

[2025 Los Angeles California Building Code Stipulations to Emphasize?](#)

Trespass in the health care industry aside.

"Events of . . . prayers . . . witnessed", for example how?

A fellow's similar experiences.

"Us" and "them" for the Klamath River hydroelectric Dams.

[East Asia for East Asians with visitation?](#)

Ike's industrial complex statement.

Popular Vote per the Electoral College? (Some tedious reckoning about National Popular Vote per States' Electoral College Votes Compact Plan)(Additional description of the proposed and 15 U.S.A. States ratified National Popular Vote Compact, has been available of www.commoncause.org/national-popular-vote .)

[Some Discussion of a National Popular Vote per States' Electoral College Votes Compact Plan](#)

[My Endorsement of a "National Popular Vote Compact" System](#)

High auto registration fee!

[Ike Eisenhower's 01/17/1961 Farewell Address](#)

[My *asterisk-annotated Ike Eisenhower 01/17/1961 Farewell Address:](#)

[Each U.S.A. State should have its own unique three Senators National Congress Representation.](#)

[U.N. Security Council Russian Voting Abstention.](#)

[Concerning U.N. Security Council Voting](#)

[U.N. Charter Amendment Proposals](#)

[Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) Commentary on UN Charter Chapter V Article 27](#)

[Requirement for a Vehicle Manually Operable Window Crank](#)

[Requirement for Whistles, flashing Lights, and same color contrast Coloring on large Windmills' propeller Blade](#)

In consequence of the 2025 SW California wild fires, a Los Angeles CA area building code that requires much the same as: "All readily ember-ignitable materials, including asphalt shingles, tar roofs, wooden shakes, and organic fiber thatching, are totally banned and outlawed from being used as roofing materials on all human occupancy buildings; only metal and/or concrete, and/or rock and/or ceramic -- including fired: clay, tile, and brick -- may be used to exteriorly roof human occupancy buildings; all human occupancy building roofs must have a fire suppressant water sprinkler and/or water drip irrigation system, between the exterior roof and any flammable roof underlayment; all wooden roof underlayment must be copper azole treated and silicone solution sealed; all human occupancy buildings must have fire resistant metal and/or concrete and/or ceramic and/or rock exterior walls"; appears soon necessary for all forthcoming construction of Los Angeles CA wild land bordering areas' new human occupancy buildings.

Trespass in the health care industry is difficult to prevent and stop. I'm old and experienced enough, and events of several of my prayers have been abundantly and greatly -- of several unusual, natural, and specific happenings -- witnessed, so I am more than adequately qualified to state that at least a large minority of U.S.A. citizens prefer to live without health care -- including X-ray of human anatomy health care -- trespass. So hey, assisted suicide is legal in Oregon, so possibly may "perfect crime"-seeking criminals match their "no fault victimization of neighbors" demand, with a "be blasted with X-rays in the name of health care **legitimacy** (!), or keep hiking and/or hiding to avoid it, while all too often uncomfortably (!) losing your teeth" ultimatum? Sadly so. Thus we need to **reject** many monopolistic opportunities that force us to be X-rayed for our health care.

"Events of . . . prayers . . . witnessed", for example how? I'm pleased to answer with three examples, of several substantially beneficial for humanity, witnessed events of some of my prayers. Thus: Often in my life I hoped for a personal message from God Almighty, that I might assure myself of and share fairly with humanity. My theory, as I subsequently now summarize it, was "per a friendly greeting from the Lord Almighty, humanity could confidently hope for, what is forever better than previous, and what is good enough forever more, for humanity!" Eventually of no other human than myself, I prayerfully, though somewhat clumsily, asked for an unusual cloud trail -- that would be similar to what I then described -- to view.

Subsequently thereafter, one day while in my nine and ten years-old age period (1961-62), and living in the house that I have always since found the nicest of my home occupancy experience (the three bedroom house had a rectangular floor plan, that connected from Living Room, to Hallway, left to Bedroom, left to "half

Bathroom”, straight through Utility Room with a right to Carport or straight forward through Kitchen area and straight to Dining Room at front of house, and left to Living Room again), I was again -- as so all too often of my youth -- bored for inspiration and problem solutions, when I remembered my quest to observe a sign from God. I then reasoned that previously I had always looked for the Lord's presence mostly conveniently to myself, so inconveniently to myself I marched myself out of the house, my face deliberately angled uncomfortably downward so as to avoid seeing much of the sky, even if someone then chanced to observe me walking unusually of humanity so, and so that once outside in front of the house, I could quickly look upward to, and mostly first observe most of the sky nearly straight above me, for a sky trail sign, that I had at least days before postulated might, in a similar way as ancient people had reported being inspired of the Lord Almighty, happen as an address to me from the Lord Almighty,.

I figured that my chances then of seeing a linear east-west direction, middle altitude vapor and/or smoke trail of natural causes, were sufficiently minor, so that such a manifestation would be very unusual for the area. There had been no noise or beckoning other than my afore-described unusual resolve to draw myself outside to view the sky.

Rather than quickly as then recently planned, I slowly elevated my face in stages from its cramped downward position, and viewed what I esimated would be another average open blue sky, with perhaps a few puffy and/or stringy/wispy water vapor clouds. Having so prepared and presented myself, I did very well to not collapse or stand rigidly in shock, for there nearly straight above me in an 18% natural cotton candy pink -- that appeared not to be just solar refraction -- and 12% dreamsicle, or creamsicle, or sherbet medium gold-orange, and 65% -- one place at least a little bit cake frosting-like -- cotton white, with 5% buff grey on mostly exclusively the length -- rather than the width -- sides, massively voluminously from east to west, silently without being disrupted of crosscurrents, though very slightly of its great -- I estimated perhaps 18 to 28 miles long -- length, apparently possibly drifting slowly west-northwest, casting no shadow on myself in the midafternoon sun, was a constant -- and wide for its elevation -- width, western horizon to out of my sight in the eastern horizon, horizontal column of thick -- I repeatedly assayed it to have perhaps expanded previously as much as 5% -- cloud, that resembled a round corrugated steel water stream confinement pipe.

A jet or a rocket passing that low -- my best approximation is within 3,000 feet of myself then -- could, though necessarily would?, have been very loud and fast; so how else could the cloud have formed since I had briefly been outside -- and at least looked out of the picture window -- in the previous few hours, unless a projectile that was able to virtually ignore wind resistance had silently combusted and/or disintegrated so, or the cloud column had coherently moved in from somewhere else and then remained at no, or a nearly or perhaps

imperceptible sideways, motion? We were residing at 528' elevation then, and airplane contrails were rarely seen, and invariably of much greater altitude, so as to appear more string-like than the runner rug-like appearance of the cloud trail that I then viewed.

I moved back indoors, and after several minutes, informed my mother that there was a sky formation that she should view outdoors. She viewed it, and although it was massive over our community, our local community news reported that its cause was unknown.

In the fifty years since then, I have seen one or a few photographic images of similarly sized, grey-whitish cloud trails, that were caused of greatly vertically falling natural bodies' incineration in earth's atmosphere. A subsonic creation and motion vector quality of the cloud trail, could help explain the "departed otherworldly presence" sensation aspect, that simultaneously remained grand and observing, and that I experienced while viewing the cloud trail. However, a subsonic aircraft of the early 1960's, maybe(?) may possibly have produced the long, thick, wide side ruffles-containing, cloud formation that we observed; though any sky writing vehicle then seemed almost certainly inadequate for that volume of display, as curiously to me, the cloud trail had much the same volume continuity throughout its long length.

A more recent and perhaps less elaborate witnessed prayer event of mine, is as follows: One time some weather reporters were noting that we had a big hurricane moving toward and near to a bay, and a miracle could sure help move the hurricane east of the bay, where the hurricane could proceed less expensively for all. So I prayed for east movement of the hurricane, and close to the bay the hurricane moved substantially east of the bay.

Another witnessed prayer event of mine, addressed censoring a 20+ years-prevalent, mass transit civil trespass. Although the event was a large earth movement of timely significance and veto opportunity relevance against the mass transit civil trespass, the event was largely ignored of the trespassers. (chuckle, I wasn't one of those many trespassers to ignore it.) **Like many other persons, however, many of my prayer requests resulted in no change where I was preferring for change to occur.**

(Hello, lonely heart. Briefly I find that God Almighty wants each person to sinlessly respect God absolutely. You may respect God per sinlessly providing sinless good care for what, and "what" includes everything that, belongs to God. Take good – and good isn't always excellent, good is \leq (less than or equal to) excellent, while excellent is always \geq (greater than or equal to) good – care of what belongs to God, and you thus take good care of yourself. Also, all of my "divine intervention" possibility observations, have been accompanied with at least one possible alternative derivation for each observation, so that I have estimated that the Lord Almighty prefers to allow us alternative

explanations sometimes of the Lord's manifestations. Similarly, in quotation of Father Black, "We're fostering a ghetto mentality.")

Here is a dramatized story of a fellow's experiences, like what I had: A chap was bummed out with the U.S.A.'s recurrent victimization of marijuana users. So the chap worked for six months on a government survey in beautiful Oregon national forest; and then used his earnings to tour outside of the U.S.A., including many weeks in N. Africa, where marijuana use was legally tolerated in public. The chap was so novel and engaging in N. Africa, that after the chap deliberately committed a substantial, though petty, trespass, so as to place the chap in embassy custody, the chap was investigated with truth serum. Well the chap was only partly able to answer evasively then, however he gave a good enough show so that he was sent back to the land of plenty, with assigned surveillance to deliver him of.

Once back in the land of plenty, the chap could barely find basic wage employment to support himself of, and upon being caught in possession of paper-rolled marijuana, the chap was placed on monthly probation (Augh, arduous scheduling, like recurrent health checkups) with the condition that if the chap joined the navy, the probation would be declared adequately served and stopped.

Thence, and since the chap wanted to earn a college degree, and fortuitously somehow, the chap's military draft number was 241, the chap enlisted in the U.S. Navy. There the chap observed a shipmate with an assignment for a volunteer: Be where you are ordered to be, when you are ordered to be there, and you may receive an early honorable discharge to go to college of.

Upon the shipmate -- and there is nothing unusual in this narrative of an average U.S.A. chap, now is there? -- being where the shipmate was ordered to be, when the shipmate was ordered to be there, the chap was given an early honorable discharge to go to college of.

