mediation or dialogue with the missionary organization does not lead to satisfactory protection of the rights of the community members to maintain their religion or belief.

The issue of the individuals and the community, to whom missionary activities are directed, also concerns the reactions of the religious structures surrounding the target for missionary activity. During the discussions in the work shops, it was mentioned that the religious group surrounding a convert may present the target with sanction and threats. "This is a form of *defensive missionary activity* which should also be encompassed by the codes of conduct for missionary activity".<sup>xxxiv</sup> Although this issue was not mentioned explicitly in the final Ground Rules, the challenge of the collective side of the religion has to be considered by the missionary societies as well as by those to whom missionary activities are directed.

## **5. The reception of the Ground Rules**

The Ground Rules were launched by the Oslo Coalition in February 2010. It was then presented to, and commented by some of the people that have been involved in the whole process, among others, representatives from the Norwegian missionary organizations,

NORME (Norwegian Council for Mission and Evangelization). Also, representatives from World Council of Churches (WCC) and World Evangelical Alliance (WEA) were present, as well as representatives from different religions and life stances.

The feedback from protestant churches and their mission organizations has been very positive. Many mission organizations already have a Code of Conduct, and they have welcomed the Ground Rules. Many of the participants in the process have pointed out the evangelical and/or charismatic churches as the groups that violate ethical rules for missionary work, but the WEA and other evangelical churches that have commented on the Ground Rules, have agreed to most of its content. They have noticed the fact that the Ground Rules acknowledges that missionary activities can be done in accordance with the religious freedom stated in the Human Rights.

From WCC and churches belonging to WCC, the feedback and comments have been that the Ground Rules is an important document, however, it has been commented that the Eastern Churches do not understand mission in the same way as the protestant churches some times do. The Orthodox Churches are much more restrictive to intra-religious mission, and within the WCC it has been expressed that the member churches should not try to convert people from one Christian Church to another. Many of the Eastern Churches are minorities in Muslim countries, and they do not see missionary work as their main task. In a meeting in Geneva with representatives from the WCC, it was also commented on their impression that the Ground Rules were secular. The WCC and the Roman-Catholic church have been working on a Code of Conduct for several years together with WEA, but this document has not yet been launched.

The advantage of Codes of Conduct written and signed by one or more missionary organizations or churches, are that the signers have agreed to act according to the codes. The advantage of the Ground Rules is that it does not belong to one religion or world view, and that it can be used by inter-religious groups. The Ground Rules might be a useful tool in societies where missionary work has created tension, or even better, it might be used to prevent conflicts before they arise. The common ground for the use of the Ground Rules is the acknowledgement that the religious freedom as stated in the Human Rights Conventions both allows missionary activities, but also in some ways limit it. The Ground Rules is grounded on the idea that the human rights conventions should provide the framework for missionary activities<sup>xxxv</sup>, and all who agree on this idea, can therefore use the Ground Rules as a tool for ethical reflection on the issue of missionary activities.

## 6. Summary

This article has tried to answer the question of what were the main issues discussed in the process of writing the Ground Rules. The process has involved people from different faiths and different countries. The GR do not wish to analyze the issue of “Mission”, but states that missionary activities are a fact, and that missionary work in itself is consistent with the religious freedom and freedom of expression in the HR. The GR deals with the problems that might arise from the missionary work, and tries to address some ethical guidelines for missionary activities in order to work for peaceful coexistence between people of different

faiths. The GR addresses the missionaries/missionary organizations, the people who the missionary work are directed at. During the process, it was decided not to address governments, although they are important because they are supposed to protect the HR of individuals. The idea behind the document is that it could be used as a tool for organizations that want to make their own Code of Conduct, or simply as a tool to reflect upon ethical questions facing those who are involved in missionary activities, or that are targets of such work.

---

<sup>i</sup> The Oslo Coalition on Freedom of Religion or Belief is an international network of representatives from religious and other life-stance communities, NGOs, international organizations and research institutes that works to advance freedom of religion or belief (FORB) as a common benefit that is accepted and embraced by all religions and persuasions. Drawing on and promoting the internationally accepted human rights standards on FORB, the Coalition works to promote mutual understanding and cooperation between communities of different persuasions and to hinder injustice, intolerance and distrust springing from religious differences. The Oslo Coalition was established by the participants of the Oslo Conference on Freedom of Religion or Belief, which was held in August 1998 on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

<sup>ii</sup> See the Ground Rules and the presentation of the project on the home page of the Oslo Coalition, <http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr.php>, 24.5.11.

<sup>iii</sup> The document was through most of the process called “Codes of Conduct”, but the name was changed to “Ground Rules” in order to underline that the document was not intended as a list of rules to be followed by all, but to stimulate to internal debate and ethical reflections within networks and organizations, as a help for them to develop their own Codes of Conduct.

