



UNHRC

*United Nations Human
Rights Council*

Official Study Guide



AGENDA

*Addressing the Rise of Islamophobia
and Religious Discrimination in the
Context of Global Counter-Terrorism
Efforts*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 Letter from the Executive Board**
- 2 Introduction to the Committee**
- 3 List of Key Terms**
- 4 Introduction to the Agenda**
- 5 Timeline**
- 6 Case Studies**
- 7 Country Positions**
- 8 Past Resolutions by the UN**
- 9 Questions A Resolution Must Answer**
- 10 Sources to Use**
- 11 Preambulatory and Operative Clauses**

Letter from the EB

Dear Delegates,

It is our honor as the Executive Board of the UN Human Rights Council at JBCNOSH MUN 2026 to address you and welcome you to the United Nations Human Rights Council.

We would like to invite you to adopt this philosophy in your participation in the committee. This conference should not be judged by the number of speeches delivered or any awards you receive. It is important to focus on the challenges you set for yourselves and the growth you get through this experience.

No matter whether this is your first or fiftieth Model UN conference, just think about it. Each great delegate had been sitting in a place like yours some day in the past, uncertain, ambitious, and ready to learn. Do not be afraid of participating in the committee. We do not expect anything but your readiness to research, think critically, negotiate, and show enough confidence to lift your placard in time.

As your executive board, we will not try to find your mistakes. We are here to provide you with a challenging and entertaining committee, which will require from you the desire to debate passionately, find innovative solutions, practice diplomacy, and step out of your comfort zone. Often, some of the brightest moments in committee start from the moment when a delegate decides to deliver a speech despite his/her initial uncertainty.

We are really looking forward to chairing this committee and getting acquainted with the unique visions of each of you. Each conference is special because of the delegates who participate in it, and this committee will definitely be no exception. We look forward to seeing the alliances you form, the resolutions you propose, and the diplomatic approach you take during the conference.

So, prepare well and get ready for the challenge. We hope that you become better delegates, as well as leaders and speakers, after this conference.

We wish you good luck in your preparation and look forward to seeing you in the committee.

Best regards,

Maanyah Gathani
Director

Prayaan Madan
Assistant Director

Introduction to the Committee

The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC), established on 15 March 2006 by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), through Resolution 60/251, aimed to replace the former United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Promotion and protection of human rights across the globe is its primary mandate, for which the Council investigates human rights violations and addresses thematic concerns within United Nations member states, including the freedom of expression, religion or belief, the rights of women, minorities, refugees or migrants, and protection against discrimination of every form.

Comprising 47, GA elected member states for staggered three-year terms, the Council is distributed according to an equitable geographical rotation to ensure balanced regional representation with membership based on a state's contribution to the promotion and protection of human rights. The Council also has the authority to suspend the rights and privileges of a member that persistently commits gross and systematic human rights violations during its term, a measure invoked against Libya in 2011 and against the Russian Federation in 2022 through a two-thirds substantive vote of the General Assembly.

The Council works closely with several other UN bodies, including the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the Third Committee of the General Assembly (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural), and the relevant Special Procedures of the Council.

The Council is further supported by subordinate entities and frameworks that amplify its reach. These include the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), through which the human rights record of all 193 member states is examined individually; the Advisory Committee, which functions as the Council's think-tank; the Special Procedures, comprising independent Special Rapporteurs, Independent Experts and Working Groups — most pertinently for this agenda, the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief, the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights while countering terrorism, and the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism; and the Complaint Procedure, which enables individuals and groups to bring consistent patterns of gross human rights violations to the Council's attention.

Owing to the broadly shared character of its mandate, the Council adopts a substantial proportion of its resolutions by consensus, without a recorded vote. It is precisely the moral authority of this consensus, rather than any coercive enforcement power, upon which the Council's influence rests a feature delegates must bear in mind when crafting actionable, realistic, and widely acceptable solutions.