Similarly, per my surveillance and colleagues, I find:

1) "Them", a minority of less than 23%, destroying the Klamath River hydroelectric dams, though "We", a majority of greater than 77%, prefer that the Klamath River hydroelectric dams be both retained, and where necessary, improved with fish passageways, is neither adequate nor satisfactory (Please see my similar finding of 4 following, whereof a proposed U.S.A. States' State ratification conversion of an

electorate's election-cast minority percentage votes, to votes that to provide electoral vote garnering, provide a summation with the election's majority vote, that results in all of some of the election's State electoral votes comprising a State majority vote for the candidate that received the election's original national popular majority vote, is identified and per an example of its numerical exchange stipulation, found to prevent some State's minority percentage vote from receiving electoral college vote, for the, or a, candidate that the minority popular percentage vote originally votes for.).

2) The U.S.A. has successfully peacefully maintained peace with Cuba, per Cuban emigrant enlistees -- I served with a couple of them -- in the U.S. Navy, and since 1903, with U.S.A. peaceful rent of the Cuban Guantanamo Bay, U.S.A. naval facility area. Similarly, Taiwan has a substantially good opportunity for successfully maintaining peace with the largely Asian continental People's Republic of China, per Taiwan renting peacefully, Taiwan island location naval base areas with People's Republic of China, for peaceful People's Republic of China military naval base naval installations and operations.

3) The U.S.A.'s annual federal government budget is spent mostly on the U.S.A. Department of Defense. That spending includes buying much research, development, and supply production from private enterprise, for the U.S.A. Department of Defense. This "guns and butter" -- from a reference quotation about the now deceased Oregon Senator Hatfield -- diplomacy, was also of a connotation, per one of my exasperated shipmates exclaiming "Oh good, now we have a milk line". Ike Eisenhower's following 01/17/1961 quote refers to the situation thusly: "the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." (A copy of my [*asterisk-annotated Ike Eisenhower 01/17/1961 Farewell Address](#), is available after my "National Popular Vote Compact Proposal" commentaries here. Ike's 01/17/1961 address, provides some **truly profound** and cogent appraisal and voting guidelines counsel.)

4) An appeal to avoid a divisive and intractable potential gerrymandering movement, such as a states' **national popular vote compact** subset of the national electoral vote system, that could seek to circumvent a U.S.A. national Presidential and Vice Presidential election popular vote majority summation system, per the movement reassigning **each** U.S.A. State's Presidential and Vice Presidential election popular vote minority percentage, to be summed with the same majority vote percentage that captured the the **State's** election per the election's original State only popular vote summation majority **rule**; so that in summation with the State's original majority vote, the reassigned -- i.e. converted to opposite support declaration -- minority votes provide a 100% **State** majority vote, that being an absolute majority vote, claims and

receives all of the State's U.S.A. Presidential and Vice Presidential electoral college votes, for the original **State** majority vote candidate, and that allows no assignment of electoral college vote to any other candidate than the **State** majority rule-elected candidate. (Currently this year 2023, most of the U.S.A. States, apparently without a mutual federal compact so to do, individually assign their electoral votes similarly to this absolute State majority system. federal compact movement possibility.)

Some Commentary per Reference of a National Popular Vote Compact Proposal

First I'll state that I prefer to Constitutionally abolish the electoral college, and to elect the President and Vice President per direct popular vote majority only, where developments don't require non-public election Constitutional procedure delegation of a President and/or a Vice President. I find that the electoral college too much functions as a clearinghouse "middleman", to circumvent small majority best social survival investment for all, in questions of best social survival development, where only a small majority occurs to a large minority opposition; and that the electoral college offers too much opportunity for fallacious government election. However the electoral college is significantly preferred as an opportunity for popular vote minority percentage rule against popular vote majority percentage rule of an election, and so a U.S. Constitution amendment to abolish the electoral college is difficult to enact.

Basically, If the U.S.A.'s Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates election national popular vote, was required both U.S.A. nationally summated, and after that summation, the U.S.A. State's electoral votes were **all** required assigned to the U.S.A. Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates who received the **majority** of the U.S.A. nationally summated popular vote, the electoral college electoral votes would then nationally support the U.S.A. **national popular majority** vote winners for the U.S.A. Presidential and Vice Presidential offices; though here, based on a forthcoming named "States A & Z example" of 4 electoral votes to 3 electoral votes below, the assigned electoral votes might not sometimes federally represent the U.S.A. **national** popular **majority** vote winners for the U.S.A. Presidential and Vice Presidential offices, because per a "federal" -- as I here use the term to denote a States first, rather than a post-national vote summation first, assignment of electoral votes -- electoral vote assignment, the popular vote **minority** percentage recipient candidate may -- as has previously happened -- be elected of the electoral majority vote.

To elaborate: If the U.S.A. **States** were **required to assign** all of each U.S.A. State's **electoral college votes** to the popular vote **majority** winner candidates of the **State's** U.S.A. Presidential and Vice Presidential **election**, before the U.S.A.'s Presidential and Vice Presidential election national popular vote summation, **rather than to assign** each U.S.A. State's electoral college

votes to the U.S.A.'s Presidential and Vice Presidential election **candidates who won, of the U.S.A.'s Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates' current election's already accomplished conclusive national popular vote summation, the majority of the U.S.A.'s Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates' State election popular vote; the State'(s) electoral vote assignments could nationally summate to elect with an electoral majority vote, the U.S.A.'s Presidential and Vice Presidential **candidates who didn't receive the U.S.A.'s national popular vote majority,, because the electoral votes were assigned of the State popular majorities only, rather than were assigned of the nationally summated state popular majorities** (please see the named "**States A & Z Example**" that follows shortly).**

Per reference to the U.S. Constitution Article 2 statement that "Section 1.

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected, as follows:

Each state shall appoint, in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves. And they shall make a list of all the persons voted for, and of the number of votes for each; which list they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted. The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such majority, and have an equal number of votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately choose by ballot one of them for President; and if no person have a majority, then from the five highest on the list the said House shall in like manner choose the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each state having one vote; A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. In every case, after the choice of the President, the person having the greatest number of votes of the electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal votes, the Senate

shall choose from them by ballot the Vice President.

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States....",

I only now have time to present two cases of one example of a voter preference **representation proportion**, that assigning a State's popular vote minority percentage to reverse itself and become part of the State's popular vote majority percentage vote, prior to the State's popular vote being summated nationally with all other States' popular votes, produces.

Thus: Given two U.S.A. States A and Z, with State A having a voter population of 4 million, State Z having a voter population of 3 million, each State awarding one electoral vote in percentage proportion for each one million votes for the same candidate, and each State having a near 50% vote for candidate C+ and a near 50% vote for candidate C-, as follows:

States A & Z Example

STATE A

2 million + 1 votes for C+

2 million - 1 votes for C-

STATE Z

1.5 million - 1 votes for C+

1.5 million + 1 votes for C-.

A nationally or federally combined State A and State Z popular vote tally is 2,000,001 votes + 1,499,999 votes = 3,500,000 votes for candidate C+; and 1,999,999 votes + 1,500,001 votes = 3,500,000 votes for candidate C-; so that candidates C+ and C- have both received 3.5 million popular votes, and are of a **combined national or federal popular vote, tied** in the election.

Then, where "**Most states give ALL** of their **electors** to the **winner in their state**", like the political advocacy group named "Common Cause" asserts is **practiced currently** per U.S. Constitution Article 2, all of State A's electoral votes would be assigned to candidate C+, and all of State Z's electoral votes would be assigned to candidate C-, for a federally -- in my parlance here -- combined election electoral result of **4** electoral votes for candidate C+ and **3** electoral votes for candidate C-; even though a nationally or a federally combined State A and State Z popular vote tally for candidates C+ and C-, is yet an exact tie vote of 3.5 million votes for each candidate; so that of a nationwide *federal or national* popular vote tally **before**

assigning electoral college State votes, both candidates are hypothetically eligible for 3.5 electoral votes.

Some Discussion of a National Popular Vote per States' Electoral College Votes Compact Plan

The political advocacy group named "Common Cause", states in some of their paper post literature: "How the Current System Works The constitution gives each state electors equal to its numbers of representatives and senators combined. We call this the Electoral College.

Most states give ALL of their electors to the winner in their state regardless of whether the candidate wins by one vote or by millions. These "winner-takes-all" state laws are not in the constitution and they have changed over time. Maine and Nebraska use a different Congressional district system. "

The Common Cause <https://www.commoncause.org/our-work/voting-and-elections/national-popular-vote/> web page states: "NATIONAL POPULAR VOTE: ENSURING EVERY VOTE COUNTS Here's how to do it: the Constitution allows states to decide how they award their electoral votes, so if enough require their electors to vote for the winner of the nationwide popular vote (instead of who won in that state), we could fix the problems with the Electoral College without needing to amend the Constitution."

The FAQ section of the Common Cause <https://www.commoncause.org/our-work/voting-and-elections/national-popular-vote/national-popular-vote-faq/> web page states: {"How does the system currently work?

Right now, the President of the United States is not elected by a popular vote. Instead, each state and Washington D.C. is assigned a certain number of electoral votes based on its population. And in all states but Maine and Nebraska, the candidate who receives the most votes in that state is awarded all of its electoral votes, whether the split is 51% to 49% or 99% to 1%. A majority of 270 electoral votes is required to elect the president. . . .

How would National Popular Vote work?

States already have the power to award their electors to the winner of the national popular vote, although this would be disadvantageous to the state that did so unless it was joined simultaneously by other states that represent a majority of electoral votes." [I find that the preceding "disadvantageous" statement, appears based on reduced election loss risk per instantaneous majority vote election win.] "Hence, the

National Popular Vote plan is an interstate compact— a type of state law authorized by the U.S. Constitution that enables states to enter into a legally enforceable, contractual obligation to undertake agreed joint actions, which may be delayed in implementation until a requisite number of states join in.

Under the National Popular Vote plan, the compact would take effect only when enabling legislation has been enacted by states collectively possessing a majority of the electoral votes: 270 of 538 total.

Once effective, states could withdraw from the compact at any time except during the six-month window between July 20 of an election year and Inauguration Day (January 20).

