

1- Is it true to conclude that paragraph 38 in your report contained in doc. A/HRC/6/5 that defamation implies that defamation of religious symbols and offending people's ^{new} ~~held~~ deeply religious feelings is an act of freedom of expression? If so, what are foundations—be it legal, moral, ethical, logical, ontological, epistemological, or even practical—to consider a hostile abusive act—speech act, artistic act a form of freedom of expression.

2- Do you really believe it would do justice to both freedom of religion and freedom of expression to view either in lieu of the other, especially in a political arena

a diversified political arena
such as the one we live
in.?