List of Key Terms

Islamophobia: Fear, prejudice and hatred directed against Muslims, or against Islam as a faith, that results in provocation, hostility, intolerance, discrimination, threats, harassment, abuse, incitement or violence against persons or communities.

Religious Discrimination: The unjust or prejudicial treatment of individuals or groups on the basis of their religion or belief, in violation of the principle of equality before the law.

Counter-Terrorism: The body of practices, laws, military tactics and strategies adopted by states and international bodies to prevent, deter and respond to terrorism.

Securitisation: The process by which a political issue, such as migration, religious practice or minority identity, is reframed as an existential security threat, thereby justifying extraordinary measures that bypass ordinary legal and democratic safeguards.

Countering Violent Extremism (CVE): A range of preventive, non-coercive programmes intended to deter individuals from adopting violent extremist ideologies, frequently criticised for disproportionately targeting Muslim communities.

Radicalisation: The process by which an individual comes to adopt extremist beliefs and, potentially, to support or engage in violence.

Religious / Racial Profiling: The use of religion, ethnicity, national origin or appearance, rather than individual conduct or credible evidence, as the basis for suspicion, surveillance or law-enforcement action.

Freedom of Religion or Belief (FoRB): The right, protected under Article 18 of the ICCPR, to hold, change, manifest and practise a religion or belief individually or in community, in public or in private.

Non-Discrimination Principle: The foundational guarantee under international law that all persons are equal before the law and entitled to equal protection without distinction of any kind, including religion.

Incitement to Hatred: Advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, prohibited under Article 20(2) of the ICCPR.

Hate Crime: A criminal act motivated wholly or partly by prejudice or hostility towards a person's actual or perceived religion, race, ethnicity or other protected characteristic.

Laïcité (Secularism): A principle of strict separation between religion and the state, most notably enshrined in French constitutional law, which has been invoked to restrict visible religious expression in public life.

Collective Punishment: The imposition of sanctions, restrictions or penalties upon an entire community for the alleged acts of certain of its members — prohibited under international humanitarian law.

Non-Refoulement: A principle of international law forbidding the return of any person to a territory where they face a real risk of persecution, torture or other irreparable harm.

Stigmatisation: The social process by which a group is labelled, stereotyped and devalued, leading to its exclusion and to the normalisation of discrimination against it.

Marginalisation: The systematic exclusion of specific groups from equal participation in political, social and economic life.

Introduction to the agenda

Following the attacks of 11 September 2001, the fight against terrorism has spread to practically all governments in the world. Most of these measures were designed to prevent terrorist attacks. However, after two decades of implementation, they have brought another unintended consequence. In many countries, “counter-terrorism” has, in some cases, turned into an instrument of viewing Muslims as suspicious by default. This is the idea behind this UNHRC agenda, "Addressing the Rise of Islamophobia and Religious Discrimination in the Context of Global Counter-Terrorism Efforts."

The methods under discussion include mass surveillance, racial and religious profiling, indefinite detention without charges, travel bans, watch lists, the closure of mosques and madrasas, and the prosecution of religious activities for extremism. Human rights organizations have been raising concerns about them for years. The main argument raised is that discrimination is fueled by profiling. It leads to alienation, which, in turn, may make some individuals more vulnerable to extremist recruitment, which is the justification used by governments to reinforce their policy further.

This case is not limited to just one country or one type of government, either. Democracies in the West operate mass surveillance and border screening operations. Secular states limit religious clothing and affiliation with religious groups. Several governments have been running mass detentions under the pretext of "de-extremification." There are also examples where counter-terrorism laws have been used to prosecute political opponents and minorities who never posed any security threat. Language double standards must also be mentioned. Critics argue that an act of violence committed by a Muslim will often be labeled as terrorism immediately. At the same time, an act of violence against Muslims is often considered an isolated criminal case.

But the consequences of such policies do not limit themselves to the field of security policy. They manifest themselves in discriminatory hiring practices, erosion of confidence in public institutions, tangible mental consequences, and pressures placed on individuals who need to conceal or minimize their religious affiliation in order to simply survive. There is another aspect that is often highlighted by this situation: the very communities that must cooperate in order to help identify the threats are the communities that will be alienated by such policies, and hence, the very goals of security policy may be undermined by its implementation. Each aggressive campaign may also provide material used by extremist groups for recruitment.