To determine the National Popular Vote winner, state election officials simply would tally the nationwide vote for president based on each state's official results. Then, election officials in all participating states would choose the electors sworn to support the presidential candidate who received the largest number of popular votes in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The winner would receive all of the **compact states'** electoral votes, giving them at least the necessary 270 to win the White House. The National Popular Vote compact would have the same effect as a constitutional amendment to abolish the Electoral College but has the benefit of retaining the power to control presidential elections in states' hands. This feature is critical to the passionate bipartisan support the compact receives."}

Common Cause's above explanation of its proposed -- and ratified of 15 U.S.A. States -- "National Popular Vote Compact", appears to be inexact where it states (italics and bold print emphasis following is mine): "To determine the **National Popular Vote** winner, *state election officials simply would tally the nationwide vote for president based on each state's official results*. Then, election officials in all *participating* states would choose the electors sworn to support the presidential candidate who received the largest number of popular votes *in* all 50 states and the District of Columbia."

A more exact description may be Common Cause's intention, as: "To determine the National Popular Vote **Compact** winner, state *and District of Columbia* election officials *of the compact*, simply would tally the nationwide *popular* vote for president, based on each state's, *of the 50 U.S.A. states*, official *own popular vote for president* results, *and based on the District of Columbia's* official *own popular vote for president* results. Then, election officials in all *of the Compact participating states and the District of Columbia*, would choose their electors who were sworn to support the presidential candidate, who *from* all 50 states' and the District of

Columbia's popular votes combined, received the largest number of popular votes ."

If the proposed -- and ratified of 15 U.S.A. States -- "National Popular Vote Compact" electoral college **subset** electoral college voting system, always from its ratifying States, only aligns and casts electoral college electoral votes, to support and enact the U.S.A.'s nationally tallied **majority** popular vote, so that that nationally tallied majority popular vote, is facilitated to, of a majority of the electoral college electoral votes, conclusively rule, definitively assign, provide and totally determine the voting outcome of the U.S.A. national Presidential and Vice Presidential election, that the nationally summated popular vote and the electoral college vote are for; I find that the "National Popular Vote Compact" is worthy as a "national popular vote majority rule" system, of being ratified into enough U.S.A. States' State law, that the "National Popular Vote Compact" provides, per and in consequence of the U.S.A. nationally summated popular vote, some or all of the electoral college vote of each U.S.A. Presidential and Vice Presidential national election.

One possible objection to the redefinition of vote declaration, "winner take all", "to the victor goes the spoils" (quoted from President Andrew Jackson), proposed U.S. States "National Popular Vote Compact" electoral college vote casting election system, claims that every voter who votes per the system, asserts that they prefer their vote to ultimately be tallied as a majority vote for whichever candidate, in the election's first total conclusive complete national popular vote summation, receives the popular majority vote. That objection however, where electoral college votes are cast in consequence of, per, and in absolute majority enactment of an afore conclusively determined national popular vote majority-assigned election result; frequently collapses to opponents and proponents of any issue, either being dissatisfied about not being represented in the election of the issue in a different way, -- such as a coin flip, or a State electoral majority national popular vote minority that voted against the national popular majority vote, -- than as a national popular majority vote-derived caster of electoral vote for the national popular majority vote-elected candidate; or those opponents and proponents simply being dissatisfied about not winning election of the issue a different way.

From this discussion of possible and/or practiced **Electoral College operation**, and per U.S. Constitution Article 2, **many** other "federal-type" -- as I here refer to them -- **electoral college popular vote tally "Compact" systems** appear possible for States to ratify and practice, including of the above States A & Z Example, 1) when per a current given U.S.A. States' popular vote tally electoral vote assignment system, State A awards 2 electoral votes to candidate C+ and 2 electoral votes to candidate C-, and State Z awards 1.5 electoral votes to

candidate C+ and 1.5 electoral votes to candidate C-, there then results of the two State's combined electoral votes, that Candidate C+ and Candidate C- each receive **3.5** electoral votes. Of some note here, is that an exact 50%50% popular vote tie, certainly qualifies as worth 1/2 electoral vote to each candidate. Also of note – though facetiously – here, of State Z's 3 million votes and State A's 4 million votes, is that 2) if the States were to here insist that less than 500 thousand and one though greater than zero popular votes (or some other percentage less than 100 percent of the votes), forfeited those votes to the opposition-supported candidate, the election tally results here of *similar* vote casting, could be **3** electoral votes to candidate C+, and **4** electoral votes to candidate C- (Silly example. Why? To emphasize that stupendously arbitrary voting tallies, that exclude and/or ignore the U.S. Citizens' national popular vote, are possible per the current U.S. Constitution Article 2 Section 1 statement that "The electors shall meet in their respective states, and vote" [thus exclusively and of only their own individual choice, for any two persons, including any two persons who only the electors may select and prefer, providing that of the persons whom any of the electors vote for, "one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves"] "by ballot for two persons, of whom one at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves. And they shall make a list of all the persons voted for, and of the number of votes for each; which list they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate." ... [Then the following gibberish:] "The person having the greatest number of votes shall be the President, if such number" [the word "such" is defined as denoting "the same or similar", and the word "similar" denotes "a resemblance, or a same quality in a different way, or a different quality in a same way, or a simultaneous sameness to difference, or a simultaneous difference to sameness"; so when is any number that is similar – though different in the same way -- sufficient to "be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed"; for example, when the number is of much different quantity value quality in the same election way?] "be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such majority," [a majority of a whole number is greater than 50% of the whole number, thus of a correctly tallied election, there can't be "more than one who have" the same majority, else the votes have been tallied to a greater sum than is "the whole number of electors appointed"; though a multiple sub-50% majority of equal votes is worthy of reckoning] "and have an equal number of votes,"

Where in consequence of an alternative electoral college popular vote tally and electoral vote casting system, that *could* be, though I am not aware if it is, enacted of a U.S.A. State, **both** a State's minority popular vote total and the State's majority popular vote total are assigned an

X-to-Y proportional electoral vote for them, so that the State's popular vote minority percentages and popular vote majority percentage are each converted, per the same X-to-Y popular vote to electoral vote ratio, and the resulting State minority percentage(s) and majority percentage electoral votes **continue** their same popular vote opposition ratio to each other; "**Depriving**" the popular vote minority percentages of electoral college vote representation, **is another possible opposition claim against** a "winner take all", "to the victor goes the spoils" absolute majority rule **redefinition of voter property** (the voter's vote), U.S. electoral college **State vote casting election system** proposal, such as reportedly **now is in use** of several U.S.A. States, whereof only the smaller percentage(s) of the State election system's electorate's popular vote -- i.e. the vote(s) that is/are a numerically smaller percentage to the State popular vote majority percentage of the State election system's electorate's entire cast vote -- is/are reversed against itself/themselves, and is/are made to absolutely oppose and reject its/their --the percentage minority's(ies') popular votes' -- original print-stated candidate support, by that original print-stated candidate support being changed to support an alternative and different majority-seeking opposition candidate of the State majority percentage vote of the election, if that alternative and different candidate is elected of the election's original popular vote majority to win the election.

Additional description of the proposed and 15 U.S.A. States ratified National Popular Vote Compact, has been available of www.commoncause.org/national-popular-vote .

On a different topic: OUCH! Oregon's DMV 2025 two year registration of my 2019 all electric Chevrolet Bolt cost \$316!

A complete copy of Ike **Eisenhower's 01/17/1961 Farewell Address** was available for viewing per <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/president-dwight-d-eisenhowers-farewell-address> , and for copying per <https://www.eisenhowerlibrary.gov/sites/default/files/research/online-documents/farewell-address/reading-copy.pdf>.

[Follows here a copy of **my *asterisk-annotated Ike Eisenhower 01/17/1961 Farewell Address:**

"My fellow Americans:" *["Greetings," or "Greetings, my", or "Good Day," or "Good Day, my", or "My") Neighbors of America: From accepting this opportunity for addressing you, I have received a great honor, and I am very grateful so (as a person of common accordance with

others, who also share our common conflicts together, of our mutual concern for our best common development).]

“Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate post-war period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology-global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method.” ***[Similarly I have found there have been two kinds of pirates, and they had the same, though each also had a different than the other had, illegal travel resolve, that might be summarized as a tendency for illegal travel extent.]** “Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex

struggle-with liberty at stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment."

*[Of our "charted course", hereof I prefer to own up some of my findings about proponent, opponent, and neutral humanity, thusly: Take a look at the results of both millions of "what is best of these two choices?" elections, and millions of "yes? or no? about this" elections, and observe the election result percentages occurrence from those elections. Are there equal occurrences of 99% to 1%, 98% to 2%, 81-83% to 19-17%, 51% to 49%, 54-56% to 46-44%, 63-66% to 37-34%, etc., or do the percentages tend to occur inequally, with the most frequently occurring percentages and percentage ranges having a common denominator factor of near 12?; for example: $50\%50\% = 6/12 + 6/12$; $81-83\% =$ approximately and nearly $10/12$, etc.?)

"Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense;" *["We see no reason at all, why America shouldn't donate its high technology weapons, so that opposition may possibly discover, copy, and maybe improve upon that technology; even if it costs extorting opposed forces by conscription (such as military draft) to do so; 'cuz for example America might replace the weapons -- including specifically any wastemaker weapons -- that it gave away, with improved weapons, that may include specifically wastemaker weapons. Remember "Necessity is the mother of invention"?"

Certainly, per "Speak softly and carry a big stick", we of "good enough" conduct haven't of complacency, deliberately refused to manufacture -- or even discover -- the ultimate weapon that only destroys truly wrongful opposition, yet? Rather, we of "good enough" conduct have merely of ambivalence deferred, and/or of conflicting opportunities been detoured from, instituting "the ultimate weapon that only destroys truly wrongful opposition", a provider or co-provider of "heaven on earth", that like us, you agree may be ours for the forging. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Matthew 11:12. "For the Word of God is quick, and powerful." Hebrews 4:12. "God doesn't need your love, you need God's love." Father Dreisbach, now deceased.

Although "the pen is mightier than the sword", may our hypothesis ever be that "potential violence prevaieth for our peaceful survival, if we guard potential violence enough"; and shall we ever "fight fire with fire", secure that our guard is adequately affordable, to peacefully prevent our weapons opportunitites from manifesting themselves excessively violently, to we who are "good enough"? Also, may the "Ultimate weapon for survival of the good enough", be confounded of the ultimate weapon for destruction of the good, the middling, and the bad; where we find our costs of guarding wastemakers to be excessive for preventing wrongful or accidental deployment of those wastemakers?; i.e. can we build more hazard, liability, even more trouble than we can afford to avoid? Time and time again, must we have to "take the grain with the chaff", so that if we snooze we lose?

