



Explanation of Vote After the Vote by Amb. Khalil Hashmi, on behalf of OIC, on draft Text L23 as Orally Revised HRC 53rd Session 12th July 2023

Mr. President,

On behalf of OIC, we would like to make this EOV after the vote to address misrepresentation of facts and set the record straight.

One, the adopted text is context specific and is a response to deliberate, premeditated and recurring acts of desecration of the Holy Quran, constituting incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence. It is also aligned with consensus HRC resolution 16/18 which noted the need for accountability on incitement to violence.

Two; It does not seek to curtail the right to free speech. It aims at striking a prudent balance between exercise of this right with special duties and responsibilities, as enshrined in Article 19 of ICCPR and call for prohibiting advocacy of religious hatred in line with its article 20. Regrettably, some states have tried to shy away from their responsibilities to combat the scourge of religious hatred.

Three, the text was balanced, thematic and solution oriented. Contrary to the approach pursued by some countries including those which opposed the present resolution, of maligning and targeting countries, the text does not target any country. It aims to address a systemic human rights impact of absence of prevention, legal deterrence and deliberate.

Four; the opposing of a few in the room has emanated from their unwillingness to condemn the public desecration of the Holy Quran or any other religious book. They lack political, legal and moral courage to condemn this act and it was the minimum that the Council could have expected from them.

Five; It is indeed misleading to claim that the draft resolution seeks to protect a specific religion or sacred book. This is about human rights impacts of such vile acts and protection against acts of religious hatred.

Six; we have seen that the issue of religious hatred has become a systemic challenge. Several instances of desecration of Holy Quran have taken place and news related to requests for burning of other holy books are viral. Complicity of states and their disrespect for fundamental principles of international law, can force us again to come to this room and then the outcome will be different.

Seven; it does not seek a Council mandated mechanism but leaves the space for States to examine and adopt national laws and policies to prevent and counter acts and advocacy of religious hatred.

Eight, Countries that voted against the resolution have sent message to Muslims and people of other faiths that their commitment to prevent religious hatred is limited to lip-service.

I thank you!