The United Nations took this issue seriously enough. In 2022, 15 March was designated as the International Day to Combat Islamophobia. But an international day does not solve the policy problem at hand. Rather, the very question before this committee is one which is difficult to address: how to counteract the threat of terrorism while not establishing a regime that punishes individuals for their religion?

Timeline of Events

Year	Event	Relevance
September 11, 2001	9/11 : Terrorist attacks against the US	Terrorist attacks against the US claimed the lives of almost 3,000 individuals. In response, UN Security Council Resolution 1373 was unanimously adopted, mandating all Member States to implement stringent counter-terrorism measures. While establishing the global "War on Terror," the rapid deployment of state security apparatuses, such as the USA PATRIOT Act, catalyzed the long-term securitization and structural profiling of Muslim populations globally.
2002–2003	NSEERS program and Guantánamo Bay	The USA implemented the NSEERS program, requiring the registration, fingerprinting, and periodic reporting of men from predominantly Muslim countries. This institutionalized religious and nationality profiling under the guise of national security. Concurrently, the establishment of the Guantánamo Bay detention camp raised profound UN human rights concerns regarding due process and arbitrary detention.
2004	French law on conspicuous religious symbols	Law No. 2004-228 in France prohibited "conspicuous religious symbols" in state schools, disproportionately impacting the Islamic headscarf. This highlighted the use of the doctrine of laïcité (secularism) to restrict the manifestation of Freedom of Religion or Belief (FoRB)

Year	Event	Relevance
July 7, 2005	London transport bombings	Coordinated bombings targeted the London transport network. This incident accelerated the UK's PREVENT strategy. While aiming to counter radicalization, the UN Special Rapporteur on Racism later noted that such programs often structurally discriminate against and stigmatize Muslim communities.
September 8, 2006	Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy	The United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (A/RES/60/288). For the first time, a global strategic document explicitly reaffirmed that "the promotion and protection of human rights for all and the rule of law is essential to all components of the Strategy," attempting to correct the abuses of the early War on Terror
2011	Human Rights Council Resolution 16/18	The Human Rights Council adopted Resolution 16/18 on "combating intolerance, negative stereotyping and stigmatization of, and discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against, persons based on religion or belief." This landmark UN text reconciled the views of the West and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, shifting the focus from protecting religions to protecting individuals.

Year	Event	Relevance
2011–2014	NYPD secret surveillance program	Investigative reporting revealed the NYPD operated a secret surveillance program mapping and infiltrating Muslim communities and mosques without credible evidence of wrongdoing. This served as a prominent case study of religious profiling and the violation of the non-discrimination principle by local law enforcement.
2012	Rabat Plan of Action	The OHCHR launched the Rabat Plan of Action, outlining a strict six-part threshold test to distinguish protected freedom of expression from criminal incitement to hatred under Article 20 of the ICCPR, providing states with a framework to combat Islamophobic hate speech without infringing on human rights.
2013	Central African Republic religious conflict	In the Central African Republic (CAR), violence between the Séléka rebel coalition and anti-Balaka militias escalated into severe religious conflict. The UN warned of "ethno-religious cleansing" against the Muslim minority. This demonstrated how local political instability in developing nations can devolve into targeted religious persecution, sparking cycles of vindictive extremism where violence is falsely justified as avenging injustices against communities.