Good money after bad, producing and/or deploying inadequately guardable wastemakers, absurdly contradicts our opportunity for spending our money on better than guarding against wrongful, accidental, and/or wasteful wastemaker deployment, where instead, both we and our opposition may, of our respective security ability, trust -- similar to previous "balance of power" weapons production escalation avoidance investment -- of our vulnerabilities together with each other, and invest independently and/or mutually for the current and future good enough to all, peaceful, and adequately correctly rights-respecting, beneficially prosperous, best survival to us both, that opportunity for human events allows to us both.] "development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture;" *[we here may recall our current climate-change caused shortage of water and salmon, so leave it to beaver sequel possibility] "a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research-these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs-balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage-balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between action of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise. I mention two only.

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment." [so, historically in America, ye impoverished join the 24/7 quonsets military] "Our arms must be mighty," *[with best possible pre-emption and fail-safe against premature weapons deployment of any nation] "ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peace time, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now" *[Currently of the period since then, we neighbors of America aren't so foreign with each other, although supply and demand is usually of relevant dominance with our economic production.] "we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United State corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence-economic, political, even spiritual-is felt in

every city, every state house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex” ***[Ike's “military-industrial complex” statement here, appears to me substantially classical. I might rephrase it slightly as: In the councils of government, accordingly per rearrangement tendencies, we should guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex.]** “. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted, only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system-ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we-you and I, and our government-must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative.” ***[We neighbors of America aren't so foreign with each other recently and ongoingly, as some of our previous generations have been; however apparently each new generation is born to us, of above average foreignness with us; and supply and demand yet is usually of relevant dominance with our economic production]** “ Together we must learn how to compose difference, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war-as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years-I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little” ***[when stopping America's Vietnam war, Ike's "little" appeared small indeed in my neighborhood]** “I can to help the world advance along that road.

So-in this my last good night to you as your President-I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find somethings worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I-my” ***[neighbors of America]** “fellow citizens-need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing inspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs” ***[morally decently and sinlessly]** “satisfied; that those now denied” ***[fair or better]** “opportunity” ***[for all]** “shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.”}

Respectfully yours,

Danny L. Hull, B.S. Biology (with a Medical Technology major); A.A.S. Environmental Health Technology (with a Water Quality Control major).

(now of November 26, 2024 7:31 A.M. press time, with updates possible additionally)

Post Script: Pirates used to stealthily slip into harbors, then capture wealth and people of cities; like today politicians are able to stealthily slip into political offices, and then capture wealth and people of cities. Unfortunately for America, majority rule costs money so much, that per party representation in the U.S.A.'s current national government structure, America can't financially afford more than mostly two political parties -- the Dem who crats and the Repub who like cans -- at the U.S.A.'s national Congressional bargaining table, most of the time.

Each U.S.A. State should have its own unique three Senators National Congress Representation.

I estimate that constitutionally requiring 3 senators to represent each U.S.A. State in the U.S.A.'s national Congressional Senate, so that each U.S.A. State is uniquely represented individually in the U.S.A. national Senate, per three U.S.A. federal senators who each are separately elected from that individual U.S.A. State only, and who may not serve simultaneously as U.S.A. national Congressional senators from any other U.S.A. State or region, with the sole exception of those Senators' U.S.A. national senatorial service, that in consequence of those Senators being U.S.A. national Congressional senators of a U.S.A. State, concomitantly those Senators already perform simultaneously, in being and as U.S.A. national senators of the entire U.S.A. nation; would greatly improve both the U.S.A.'s public citizens' U.S.A. national Congressional Senate representation, and would greatly financially afford more than two political parties in the U.S.A.'s national Congress.

Therefore I herewith now vote that the Constitution of the United States of America, Amendment 17, be amended so that it states the same paragraph of only any one of the following paragraphs:

[1] "The United States of America (U.S.A.) Senate shall be composed from each State, per each State's resident citizens uniquely electing for six year Senatorships from their State only, three U.S.A. national citizen candidates to serve as Senators, who are permanent State residents of only the State that they are elected to Senatorship of; and each Senator shall have one vote.", or

[2] "The United States of America (U.S.A.) Senate, shall be composed from each State, per those State's resident citizens uniquely electing, for six year Senatorships that are from the citizens' State only, three U.S.A. citizen candidates to serve as Senators, who are permanent State residents of only the State that they are elected to Senatorship of; and each Senator shall have one vote.", or

[3] "The United States of America (U.S.A.) Senate, shall be composed from each State, per the State's resident citizens uniquely electing for six year Senatorships, that are from the electing citizens' single U.S.A. State only, three U.S.A. national citizen candidates to serve as Senators, who are permanent State residents of only the State that they are elected to Senatorship of;

and each Senator shall have one vote.", or

[4] "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of three Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

U.S. Constitution Amendment 17 currently states: "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

Is Russia Required to Abstain from Voting in U.N. Security Council Voting on the combined east Ukrainian, Crimean, and Russian Dispute?

On 02/26/2024 I asked AI:

Question: Is Russia Required to Abstain from Voting in U.N. Security Council Voting on the combined east Ukrainian, Crimean, and Russian Dispute?

Copilot **Answer:** No, Russia is not required to abstain from voting in the UN Security Council on the issue of Ukraine, Crimea, and Russia. According to the UN Charter, Article 27, paragraph 3, each member of the Security Council has one vote, and decisions on non-procedural matters require the affirmative votes of nine members, **including the concurring votes** of the permanent members. This means that any of the five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) can veto a resolution by voting against it or abstaining.

However, there is a convention known as the rule of impartiality, which states that a member of the Security Council that is a party to a dispute should abstain from voting on resolutions concerning that dispute. This rule is not legally binding, but rather a matter of political and moral obligation. The rule of impartiality has been applied inconsistently by the permanent members, depending on their interests and alliances. For example, in 2022, Russia vetoed a resolution that would have demanded that it stop its attack on Ukraine and withdraw all troops, while China, India, and the United Arab Emirates abstained. In 2023, Russia and the US abstained from a resolution that demanded immediate, safe and unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance to Gaza, while the other 13 members voted in favour.

Therefore, Russia has the right to vote on any resolution concerning the conflict in Ukraine, Crimea, and Russia, but it may choose to abstain or veto depending on its strategic and diplomatic objectives. The same applies to the other permanent members of the Security Council. The rule of impartiality is a voluntary and flexible principle that does not prevent any member from exercising its voting power.

Question: Since U.N. Charter Chapter V Article 27 states that . . . "provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.", isn't Russia thus of U.N. Charter Chapter V Article 27, required to abstain from Voting in U.N. Security Council Voting on the combined east Ukrainian, Crimean, and Russian Dispute?

Answer: That is a good question. The answer is not so simple, because the UN Charter does not define what constitutes a party to a dispute, nor does it specify how to determine if a decision falls under Chapter VI or paragraph 3 of Article 52. These are matters of interpretation and practice, which may vary depending on the context and the views of the Security Council members.

Chapter VI of the UN Charter deals with the **pacific** settlement of disputes, and Article 52, paragraph 3, refers to the role of regional arrangements or agencies in maintaining international peace and security. The purpose of the rule that a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting on decisions under these provisions is to ensure the impartiality and credibility of the Security Council. However, the rule does not apply to decisions under Chapter VII, which authorizes the Security Council to take action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression.

The problem is that the **Security Council often does not explicitly indicate whether a resolution is adopted under Chapter VI, Chapter VII, or both.** Sometimes, the Security Council may use language that implies the invocation of Chapter VII, such as "acting under Chapter VII" or "decides" instead of "recommends" or "calls upon". Other times, the Security Council may adopt resolutions that contain elements of both Chapter VI and Chapter VII, such as calling for a ceasefire, imposing sanctions, or authorizing a peacekeeping operation. In such cases, it is **unclear whether the rule of abstention applies or not.**

Another problem is that the Security Council does not have a clear or consistent criteria for determining **who is a party to a dispute**. This is left to the discretion of each member, who may decide to abstain or not based on their own interests and arguments. For example, in 2022, Russia claimed that it was not a party to the dispute in Ukraine, but rather a mediator, and therefore did not abstain from voting on a resolution that condemned its military intervention. In contrast, in 2023, Russia argued that it was a party to the dispute in Syria, and therefore abstained from voting on a resolution that called for a political transition.

Therefore, the **answer** to your question **depends on how the Security Council frames the issue** of Ukraine, Crimea, and Russia, and how Russia and the other permanent members interpret their roles and responsibilities. Russia is not required to abstain from voting on any resolution concerning the conflict, but it may choose to do so or not based on its strategic and diplomatic objectives. The same applies to the other permanent members of the Security Council. The rule of abstention is a voluntary and flexible principle that does not prevent any member from exercising its voting power.

The United Nations (U.N.) Charter is available from

<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>

Concerning U.N. Security Council voting,

From <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/voting-system>:

"Voting System

Vote and Majority Required"

Chapter V Article 27 of the UN Charter states that:

"1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an

affirmative vote of nine members.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, *in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.*"
(italics and bold font mine)

"The Right to Veto

The creators of the United Nations Charter conceived that five countries — China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) [which was succeeded in 1990 by the Russian Federation], the United Kingdom and the United States —, because of their key roles in the establishment of the United Nations, would continue to play important roles in the maintenance of international peace and security.

They were granted the special status of Permanent Member States at the Security Council, along with a special voting power known as the "right to veto". It was agreed by the drafters that if any one of the five permanent members cast a negative vote in the 15-member Security Council, the resolution or decision would not be approved.

All five permanent members have exercised the right of veto at one time or another. If a permanent member does not fully agree with a proposed resolution but does not wish to cast a veto, it may choose to abstain, thus allowing the resolution to be adopted if it obtains the required number of nine favourable votes."