<sup>iv</sup> The Appendix 2 is called: The right to try to convince the other: Missionary Activities and Human Rights, and is written by the lawyer Thom Arne Hellerslia, [http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr\\_background\\_eng.php](http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr_background_eng.php), 24.5.11.

<sup>v</sup> Recommended Ground Rules for Missionary Activities 2009:4, <http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr.php>, 24.5.11.

<sup>vi</sup> Hellerslia, [http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr\\_background\\_eng.php](http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr_background_eng.php), 24.5.11.

<sup>vii</sup> Quotation from Dr. Ataullah Siddiqui, A Muslim Viewpoint, held on a conference discussing a draft of the Codes of Conducts in November 2008.

<sup>viii</sup> Ground Rules 2009:3-4.

<sup>ix</sup> Ground Rules 2009:3.

<sup>x</sup> The Appendix 1 is called: The concept of missionary activity seen from the perspective of different religions, and the articles are written by Nora Eggen, Tormod Engelsviken and Tore Laugerud, Knut A. Jacobsen and Egil Lothe. [http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr\\_background\\_eng.php](http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr_background_eng.php), 24.5.11.

<sup>xi</sup> Gard Lindseth, Introduction to the international conference in November 2008.

<sup>xii</sup> Tormod Engelsviken, What is Christian Mission? Paper to workshop in June 2007.

<sup>xiii</sup> The workshops/conferences held during the process were: August/September 2006 with the theme: “Proselytism and Human Rights”, June 2007: “What is Christian and Muslim mission?”, November 2008: “Codes of Conduct for Missionary Activities”, June 2009: “Code of Conducts Strategy Meeting”. All workshops were held in Oslo.

<sup>xiv</sup> The World Council of Churches (WCC) and the World Evangelical Alliance (WEA) were both involved in the consultation process through Dr. Shanta Premadwahana (WCC) and Dr. Thomas Schirrmacher (WEA).

<sup>xv</sup> The working group from the Oslo Coalition consisted of: Guro Almås, Sven Thore Kloster, Egil Lothe, Dag Nygård and Ingunn Folkestad Breistein. Chairpersons were Gard Lindseth (2008-2009), Ingunn Folkestad Breistein (2009-). The reference group consisted of: Lars Gule, Ernst Harbakk, Thom Arne Hellerslia, Vebjørn Hørsfjord, Senaid Koblica, Lena Larsen, Bjørn A. Wegge and Gerd Marie Aadna.

<sup>xvi</sup> See Conference Report from the Workshop on Proselytism and Human Rights, Oslo Coalition for the Freedom of Religion and Belief, Oslo, August 31<sup>st</sup> to September 2<sup>nd</sup> 2006, <http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr.php>, 25.5.11.

- 
- <sup>xvii</sup> Nora Eggen: "What is Islamic Mission?", June 2007.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Dr. Ataullah Siddiqui: "A Muslim Viewpoint", November 2008. Dr. Siddiqui also referred to the Chambesy Agreement between Orthodox Christians and Muslims in 1975 which states: 'The conference upholds the principle of religious freedom recognizing that the Muslims as well as the Christians must enjoy the full liberty to convince and be convinced, and to practice their faith and order their religious life in accordance with their own religious laws and principles; that the individual is perfectly entitled to maintain his/her religious integrity in obedience of his/her religious principles and in faithfulness to his/her religious identity.'
- <sup>xix</sup> Dr. Tormod Engelsviken: "What is Christian Mission?", June 2007.
- <sup>xx</sup> Mr. Thom Arne Hellerslia: Discussions during the conference in November 2008.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Dr. Girdhari Lal Bhan: "A Hindu Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Dr. Ataullah Siddiqui: "A Muslim Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Mr. Manohara De Silva: "A Buddhist Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Dr. Dennis Mc Cann: Discussion in the workshop November 2008.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Dr. Ataullah Siddiqui: "A Muslim Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Dr. Anuja Prashar: A Hindu Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> Mr. Manohara De Silva: "A Buddhist Viewpoint" and Dr. Ataullah Siddiqui "A Muslim Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> All quotations in this section are from Ground Rules 2009:5.
- <sup>xxix</sup> All quotations in this section are from Ground Rules 2009:5.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Dr. Ataullah Siddiqui: "A Muslim Viewpoint", November 2008.
- <sup>xxxi</sup> The text discussed in this section is from Ground Rules 2009:6.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> All quotes in this section are from Ground Rules 2009:6-7.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> The text discussed in this section are from Ground Rules 2009:7-8.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> Thom Arne Hellerslia, discussions during the conference in November 2008.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> Ground Rules 2009:3.

## Bibliography

The Oslo Coalition on Freedom of Religion or Belief: *Missionary Activities and Human Rights: Recommended Ground Rules for Missionary Activities*. Oslo: 2009. Electronic Version: <http://www.oslocoalition.org/mhr.php>, 25.5.11.