Year	Event	Relevance
2014 onwards	ISIL/Da'esh and Xinjiang	The emergence of ISIL/Da'esh saw the group weaponizing genuine grievances regarding the marginalization of Muslims to recruit and justify violence (vindictive extremism), severely disrupting peaceful coexistence globally. Conversely, in China, the "Strike Hard Campaign against Violent Terrorism" in Xinjiang initiated the large-scale, state-sponsored arbitrary detention of Uyghur and Turkic Muslims. A 2022 OHCHR report concluded these counter-terrorism pretexts may constitute "crimes against humanity."
2015	Charlie Hebdo and Paris attacks	The Charlie Hebdo and November Paris attacks, intersecting with Europe's migration crisis, caused a severe surge in anti-Muslim hate crimes. This era cemented the narrative of Muslims as an existential security threat in Western political discourse, leading to exclusionary immigration policies.
2016	Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism	The UN Secretary-General presented the Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (A/70/674). The UN stressed that "violent extremism cannot and should not be associated with any religion," and highlighted that marginalization, state-led injustice, and human rights violations often fuel vindictive extremism. It urged a shift from exclusively coercive counter-terrorism to holistic, preventive approaches in both developed and developing nations.

Year	Event	Relevance
2017	US "Muslim Ban" and Rohingya crisis	Executive Order 13769 (the "Muslim Ban") barred citizens from several Muslim-majority countries from entering the US, institutionalizing collective punishment. In Myanmar, military "clearance operations"—justified domestically as counter-terrorism—led to over 700,000 Rohingya Muslims fleeing to Bangladesh. The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights termed this a "textbook example of ethnic cleansing," highlighting extreme state-led minority oppression in the Global South.
March 15, 2019	Christchurch mosque attacks	An armed attacker murdered 51 people at two mosques in Christchurch, New Zealand, broadcasting his actions live. This clearly illustrated how Islamophobic rhetoric and white supremacist ideologies have globalized into deadly, transnational terrorist threats themselves.
2020–2021	French "anti-separatism" law and Indian Citizenship Amendment Act	Following extremist attacks, France enacted the "anti-separatism" law, resulting in the shutdown of multiple mosques. UN human rights experts expressed concern over the disproportionate impact on Muslims. Simultaneously, in developing nations like India, the passage of the Citizenship Amendment Act and ensuing communal violence highlighted the severe marginalization and rising violence against Muslim minorities outside the Western hemisphere.

Year	Event	Relevance
March 15, 2022	International Day to Combat Islamophobia	The United Nations General Assembly passed Resolution 76/254, officially declaring 15 March as the International Day to Combat Islamophobia. This marked the highest level of international recognition regarding the systemic nature of anti-Muslim prejudice.
2023–2025	Qur'an burnings and Gaza conflict	Repetitive public acts of Qur'an burnings in Europe prompted the UN Human Rights Council to adopt Resolution 53/1, condemning such acts as religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination. Concurrently, the escalation of the conflict in Gaza beginning in October 2023 resulted in a documented, unprecedented global surge in both Islamophobic and antisemitic hate crimes, underscoring how geopolitical crises frequently trigger the collective punishment and stigmatization of diasporas.

Case Studies

1. The United States and the architecture of the "War on Terror"

Since the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, the United States of America has been one of the main designers of the global anti-terrorism framework. After the attacks, the USA PATRIOT Act was enacted to expand the investigative powers of law enforcement and intelligence agencies. Later on, civil rights advocates claimed that some of those powers had been applied to Muslims excessively.

In 2002, the NSEERS programme was launched, requiring many male citizens from predominantly Muslim countries to register, undergo an interrogation, and submit fingerprints. Despite requiring registration of tens of thousands of people, the programme has resulted in no convictions for terrorist activity and was suspended, and later on, officially ended in 2016. At the same time, hundreds of people were detained at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility, where they stayed without trial. Both actions have been heavily criticised by the UN, Amnesty International, and other human rights organisations for violating their international standards and due process requirements.

In 2002 – 2014, the New York Police Department carried out surveillance in mosques, local businesses, and Islamic student groups. As a result of its investigation, the programme yielded no leads related to terrorism, and it was discontinued following lawsuits.

In 2017, Executive Order 13769 was adopted, which suspended the entry into the United States from predominantly Muslim countries. The justification for it was the national security concern. In response to the executive order, opponents cited some of Trump's campaign promises on a 'Muslim ban'. Finally, a modified version of it was accepted by the Supreme Court in 2018. Therefore, all those policies raise questions about whether anti-terrorism measures may target some religious groups and comply with international human rights standards at the same time.