Some pertinent excerpts from U.N. Charter Chapter VI, with regard to permanent U.N. Security Council member nations abstaining from U.N. Security Council resolution voting, herewith

follow:

Charter of the United Nations

Chapter VI — Pacific Settlement of Disputes

“Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.
2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.
2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.”
[Here's Chapter IV Articles 11, 10, and 12]:

“Article 11

1. The General Assembly may consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.

2. The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council, or by a state which is not a Member of the United Nations in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the state or states concerned or to the Security Council or to both. Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion.

3. The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security.

4. The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10.”

“Article 10

The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, may

make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.”

“Article 12

1. While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.

2. The Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, shall notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and shall similarly notify the General Assembly, or the Members of the United Nations if the General Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.”

“Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to

settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.”

Per the above excerpt stipulations, such as "resort to regional agencies or arrangements" (Ch. VI, Article 33, Paragraph 1), and per following Chapter VII stipulations, such as Article 39, I estimate that we may find adequate requisites to require that Russia, being currently a party to the combined east Ukrainian, Crimean, and Russian dispute, should of several U.N. Security Council voting opportunities, abstain from U.N. Security Council voting on current combined east Ukrainian, Crimea, and Russian dispute questions.

What about the United Nations Security Council deploying Vietnamese and/or Bangladeshi and/or South Africa U.N. security forces to Kyiv Ukraine, to defensively guard against ground troop invasion of Ukraine's Kyiv capital city?

That deployment possibly is claimed as being premature, per the following situation:

Given that:

The 15 nation member U.N. Security Council, has a permanent 5 U.N.-founding nation membership (composed of People's Republic of China, France, Russia, United Kingdom, and United States of America), and the U.N. Charter requires that for a Security Council resolution to be approved into U.N. law, the resolution must receive at least nine approving Security Council votes, where each of the Security Council member nations that do not abstain from voting on the resolution, have one vote on the resolution, and none of the U.N.-founding 5 nations vote against the resolution, and all of the U.N.-founding 5 nations that do not abstain from voting on the resolution, vote for the resolution;

Then: the U.N. may be inveighed against and enjoined, that to so provide security forces currently, the U.N. first needs U.N. Charter authorization, from first providing wording to go with and in support of a provision in Chapter V Article 27(3) of the U.N. Charter, where the Article 27(3) provision requires states that are “*party to a dispute*”, to abstain from voting in decisions under Chapter VI of the U.N. Charter; because the abstention obligation of Article 27(3) is interpreted as both applying only to the Security Council’s Chapter VI “*pacific settlement of disputes*”, and to not applying to *more explicitly declared* physically substantial opportunities, that are authorized in the Security Council’s Chapter VII, and that may include Articles 39 to 51 particularly in part as follows:

Chapter VII — Action with respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the

Peace, and Acts of Aggression

“Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international

peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Article 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined

international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.”

“Article 48

The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.”

“Article 50

“If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain

international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

Per the aforegiven Chapter V Article 27 Paragraph 3 statement that . . ."*3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.*" (italics and bold font mine), follows here (underlining and bold font mine):

Charter of the United Nations

Chapter VIII — Regional arrangements

“Article 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.
2. The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.
3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of

local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.”

Will you please allow me to ask you: "If I am a defendant or a plaintiff in a court trial, does that qualify me to also serve as judge and/or jury of that trial?" If your answer is that it depends on the trial's system, and that of many trial systems now extant, myself serving then as judge and/or jury, simply reduces the trial outcome to my preferred trial results exclusively, regardless of what trial evidence is presented in opposition to my trial claim; then perhaps like me you can see that presently the Russian U.N. Security Council representative is often, and should be often, required to abstain from voting on U.N. Security Council resolutions that pertain to the current combined east Ukrainian, Crimean, and Russian dispute.

That Russia has annexed some of east Ukraine and Crimea, doesn't necessarily denote that Russia deserves to seize all of Ukraine. Thus United Nations multinational peacekeeping troops should be -- and should have been -- deployed in Ukraine's Kyiv capital, to establish and maintain adequately effective defense of western Ukraine's Ukrainian sovereignty and independence. Those UN peacekeeping troops could've been partly composed of U.S. troops, and yet appropriately, the U.S.A. could independently deploy peacekeeping troops in Ukraine's Kyiv capital, to adequately defend only western and west central Ukraine from seizure from insurgents and/or a foreign nation.

Although Crimea may plausably be nationally geographically annexed with Russia, per both an ocean Kerch Straits bridge from Russia into Crimea, and a Ukraine-approved purchase or donation of Crimea from Ukraine, geographically and culturally Crimea has legitimately belonged to Ukraine. If Ukraine prefers to rent, sell, or donate some of east Ukraine and/or Crimea to Russia, I find those transactions adequately legitimate. For example, I find that Ukraine has a strong natural eastern border per the Sea of Azov, that Russia could respect as Ukrainian, while for the purpose of Russia governing Crimea and the Sea of Azov

with Ukraine, Russia peacefully rents Crimea from Ukraine.

Russia's desire for Crimea appears similar to a hypothetical U.S.A. State of Washington desire for seizing Vancouver Island BC, a convenient possession for Washington to more greatly control Puget Sound of, however disrespectfully selfish -- e.g. "if Washington doesn't annex it, Russia might" -- and superfluous seizing and possessing so is. Russia appears motivated to govern Crimea per a desire to control access for and use of the Azov Sea, and to conscript some or all of Ukraine to Russian fealty.

(An interesting aside here concerning the U.N. Security Council's five founding nations permanent membership, is that the Republic of China -- that after the 1949 Chinese Civil War, became the Republic of China of Taiwan -- Administration of Chiang Kai-Shek, was the original Chinese U.N.-founding government. Since on Oct. 25, 1971 the United Nations recognized the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate representative of China in the U.N., the representatives of the Chiang Kai-Shek Administration were removed from the U.N., with the result that Taiwan has never been a U.N. member, and the Asian mainland People's Republic of China is now one of the U.N. Security Council's five U.N.-founding nations (China, France, Russia Federation, United Kingdom, United States of America) permanent members.)

[Version 5/08/2025, approx. 09:12 A.M. Caution, this version has several phrasing corrections that provide substantial difference with earlier versions.]

A Petition for Amending the U.N. Charter

Herewith now I vote for only one amendment proposal, of any of the following three proposals 1 and 2 for U.N. Charter Chapter IV Article 10, and 1 for U.N. Charter Chapter IV Article 18-4, to be ratified into the U.N. Charter:

[Amendment Proposal 1 for Chapter IV: The General Assembly . . .](#)

[Functions And Powers Article 10:](#)

“Article 10 - 1. The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.

Article 10 – 2. The General Assembly must at all times, per the General Assembly's affirmative vote that equals at least greater than one-half of the General Assembly's total membership vote, specify for and provide a UN General Assembly International Security Quorum, that for all of the UN, provides an identification and description of any nation's current international security status. If upon receiving from the (UN General Assembly) International Security Quorum, the quorum's current security status description of a nation, the General Assembly finds to an extent of 44% or greater affirmatively, in the General Assembly's finding decision vote under this Charter 's Chapter VI, and/or paragraph 3 of Article 52, and/or Chapter VII, that respectively currently the nation of the quorum's security description, is of other than U.N. deployment, a party to a dispute, and/or a party to a threat to the peace, and/or a party to a breach of the peace, and/or a party to an act of aggression, the UN shall respect the nation of the quorum's security description as being a party so, until respectively the General Assembly finds affirmatively, per greater than 56% of the General Assembly's subsequent vote under this Charter 's Chapter VI, and/or paragraph 3 of Article 52, and/or Chapter VII, that the nation isn't a party so.”, or

[Amendment Proposal 2 for Chapter IV: The General Assembly . . .](#)

[Functions And Powers Article 10:](#)

“Article 10 - 1. The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.

Article 10 – 2. The General Assembly must at all times -- per the General Assembly's affirmative vote that equals at least greater than one-half of the General Assembly's total membership vote, -- specify for and provide a UN General Assembly International Security Quorum, that for all of the UN, provides an identification and description of any nation's current international security status. If upon receiving from the (UN General Assembly) International Security Quorum, the quorum's current security status description of a nation, the General Assembly finds to an affirmative extent of 44% or greater, in the General Assembly's finding decision vote under this Charter 's Chapter VI, and/or paragraph 3 of Article 52, and/or Chapter VII, that respectively currently the nation of the quorum's security description is of other than U.N. deployment, a party to a dispute, and/or a party to a threat to the peace, and/or a party to a breach of the peace, and/or a party to an act of aggression, the UN shall respect the nation of the quorum's security description as being a party so, until respectively the General Assembly finds affirmatively, per greater than 56% of the General Assembly's subsequent vote under this Charter 's Chapter VI, and/or paragraph 3 of Article 52, and/or Chapter VII, that the nation isn't a party so.”, or

[Amendment Proposal 1 for Chapter IV: The General Assembly . . . Voting](#)

[Article 18](#): “Article 18 - 4. Per this exception to subArticle 18 – 2, if upon receiving from a UN General Assembly International Security quorum, -- that at all times, is of at least greater than one-half of the UN General Assembly's membership, ratified completely as being currently specifically valid to

recognize for all of the UN, any nation's international security status,-- the quorum's current security status description of a nation, the UN General Assembly votes 44% or greater affirmatively, in the General Assembly's vote decision under this Charter 's Chapter VI, and/or paragraph 3 of Article 52, and/or Chapter VII, that currently respectively the nation of the quorum's security description is of other than U.N. deployment, a party to a dispute, and/or a party to a threat to the peace, and/or a party to a breach of the peace, and/or a party to an act of aggression; the UN shall respect the nation of the quorum's security description as being a party so, until respectively the General Assembly finds affirmatively, per greater than 56% of the General Assembly's subsequent vote under this Charter 's Chapter VI, and/or paragraph 3 of Article 52, and/or Chapter VII, that the nation isn't a party so.”

