



**Statement on behalf of OIC, delivered by Amb. Khalil Hashmi, during the
General Debate under Agenda Item 8**

52nd Session
29 March 2023

Mr. President,

Thirty years since the VDPA, much progress has been made in advancing universal respect for human rights. We reaffirm our commitment to promote and protect rights and freedoms for all, in accordance with international law.

In fostering and safeguarding rights, the VDPA outlines effective international cooperation as a vehicle to do so.

Unfortunately, we are witnessing troubling trends and developments that undermine the VDPA spirit.

We see self-serving efforts to re-interpret international human rights law in order to legitimize the controversial concept of “sexual orientation and gender identity”.

The rush to normalize these individual sexual choices not only ignores the integrity of human rights principles, it also creates legal complications with no common human benefit.

Unlike the fundamental human rights **principles**, this concept is neither universal nor inalienable.

Legally, sexual orientation and gender identity is a personal choice, not a human right. It is not recognized as a legal ground of discrimination under international human rights law. Like other personal choices, it is not immune from the law and cannot be promoted as a supra legal norm above respective legal jurisdiction.

An individuals’ legal entitlement to rights is based on inherent dignity of human beings and not on his/her sexual orientation. We reject arbitrary creation of categories of the so called rightsholders on the basis of their personal choices such as “sexual orientation”.



Mr. President

The campaign to normalize and legalize personal sexual choices has yet to demonstrate its beneficial impact on society.

Instead, by imposing private sexual matters on multilateral agendas, this divisive approach is diverting attention from the common pursuit of poverty alleviation, universal health care, sustainable development, combating climate change, racism, religious intolerance and phobias against people of faith.

Forcing non-consensual mandates of questionable legality across the multilateral world is both ill-advised and counterproductive.

Even worse, tactics such as “claiming political victimization”, “name calling” and “development conditionalities” are being employed to coerce developing countries to legislate this concept in national laws. These measures contravene the foundational principles of sovereignty and independence of states.

The campaign to hoist the proverbial rainbow flag on multilateral processes, on sovereign states and on dissenting hearts and minds is promoting divisions and polarizing the atmosphere.

The future of multilateral cooperation cannot be tied to a contentious social concept which is neither universally defined nor accepted; and whose societal perspectives vary over time, across regions and where its own subscribers are still evolving their forms of expression.

I thank you.