2. France: laïcité, counter-terrorism, and religious expression

There is an additional type of model that France uses, where the issue of counter-terrorism comes into conflict with the constitutional principle of laïcité. In this context, Law No. 2004-228 prohibited religious symbols in state schools, and Law No. 2010-1192 forbade the wearing of face coverings in public spaces. The latter was particularly applicable to the Muslim women. The former was justified by the European Court of Human Rights in terms of the problematic idea of "living together," but the UN Human Rights Committee issued an opinion according to which the law violated the rights of the affected women.

After several terrorist attacks and the murder of the teacher Samuel Paty in 2020, France adopted a new "law reinforcing respect for the principles of the Republic." It was followed by an administrative campaign which entailed the inspection of the mosques, schools, and Muslim civil society organizations' associations. The UN human rights experts and others criticized France for its actions, which may result in treating religious conservatism in the same way as extremism and using the methods of counter-terrorism in relation to lawful religious and associational activity. Such an approach poses a threat to all Muslims in the country and may affect their rights, which are claimed to be protected in the Republic.

3. China: Xinjiang and "de-extremification"

The case of China provides the most egregious example of the counter-terrorism justification being employed as a means of repressive control. In response to ethnic clashes earlier in the decade, the government initiated a "Strike Hard Campaign against Violent Terrorism" in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. Justifying their actions with the fight against terrorism, separatism, and "religious extremism," they constructed an elaborate system of detention and surveillance.

According to independent evaluations and an OHCHR report from 2022, the number of Turkic Muslims who were arbitrarily detained in "vocational education and training centers" ranges from one to three million individuals. The list of abuses documented includes forced ideological brainwashing, coercion to abandon Muslim beliefs, family separation, mass surveillance, restrictions on religious activities, demolition or remodeling of mosques, and forced labor practices. The OHCHR determined that arbitrary detention on such a scale could constitute crimes against humanity. The situation in Xinjiang provides a striking illustration of how the counter-terrorism discourse could be applied to justify a cultural and religious genocide of a minority. This represents the most extreme case within the scope of the policy in question.

4. The United Kingdom: the PREVENT strategy.

The UK PREVENT strategy, a key component of the wider CONTEST counter-terrorism strategy, was designed to detect and steer away individuals at risk of being radicalized before committing any criminal acts. Starting from 2015, PREVENT imposes an "obligation" on teachers, healthcare practitioners, and others working within the public sector to spot and refer cases of radicalization, which then enter the "Channel" scheme.

Although PREVENT is supposed to be politically and ideologically impartial, numerous community groups, academics, and human rights organizations have persistently criticized the policy for being prejudiced against Muslims, for suppressing political and religious freedoms, and for using relationships based on care and teaching to facilitate policing. What is more, they assert that PREVENT has led to the deterioration of trust within Muslim communities towards governmental agencies, which is crucial in order to develop genuine community-based preventive work. Thus, it is evident how difficult it is to implement preventive counter-terrorism policies without securitizing a whole religious group.

Country Positions

The United States of America

However, the U.S. takes a dual approach that may appear inconsistent at times. The U.S. has been an active participant in shaping the international counter-terrorism architecture, where it has advocated for stringent security policies, although maintaining its adherence to the Constitution in terms of religious freedoms. In terms of domestic policy, there have been sharp swings from one administration to another from the introduction of surveillance programs and immigration control to their roll-back. On the international level, freedom of religion or belief has become a cornerstone of American foreign policy, but the counter-terrorism practices of the U.S. (profiling, watch-lists, and indeterminate detentions) undermine its moral authority in this respect.

The French Republic

On the other hand, in addressing this agenda, France does so from the perspective of laïcité, which it considers as a safeguard of equality rather than a limitation of religion. It absolutely does not accept being labeled in such a way that would make its secular laws and anti-terrorism policies discriminatory, as it sees that the Republic safeguards the citizens rather than the communities. France is definitely going to resist the recognition of “Islamophobia” as a legal category of discrimination, opting for the concept of “anti-Muslim hatred.”