Herewith now I vote for only one amendment proposal, of any of the following four amendment proposals 1,1-1, and 2 for U.N. Charter Chapter V Article 27, and 1 for U.N. Charter Chapter VII Article 51, to be ratified into the U.N. Charter:

[Amendment Proposal 1 for U.N. Charter Chapter V: The Security Council . . . Voting Article 27:](#)

“(3)(a) Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members of the Security Council, provided that each United Nations (U.N.) Security Council member nation, that – for example, of physical deployment of its national public security force, -- in any decision under Chapter VI, and/or under paragraph 3 of Article 52, is of other than U.N. deployment a party to a dispute that the decision specifically pertains to, or in any decision under Chapter VII, is a non-U.N.-deployed party to a threat to the peace, and/or to a breach of the peace, and/or to an act of aggression that the decision specifically pertains to, must -- to remain in compliance with this Charter -- abstain from voting in the decision; and for both each voting-

abstention-required Security Council member nation so, and each voting-abstention-required Security Council decision so, a U.N. member nation that then

(1) is not a Security Council member, and affirmatively per greater than at least 56% of the General Assembly's then expedited complete vote, or per the General Assembly's then expedited designation, of a majority of the (Article 10-2) International Security Quorum, is certified as not being

(a) a party of other than U.N. deployment, to the same Chapter VI, and/or same paragraph 3 of Article 52 dispute, and/or same Chapter VII threat, peace breach, and/or aggression, that the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation must, as a non-U.N.-deployed party of, abstain from voting in a decision on, and

(b) a non-U.N.-deployed party to any materially physically violent civil trespass conflict that, and/or physically obstructive material, energy, and/or social media production trespass controversy that the U.N. Security Council voting abstention-required decision specifically pertains to;

to remain in compliance with this Charter, and to temporarily substitute serve in the voting-abstention-required decision, in place of and for only one of however many voting-abstention-required Security Council member nations then are required to abstain from voting in the decision, must of the U.N. General Assembly per a random selection process that at least greater than one-half of the U.N. General Assembly's membership constituency has agreed to then use, be randomly selected to temporarily serve in the Security Council as a Security Council temporary member, that then is able to exercise the voting-abstention-required Security Council member nation's full optional and voluntary Security Council member nation voting right -- including the Security Council member nation's optional and voluntary voting abstention right -- only for voting in the decision that the voting-abstention-required

Security Council member nation mandatorily was required to abstain from voting in.

(3)(b) If due to the paragraph (3)(a) Security Council member substitution requirement of this Article, enough United Nations member nations to comprise and vote in a Security Council members-only Ch. V Article 23 decision vote, can't be selected for a decision, each of all, if any, Security Council members – including all Security Council temporary members -- that then are qualified and selected to vote in the decision, plus, per random draw from all -- if any -- of the remaining Security Council members that then were required per this Article to abstain from voting in the decision, each of only enough of those remaining Security Council members, to if then possible, provide the Security Council with the rest of the members that may, per Ch. V Article 23 and Article 27 of this charter, vote in the decision; or if that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, then additionally -- per random draw from all of the remaining U.N. members, if any, that then aren't selected to vote in the decision -- each of only enough of the remaining U.N. members, to in addition to and together with all of any U.N. members that then are qualified and selected of this Article to vote in the decision, vote decisively per Ch. V Article 23, or that then being impossible of Security Council numerical constituency, per Ch. V Article 27 of this charter in the decision; or if then that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, each U.N. member -- if any -- that the U.N. then is comprised of, so as to provide the decision of a U.N. vote, whereof the greatest majority vote, or a tie of opposite votes, or a unanimous abstention of all of the voters of the vote's total results, must prevail to resolve the decision, must -- to remain in compliance with this Charter -- either vote or abstain from voting in the decision.

(4) Every U.N. Security Council member optionally and voluntarily-exercised vote abstention in a decision, must be counted as both one-half vote for and one-half vote against passage of the decision.”, or

[Amendment Proposal 1-1 for U.N. Charter Chapter V: The Security Council . . . Voting Article 27:](#)

“(3)(a) Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members, including all – if any -- concurring votes that in the decision are cast of the permanent members that do not abstain from then voting; provided that each U.N. Security Council member nation, that – for example, of physical deployment of its national public security force, -- in any decision under Chapter VI, and/or under paragraph 3 of Article 52, is of other than U.N. deployment a party to a dispute that the decision specifically pertains to, or in any decision under Chapter VII, is a non-U.N.-deployed party to a threat to the peace, and/or to a breach of the peace, and/or to an act of aggression that the decision specifically pertains to, must -- to remain in compliance with this Charter -- abstain from voting in the decision; and for each Security Council member nation that is so required to abstain from voting, a U.N. member nation that then

(1) is not a Security Council member, and affirmatively per greater than at least 56% of the General Assembly's then expedited complete vote, or per the General Assembly's then expedited designation, of a majority of the (Article 10-2) International Security Quorum, is certified as not being

(a) a party of other than U.N. deployment, to the same Chapter VI, and/or same paragraph 3 of Article 52 dispute, and/or same Chapter VII threat, peace breach, and/or aggression, that the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation must, as a non-U.N.-deployed party of, abstain from voting in a decision on, and

(b) a non-U.N.-deployed party to any materially physically violent civil trespass conflict that, and/or physically obstructive material, energy, and/or social media production trespass controversy that the U.N. Security Council voting abstention-required decision specifically pertains to;

to remain in compliance with this Charter, and to temporarily substitute serve in the (abstention-required) decision in place of and for only one of however many Security Council member nations then are required (of this Article) to abstain from voting in the decision, must of the U.N. General Assembly per a random selection process that at least greater than 50% of the U.N. General Assembly's membership constituency has agreed to then use, be randomly selected to temporarily serve in the Security Council as a Security Council temporary member, that then is able to exercise the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation's full optional and voluntary Security Council member nation voting right -- including the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation's optional and voluntary voting abstention right -- only for voting in the decision that the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation mandatorily was required to abstain from voting in.

(3)(b) If due to the Article 27(3)(a) Security Council member substitution requirement, enough United Nations member nations to comprise and vote in a Ch. V Article 23 Security Council members-only decision vote, can't be selected for a decision, each of all, if any, Security Council members -- including all Security Council temporary members -- that then are qualified and selected to vote in the decision, plus per random draw from all of the remaining Security Council members, if any, that then were required per this Article to abstain from voting in the decision, each of only enough of those remaining Security Council members, to provide the Security Council with the rest of -- if then possible, or if then not possible, at least the minimum quantity of -- the

members that may, per Ch. V Article 23 and Article 27 of this charter, vote in the decision; or if then that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, then additionally to that draw's results, per random draw from all of the remaining U.N. members, if any, that then haven't been selected to participate in the decision vote, each of only enough of the remaining U.N. members, to in addition to and together with all of the U.N. members, if any, that then have been qualified and selected of this Article to vote in the decision, vote decisively per Ch. V Article 27 of this charter in the decision; or if then that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, all U.N. members -- if any -- that the U.N. then is comprised of, must -- to remain in compliance with this Charter -- either vote or abstain from voting in the decision.

(4) Every U.N. Security Council member optionally and voluntarily-exercised vote abstention in a decision, must be counted as both one-half vote for and one-half vote against passage of the decision.”, or

[Amendment Proposal 2 for U.N. Charter Chapter V: The Security Council . . . Voting Article 27:](#)

(4) Every U.N. Security Council member mandatorily-exercised or optionally and voluntarily-exercised vote abstention in a decision, must be counted as both one-half vote for and one-half vote against passage of the decision.”

[Amendment Proposal 1 for U.N. Chapter VII: Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression Article 51:](#)

“(1) Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in

the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

(2) When any member of the Chapter V Article 23 United Nations Security Council members, is – for example, of physical deployment of its national public security force, -- a non-U.N.-deployed party to a Chapter VI dispute, and/or to a paragraph 3 of Article 52 dispute, and/or to a Chapter VII threat to the peace, and/or breach of the peace, and/or act of aggression, that the U.N. Security Council is voting on in a decision, each U.N. Security Council member that is a party so, must to remain in compliance with this Charter, abstain from voting in each U.N. Security Council decision that specifically pertains to the dispute, and/or threat to the peace, and/or breach of the peace, and/or act of aggression that the member is so a party to; and for both each Security Council member nation that is so required to abstain from voting, and each so abstention-required decision, a U.N. member nation that then

(a) is not a Security Council member, and affirmatively per greater than at least 56% of the General Assembly's then expedited complete vote, or per the General Assembly's then expedited designation, of a majority of the (Article 10-2) International Security Quorum, is certified as not being

(1) a party of other than U.N. deployment, to the same Chapter VI, and/or same paragraph 3 of Article 52 dispute, and/or same Chapter VII threat, peace breach, and/or aggression, that the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation must, as a non-U.N.-deployed party of, abstain from voting in a decision on, and

(2) a non-U.N.-deployed party to any materially physically violent civil trespass conflict that, and/or physically obstructive material, energy, and/or

social media production trespass controversy that the U.N. Security Council voting abstention-required decision specifically pertains to;

to temporarily substitute serve in the abstention-required decision in place of and for only the Security Council member nation that is so required to abstain from voting, and to remain in compliance with this Charter, must of the U.N. General Assembly per a random selection process that the U.N. General Assembly of its minimum majority – i.e., any majority that is greater than 50% -- has agreed to then use, be randomly selected to temporarily serve in the Security Council as a Security Council temporary member, that then is able to exercise the required to abstain from voting Security Council member's full optional and voluntary Security Council voting right -- including the member's optional and voluntary voting abstention right – only for voting in the decision that the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation mandatorily was required to abstain from voting in.

Every U.N. Security Council member optionally and voluntarily-exercised vote abstention in a decision, must be counted as both one-half vote for and one-half vote against passage of the decision.

(3) If due to the Article (51)(2) Security Council member substitution requirement, enough United Nations member nations to comprise and vote in a Security Council members-only Ch. V Article 23 decision vote, can't be selected for a decision, each of all, if any, Security Council members – including all Security Council temporary members -- that then are qualified and selected to vote in the decision, plus, per random draw from all -- if any -- of the remaining Security Council members that then were required per this Article to abstain from voting in the decision, each of only enough of the remaining Security Council members, to if then possible, provide the Security Council with the rest of the members that may, per Ch. V Article 23 and Article 27 of this charter, vote in the decision; or if that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough

Security Council members so to vote, then additionally -- per random draw from all of the remaining U.N. members, if any, that then aren't selected to vote in the decision -- each of only enough of the remaining U.N. members, to in addition to and together with all of any U.N. members that then are qualified and selected of this Article to vote in the decision, vote decisively per Ch. V Article 23, or that then being impossible of Security Council numerical constituency, per Ch. V Article 27 of this charter in the decision; or if then that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, each U.N. member -- if any -- that the U.N. then is comprised of, so as to provide the decision of a U.N. vote, whereof the greatest majority vote, or a tie of opposite votes, or a unanimous abstention of all of the voters of the vote's total results, must prevail to resolve the decision, must either vote or abstain from voting in the decision.”