The People's Republic of China

The measures taken by China in Xinjiang are always justified as lawful and effective anti-terrorism measures that are successful and have been designed to deal with problems such as terrorism, separatism, and extremism. China refuses to accept any form of monitoring since that would constitute an invasion of its sovereignty and internal affairs. It has managed to find diplomatic support from several nations in order to address the criticisms leveled against it within the Security Council. China will be strongly opposed to any form of specific measures or expanded monitoring regimes.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

On the other hand, the UK considers its preventive system of counter-terrorism, PREVENT, among them, as being a proportional and rights-respecting mechanism for the sake of safety, and appreciates the necessity of involving communities and reviewing the mechanisms regularly. On the other hand, the UK agrees on the international approach to freedom of religion or belief and condemns any acts of hatred towards Muslims, but remains cautious about the sovereignty of states when it comes to crafting their own domestic policies for security.

The Islamic Republic of Pakistan (on behalf of the OIC)

Pakistan has been the chief diplomatic proponent of international measures against Islamophobia through its efforts in getting, as a representative of the Organisation of Islamic Cooperation, a General Assembly resolution that led to the creation of the International Day to Combat Islamophobia. Pakistan is seeking official acknowledgement of Islamophobia as a new and emerging form of discrimination, the nomination of an envoy specifically charged with the task, and steps against the defilement of religious symbols and literature. Pakistan will advocate for action-oriented language while dealing with criticism about the treatment of religious minorities in Pakistan itself.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia, being the guardian of the holy places of Islam and a member of the Organization of Islamic Countries, is fully supportive of condemnation of Islamophobia internationally and for the protection of Muslims and their religion globally. On the other hand, as Saudi Arabia is also a nation that is very much dependent on cooperation in counter-terrorism measures and security arrangements, it is also cautious about any terminology that may hinder this aspect of its foreign policy.

Past Resolutions

Resolution	Content of Resolution
UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION A/RES/76/254 (2022)	Proclaims 15 March as the International Day to Combat Islamophobia, calling for global dialogue, tolerance and concrete measures to counter the rise of anti-Muslim hatred. It represents the first dedicated international recognition of Islamophobia as a phenomenon warranting collective action.
HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL RESOLUTION 16/18 (2011)	A landmark consensus resolution on combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatisation, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons based on religion or belief. It established an action-oriented framework bridging Western free-expression concerns and OIC demands, and gave rise to the ongoing “Istanbul Process.”
UN GLOBAL COUNTER- TERRORISM STRATEGY A/RES/60/288 (2006)	Adopted by consensus, this strategy affirms that effective counter-terrorism measures and the protection of human rights are not conflicting goals but complementary and mutually reinforcing ones, and it commits states to ensuring that counter-terrorism complies with international human rights law.

Resolution	Content of Resolution
UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1373 (2001)	Adopted under Chapter VII following the 11 September attacks, it obliged all member states to criminalise terrorist financing, enhance border controls and cooperate on counter-terrorism. While foundational to global security cooperation, its broad implementation contributed to the securitisation that this agenda critically examines.
INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, ARTICLES 18 & 20 (1966)	Article 18 guarantees the freedom of thought, conscience and religion, including the right to manifest one's religion in worship, observance, practice and teaching. Article 20(2) prohibits any advocacy of religious hatred constituting incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence together forming the legal bedrock for this agenda.
THE RABAT PLAN OF ACTION (OHCHR, 2012)	Provides an authoritative six-part threshold test context, speaker, intent, content, extent and likelihood of harm for distinguishing protected expression from criminal incitement to hatred, guiding states in calibrating restrictions without unduly curtailing free speech.