Herewith now I provide – though I don't vote for – the following acceptable alternative Amendment Proposal 2:

[Alternative Amendment Proposal 2 for U.N. Chapter VII, Article 51:](#)

“(2) Each member of the Chapter V Article 23 United Nations Security Council members, that – for example, of physical deployment of its national public security force, -- is a non-U.N.-deployed party to a Chapter VI dispute, and/or to a paragraph 3 of Article 52 dispute, and/or to a Chapter VII threat to the peace, breach of the peace, and/or act of aggression, that the U.N. Security Council is voting on in a decision, must to remain in compliance with this Charter, abstain from voting in each U.N. Security Council decision that specifically pertains to the dispute, and/or threat to the peace, and/or breach of the peace, and/or act of aggression that the member is so a party to; and for both each Security Council

voting-abstention decision so required, and each Security Council member nation that in the decision is so required to abstain from voting, a U.N. member nation that then is not a Security Council member, and that

(a) affirmatively per greater than at least 56% of the General Assembly's then expedited complete vote, or per the General Assembly's then expedited designation, of a majority of the (Article 10-2) International Security Quorum, is certified as not being

(1) a party of other than U.N. deployment, to the same Chapter VI, and/or same paragraph 3 of Article 52 dispute, and/or same Chapter VII threat, peace breach, and/or aggression, that the required to abstain from voting Security Council member nation must, as a non-U.N.-deployed party of, abstain from voting in a decision on, and

(2) a non-U.N.-deployed party to any materially physically violent civil trespass conflict that, and/or physically obstructive material, energy, and/or social media production trespass controversy that the U.N. Security Council voting abstention-required decision specifically pertains to;

to remain in compliance with this Charter, must of the U.N. General Assembly, per a random selection process that at least greater than one-half of the U.N. General Assembly's total membership constituency has agreed to then use, be randomly selected to substitute serve temporarily in the (voting-abstention-required) decision as a Security Council temporary member, that per cumulative service substitution in the decision for no more than one of all nations so required to abstain from voting in the decision, is able to exercise the (afore-specified) required to abstain from voting Security Council member's full Security Council optional and voluntary voting right -- including its optional and voluntary voting abstention right -- only for voting in the (voting-abstention-required) decision that the (afore-specified mandatorily) vote-

abstaining Security Council member (mandatorily of this Article) was required to abstain from voting in; and

(b) if in any decision vote, at least three of the Security Council permanent members, each that may be a Security Council member that, in consequence of this Article, must serve as a temporary Security Council member substitute for a permanent Security Council member, each vote against the decision, the decision then is vetoed conclusively of the three votes, and the decision is not passed of the decision vote.

(c) Every U.N. Security Council member optionally and voluntarily-exercised vote abstention in a decision, must be counted as both one-half vote for and one-half vote against passage of the decision.”

(3) If due to this Article's paragraph (2) Security Council member substitution requirement, enough United Nations member nations to comprise and vote in a Ch. V Article 23 Security Council members-only decision vote, can't be selected for a decision, each of all, if any, Security Council members – including all Security Council temporary members -- that then are qualified and selected to vote in the decision, plus per random draw from all of the remaining Security Council members, if any, that then were required per this Article to abstain from voting in the decision, each of only enough of those remaining Security Council members, to provide the Security Council with the rest of -- if then possible, or if then not possible, at least the minimum quantity of -- the members that may, per Ch. V Article 23 and Article 27 of this charter, vote in the decision; or if then that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, then additionally to that draw's results, per random draw from all of the remaining U.N. members, if any, that then haven't been selected to participate in the decision vote, each of only enough of the remaining U.N. members, to in addition to and together with all of the U.N. members, if any, that then have been qualified and selected of this Article to

vote in the decision, vote decisively per Ch. V Article 27 of this charter in the decision; or if then that draw is yet insufficient to provide enough Security Council members so to vote, all U.N. members -- if any -- that the U.N. then is comprised of, must either vote or abstain from voting in the decision.”

U.N. Charter Chapter V Article 28 states: “1. The Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member of the Security Council shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization. 2. The Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative”.

{Versions 05/08/2025 approx. 09:12 A.M.}

A United Nations contact email page has been available at:

<https://www.un.org/en/contact-us-0>.

The "United States Mission to the United Nations" "Contact Us" page, has been available at: <https://usun.usmission.gov/mission/contact-us/>. Their street address is: United States Mission to the United Nations, 799 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017.

Per the internet, we also may vote comment with the U.S.A. Department of State, of:

<https://register.state.gov/contactus/contactusform> .

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Commentary on UN Charter Chapter V Article 27

The current UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 states: "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

During 02/26/2024 to 03/01/2024 I asked AI:

Question: Since per UN Charter Chapter V Article 27, I find that "the rule of abstention" (here quoting artificial intelligence (AI)) utilizes an involuntary and inflexible principle, a principle of resolved destined manifestation, to specifically declare that "in decisions under Chapter VI" ... "a party to a dispute shall" -- i.e. the party has no other choice than to -- "abstain from voting."; may artificial intelligence (AI) corroborate my finding as valid?

Again, though emphasized with more explanation, since per UN Charter Chapter V Article 27, I find that "the rule of abstention" (here quoting artificial intelligence (AI)) utilizes an involuntary and inflexible principle, a principle of resolved destined manifestation, to specifically declare, that "in decisions under Chapter VI" (i.e., in all decisions under Chapter VI) ... "a party to a dispute shall" -- i.e. "shall", because the party has no other choice than to -- "abstain from voting."; may artificial intelligence (AI) corroborate my finding as valid?

Copilot **Answer:**

Certainly! Your understanding aligns with the provisions outlined in Article 27 of the United Nations Charter. Let's delve into the details:

Article 27 states:

Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters require an affirmative vote of nine members.

Decisions on all other matters necessitate an affirmative vote of nine members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members. However, in decisions under Chapter VI (which deals with the pacific settlement of disputes), a party to a dispute is obliged to abstain from voting. In essence, when the Security Council is addressing matters related to dispute resolution (Chapter VI), the involved parties are compelled to abstain from voting. This principle ensures impartiality and prevents parties directly affected by the dispute from influencing the decision-making process.

Your interpretation is indeed valid, and it reflects the intent behind this rule of abstention. If you have any further questions or need additional clarification, feel free to ask! ☐ ☐

Prior to its amendment, Art. 27, par. 3, of the Charter provided that all decisions of the Security Council on non-procedural matters "shall be made

by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.“

Publish Year: 1967

Question: Since per the **UN Charter Chapter V Article 27** statement that "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.",

I found that **when a UN Security Council permanent member abstains** from casting a Security Council decision vote voluntarily, the affirmative concurring Security Council permanent member **"votes"** that **Chapter V Article 27 requires** to make decisions of the Security Council, **must be** from the Security Council permanent members that didn't abstain to vote, because abstaining to vote results in no vote to count as affirmation or denial of a decision; **however when a UN Security Council permanent member abstains** from casting a Security Council decision vote because UN Charter **Chapter V Article 27** requires that abstention, the affirmative concurring Security Council permanent member **"votes"** that **Chapter V Article 27 requires** to make decisions of the Security Council, **must be** derived per the "party to a dispute" Security Council permanent member's **Chapter V Article 27 abstained** vote, with the result that "Decisions of the Security Council" "shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members", that includes the concurring votes of the permanent Security Council members that **Chapter V Article 27 allows to vote**, plus another United Nations Security Council member;

can artificial intelligence (AI) validate my finding?

Copilot **Answer:**

“Certainly! Your analysis aligns with the provisions outlined in Article 27 of the United Nations Charter. Let’s break it down:

Article 27 specifies the voting rules within the United Nations Security Council: Each member of the Security Council has one vote.

Procedural matters require an affirmative vote of nine members.

All other matters (excluding procedural ones) necessitate an affirmative vote of nine members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members.

However, in decisions under Chapter VI (which deals with the pacific settlement of disputes), a party to a dispute is obliged to abstain from voting.

Now, let's address your specific scenarios:

Voluntary Abstention:

When a permanent member voluntarily abstains from voting, the affirmative concurring votes must come from the remaining permanent members who did not abstain.

This ensures that the decision still meets the requirement of nine affirmative votes.

Obligatory Abstention (Party to a Dispute):

When a permanent member abstains due to the obligation under Article 27 (e.g., because they are a party to the dispute), the affirmative concurring votes must be derived from the remaining permanent members and one additional non-permanent member.

This maintains the total of nine affirmative votes, as mandated by Article 27.

Your interpretation is accurate, and it reflects the intent behind Article 27. The rule of abstention ensures fairness and impartiality in decision-making within the Security Council. If you have any further questions or need additional clarification, feel free to ask! ☐ ☑

[*In the question immediately above here, perhaps AI interprets my "can artificial intelligence (AI) validate my finding?" query, to ask if AI can find an interpretation of UN Charter Chapter V Article 27, that proves that "one additional non-permanent member" affirmative vote is

necessary to be cast as a "permanent member" affirmative concurring vote; however an implication that the "one additional non-permanent member" casts a vote as a "permanent member" occurs, so I rephrased my question to exclude that implication in the query that follows this comment.]

Question: Does AI find that when a UN Security Council permanent member abstains from casting a Security Council decision vote, because UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 requires that abstention, the "affirmative vote of nine members" that is necessary per UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 for "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters" to be made of, must be derived from both the remaining permanent members that neither voluntarily abstained nor were required of UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 to abstain, and enough of any non-permanent Security Council members' affirmative votes, to give a total of nine affirmative votes that include the aforespecified requisite permanent Security Council members' "concurring votes"?

Copilot Answer: Certainly! Let's delve into the intricacies of UN Security Council voting procedures.

According to Article 27 of the UN Charter, each member of the Security Council has one vote. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters are made by an affirmative vote of nine members. This means that for procedural matters, any combination of nine members (permanent or non-permanent) voting in favor is sufficient.

However, when it comes to decisions on all other matters, including substantive issues, the requirement is more specific. The affirmative vote of nine members, including the concurring votes of all five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States), is necessary. In other words, for substantive decisions, the permanent members must actively participate and provide their affirmative votes.

Now, let's break down the scenario you described:

A permanent member voluntarily abstains from voting due to Article 27 requirements.

The remaining permanent members (who neither abstained nor were required to abstain) must still provide their affirmative votes.

Additionally, enough non-permanent Security Council members' affirmative votes are needed to reach a total of nine.

In summary, for substantive decisions, the affirmative votes must include both the remaining permanent members' concurrence and sufficient non-permanent members' votes. Abstentions by permanent members do not exempt them from this requirement.

Remember, the Security Council's voting dynamics can be complex, but adherence to these rules ensures fair representation and effective decision-making within the UN framework.

Question: Does AI find that per the current UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 stipulations of "concurring votes of the permanent members" and of "a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting", if four or all five UN Security Council permanent members are required per UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 to abstain from voting, no "affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members" is possible to accomplish, for "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters" to be made of?

Copilot Answer: Certainly! Let's explore the intricacies of UN Security Council voting rules based on the current UN Charter.

Procedural Matters:

According to Article 27 of the UN Charter, decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters are made by an affirmative vote of nine members. In this case, any combination of nine members (permanent or non-permanent) voting in favor is sufficient.

All Other Matters:

For decisions on all other matters, including substantive issues, the requirement is more specific.

The affirmative vote of nine members is necessary, and it must include the concurring votes of all five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States).

However, if four or all five permanent members are required to abstain due to a dispute or other reasons, achieving the necessary nine affirmative votes becomes impossible.

In such a scenario, the Security Council would face a deadlock, as it cannot meet the requirement for substantive decisions.

Implications:

If a dispute involves a significant number of permanent members abstaining, it could severely impact the Council's ability to make decisions.

The UN Charter does not provide a clear solution for this specific situation, and it would likely require diplomatic negotiations and creative problem-solving to address.

In summary, while the UN Charter emphasizes the importance of permanent members' concurrence, it does not explicitly address the scenario where a substantial number of them are required to abstain. The delicate balance between unanimity and effective decision-making remains a challenge for the Security Council.

Question: Does CoPilot AI find, that in reference to Article 27 of the UN Charter, **if** as CoPilot AI states "The affirmative vote of nine members is necessary, and it must include the concurring votes

of all five permanent members", **then** Article 27 of the UN Charter disallows "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters" to be made, when Article 27 of the UN Charter requires any member "of the permanent members" that "in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52," is a party to a dispute, to "abstain from voting."?

Copilot Answer: Certainly! Let's break down the implications of Article 27 of the UN Charter regarding Security Council voting procedures.

Procedural Matters:

Article 27 states that decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.

In this context, any combination of nine members (permanent or non-permanent) voting in favor is sufficient.

All Other Matters:

For decisions on all other matters, including substantive issues, the requirement is more specific.

The affirmative vote of nine members is necessary, and it must include the concurring votes of all five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States).

However, if four or all five permanent members are required to abstain due to a dispute or other reasons, achieving the necessary nine affirmative votes becomes impossible.

In such a scenario, the Security Council would face a deadlock, as it cannot meet the requirement for substantive decisions.

Dispute Involving Permanent Members:

If a dispute involves a significant number of permanent members abstaining, it could severely impact the Council's ability to make decisions.

Article 27 does not explicitly address this specific situation, and it would likely require diplomatic negotiations and creative problem-solving to find a resolution.

In summary, while the UN Charter emphasizes the importance of permanent members' concurrence, it does not provide a clear solution when a substantial number of them are required to abstain. Balancing unanimity with effective decision-making remains a challenge for the Security Council.

Question: (*Here CoPilot gave this entry and following answer, perhaps of an inadvertant copy and paste key punch) UN Security Council voting rules

Copilot Answer: The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) has specific rules governing its voting

procedures. Here are the key points:

Each Member's Vote: According to Article 27 of the UN Charter, each member of the Security Council has one vote. This means that regardless of a country's size or influence, it has an equal say in decisions made by the Council.

Majority Required: Decisions of the Security Council are made by an affirmative vote of nine members. In other words, for a resolution to pass, at least nine out of the fifteen Council members must vote in favor.

Procedural Matters: When it comes to procedural matters, such as setting the agenda or organizing meetings, the Council can make decisions with a simple majority of nine votes. These procedural decisions do not require unanimity.

Non-Permanent Members: The UNSC has ten non-permanent members who serve two-year terms. To secure a place on the Council, countries must receive a two-thirds majority (128 votes) in the General Assembly. Even if a country runs uncontested, it still needs this majority to be elected.

In summary, the UNSC decisions on substantive matters require at least nine affirmative votes, while procedural matters can be decided by a simple majority. This system ensures that all member states have an equal voice in shaping global security policies.

Question: Does CoPilot find, that if as CoPilot states "The affirmative vote of nine members is necessary, and it must include the concurring votes of all five permanent members", then Chapter V Article 27 of the UN Charter disallows "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters" to be made, when UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 requires any member "of the permanent members" that is a party to a dispute "in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52," to "abstain from voting."?

Copilot Answer:

Certainly! Let's delve into the intricacies of UN Security Council voting rules based on Article 27 of the UN Charter.

Procedural Matters: Article 27 states that decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.

In this context, any combination of nine members (permanent or non-permanent) voting in favor is sufficient.

All Other Matters: For decisions on all other matters, including substantive issues, the requirement is more specific.

The affirmative vote of nine members is necessary, and it must include the concurring votes of all

five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States).

However, if four or all five permanent members are required to abstain due to a dispute or other reasons, achieving the necessary nine affirmative votes becomes impossible.

In such a scenario, the Security Council would face a deadlock, as it cannot meet the requirement for substantive decisions.

Dispute Involving Permanent Members: If a dispute involves a significant number of permanent members abstaining, it could severely impact the Council's ability to make decisions.

Article 27 does not explicitly address this specific situation, and it would likely require diplomatic negotiations and creative problem-solving to find a resolution.

In summary, while the UN Charter emphasizes the importance of permanent members' concurrence, it does not provide a clear solution when a substantial number of them are required to abstain. Balancing unanimity with effective decision-making remains a challenge for the Security Council.

Question: (On 03/01/2024, after having asked AI all of the here preceding "UN Charter Chapter V Article 27" questions, I asked CoPilot AI the following question):

"Does AI find that when a UN Security Council permanent member abstains from casting a Security Council decision vote, because UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 requires that abstention, the "affirmative vote of nine members" that is necessary per UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 for "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters" to be made of, must be derived both from "concurring votes" of only the remaining permanent members that neither voluntarily abstained nor were required of UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 to abstain, and from enough of any non-permanent Security Council members' affirmative votes, to give a total of nine affirmative votes, that includes what then is a possible requisite quantity of permanent Security Council members' "concurring votes"?"

(On 03/01/2024 CoPilot AI finally gave me much of the kind of answer that I would like to believe is the true standard UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 voting procedure; however I doubt that is so, based on the current UN Charter Chapter V Article 27 wording that is: "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.")

Copilot Answer: Certainly! Let's break down the UN Security Council voting rules and explore how decisions are made.

Article 27 of the UN Charter:

Each member of the Security Council has one vote.

Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters require an affirmative vote of nine members.

For all other matters, including substantive decisions, the same nine affirmative votes are needed.

Permanent Members and Abstentions:

The permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) have the power to veto any substantive decision.

However, when a permanent member abstains, they are not using their veto power. Abstention is a way to express neither approval nor disapproval.

In such cases, the affirmative vote of nine members is still required for the decision to pass.

Concurring Votes:

When a permanent member abstains, the remaining permanent members' votes become crucial.

The requisite quantity of permanent members' "concurring votes" would be the number of permanent members who neither voluntarily abstained nor were required by Article 27 to abstain.

If, for example, two permanent members abstain, the remaining three permanent members' affirmative votes would be necessary.

Non-Permanent Members:

Non-permanent members also play a role. Their affirmative votes contribute to reaching the required total of nine.

If all five permanent members abstain, the decision would still require at least four affirmative votes from non-permanent members.

In summary, when a permanent member abstains, the remaining permanent members' votes and sufficient non-permanent members' votes together ensure that the nine affirmative votes needed for a decision are obtained. The specific combination depends on the context and the number of abstentions.

Requirement for an Emergency Egress Manually Operable Window Crank, for Three and/or more-Wheeled hardtop Motor Vehicles

Once again the motor vehicle industry is **negligent** to provide necessary safety equipment (even without mentioning the safe "luxury" practicality of an indoor, highly flexible silicone brush, rear window wiper, for hardtop three and/or more-wheeled motor vehicles, that have an only-stationary rear window).

Thus herewith now I vote that the United States of America national Government should legally require, that all new manually steered, hardtop motor vehicles, that have a driver's side driver access door, and that when in operation on a road, usually have three or more road-encountering wheels, must have a driver's door-side manually operable driver's door-side window hand crank, that allows the driver to manually by hand with that side window hand crank, fully open and close the largest driver-side door window!

Currently 400 people per year are estimated to drown in their motor vehicle, apparently often because those people weren't able to lower a power or other window in their motor vehicle, so as to escape flooding in their motor vehicle.

Requirement for Whistles, flashing Lights, and same color contrast Coloring, on large Windmill propeller Blade

Several years ago for an Oregon national Congressperson, I personally hand-delivered my petition that gave my vote for all new large wattage-generating windmills, to be required equipped with whistles and lights for bird and bat safety. Since then a European study has found, that from windmills that have only three propeller blades, fewer flying animal injuries result if one of the windmills' three propeller blades is colored a different color than both of the other propeller blades are colored.

I was surprised to learn that some electricity-generating windmill farms, have been usually operated per human observers halting windmill operation, whenever birds that were prone to collide with windmills, were observed at hazard of windmill collision.

Herewith now I vote for the United States of America national Government to require that each power generation windmill, that currently or forthwith is installed on United States of America property to generate power, and that has propeller blade that is longer than five feet long, must have a whistle – such as an air flow activated, high frequency sound pitch whistle -- and a flashing LED light on each of the windmill's propeller blades, and must have an odd minority of the propeller blades, or in the case of only one or two propeller blades being present, must have 1/2 of only one propeller blade, painted the same one color, that is in contrast to a same different color that, along with other contrast color figure and/or contrast color character, all other propeller blade of the windmill has.