Questions a Resolution Must Answer

- 1. What safeguards can be embedded within national and international counter-terrorism frameworks to ensure that security measures do not result in religious or ethnic profiling, arbitrary detention or collective punishment?
- 2. How can the United Nations establish a clear, internationally accepted definition of Islamophobia that enables monitoring and accountability without infringing upon the freedom of expression?
- 3. What mechanisms can the UNHRC create to monitor, document and report instances where counter-terrorism laws are misused to suppress religious minorities or political dissent?
- 4. How can states be held accountable for mass surveillance, religious profiling and discriminatory entry restrictions carried out under the rationale of national security?
- 5. What is the appropriate balance between a state's legitimate interest in regulating the public sphere (including religious dress and association) and an individual's right to manifest their religion or belief?
- 6. How can the Council distinguish protected expression including criticism of religion from criminal incitement to religious hatred, and what role should the Rabat Plan of Action play in this distinction?
- 7. What positive measures (education, inter-faith dialogue, hate-crime legislation, community policing) can be promoted to reduce Islamophobia and rebuild trust between minority communities and state institutions?
- 8. How can the United Nations ensure that its own counter-terrorism architecture, including sanctions lists and the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, is consistently subordinated to international human rights law?
- 9. Beyond condemnation and the designation of commemorative days, what concrete and enforceable steps such as a Special Envoy or independent monitoring mandate can the Council take to deter and remedy religious discrimination committed in the name of counter-terrorism?

Sources to Use

The Right Sources

1. **Official United Nations websites, articles, and libraries (OHCHR, UNHRC, UN documentation).**
2. **UN-recognised and reputable news and reference outlets, e.g., Al Jazeera, Reuters, Britannica.**
3. **Reports of the Special Rapporteurs (on freedom of religion or belief; on counter-terrorism and human rights).**
4. **Governmental websites of your own country and official policy documents.**
5. **Established human rights organisations and NGOs (Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch) and “.org” sites that follow fact-based reporting.**

These sources are verified and provide accurate information that your portfolio can rely upon. An official UN website is the most reliable, as it is UN-ratified and offers in-depth context on your country's stance and obligations.

The Wrong Sources

1. **BuzzFeed and similar entertainment-oriented outlets.**
2. **Wikipedia (useful only as a starting point for tracing primary sources).**
3. **Quora and other crowd-sourced opinion platforms.**
4. **“.com” websites with a vested commercial or political interest.**
5. **Op-ed and editorial articles presenting individual opinion as fact.**

All of the sources listed above are coloured by the perceptions of their writers and answer questions from an individual knowledge domain with no proven accuracy. Delegates are expected to corroborate every claim against primary, verifiable documentation.

Preambulatory and Operative Clauses

Preambulatory clauses:

Acknowledging Affirming Alarmed by Approving Aware of Believing Bearing in mind Confident Congratulating Contemplating Convinced Declaring Deeply concerned Deeply conscious Deeply convinced Deeply disturbed Deeply regretting Deploing Desiring Emphasizing Expecting Expressing its appreciation Expressing its satisfaction	Fulfilling Fully alarmed Fulfilling Fully alarmed Fully aware Fully believing Further deploring Further recalling Guided by Having adopted Having considered Having considered further Having devoted attention Having examined Having heard Having received Having studied Keeping in mind Noting further.	Taking note Viewing with appreciation Welcoming Noting with appreciation Noting with approval Noting with deep concern Noting with regret Noting with satisfaction Observing Pointing out Reaffirming Realizing Recalling Recognizing Referring Reminding Seeking Taking into account Taking into consideration
--	---	---

Preambulatory and Operative Clauses

Operative clauses:

Accepts	Designates	Recommends
Affirms	Encourages	Regrets
Approves	Endorses	Requests
Appreciates	Expresses its hope	Resolves
Asks	Further invites	Seeks
Authorizes	Further proclaims	Strongly affirms
Calls for	Further recommends	Strongly condemns
Calls upon	Further requests	Strongly urges
Condemns	Further resolves	Suggests
Congratulates	Hopes	Trusts
Confirms	Proclaims	Transmits
Deplores	Proposes	Urges