

# **2010 UNHRC SCORECARD**

***WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR U.S. LEADERSHIP***



Presented at UN Human Rights Council  
Geneva, March 9, 2010

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Summary of Key Findings.....2

Table 1: Scorecard of How Countries Voted.....4

Table 2: UNHRC Membership in 2010.....5

Table 3: How UNHRC Addressed World’s Worst Abusers .....7

Table 4: Key Actions by UN Human Rights Council .....19

Recommendations to the U.S. Government.....39

## Summary of Key Findings

- **Only 13 of 47 HRC Members Voted Positively.** Out of 47 HRC member states, only a minority of 13 had positive voting records in our study of actions taken on 30 key resolutions adopted in the past year. In order of highest ranking, these were Canada, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, France, Slovakia, Slovenia, United Kingdom, Japan, Switzerland, Ukraine, Bosnia, and the Republic of Korea. See scorecard at Table 1 and full chart of resolutions at Table 4.
- **Majority 34 of 47 HRC Members Voted Negatively.** A majority of 34 out of the 47 HRC member states had negative voting records—casting ballots against independent human rights mechanisms or basic principles such as free speech—or supported counter-productive resolutions sponsored by repressive regimes. From bad to worse, these were: Chile, Mexico, Argentina, Mauritius, Uruguay, Brazil, Zambia, Cameroon, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Burkina Faso, Ghana, India, Bolivia, Gabon, Senegal, Angola, Azerbaijan, Jordan, Bangladesh, Nigeria, Bahrain, Philippines, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Cuba, Djibouti, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Qatar, South Africa, China, and Egypt. (See scorecard at Table 1 and full chart of resolutions at Table 4.)
- **18 of 30 Key HRC Resolutions Were Counterproductive.** Analyzing 30 key UNHRC resolutions of the last year, this report finds that a majority of 18 were actually counterproductive to human rights. (See Key Actions chart at Table 4.) These include resolutions that praised Sri Lanka after it killed an estimated 20,000 civilians; praised Sudan for its “progress”; defined any discussion of terrorism committed in the name of Islam as a form of “defamation” and “racism”; undermined UN mechanisms designed to hold countries accountable, such as independent rights monitors; and that effectively granted exculpatory immunity to Hamas terrorism. Since its creation in 2006, the UNHRC has devoted 27 of its 33 censures to one-sided and unconstructive resolutions criticizing Israel.
- **HRC Turned Blind Eye to the World’s Most Serious Violators.** The UNHRC turned a blind eye to the world’s worst violations, granting impunity to 18 of the 20 worst violators. It failed to adopt any resolution, special session or investigative mandate for Belarus, China, Cuba, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Laos, Libya, Morocco, North Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan or Zimbabwe—all on Freedom House’s list of the world’s worst abusers. The same holds true for Iran, despite ongoing show trials and executions. (See Worst Abusers chart at Table 3.)
- **Half of 2010 HRC Membership is Non-Democratic.** Although UNGA Resolution 60/251 provides that countries should be elected based on their human rights records, 24 out of 47 current members (51%) fail to meet basic standards of democracy and human rights. (See Table 2: 2010 HRC Membership.)

- **High Commissioner Soft on Worst Abusers.** High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay should reconsider her human rights priorities. Since being appointed in 2008, Ms. Pillay criticized 25 countries rated Free by Freedom House. Yet she has only criticized 14 countries rated Not Free, and only 9 countries rated Partly Free. She failed to make any statements whatsoever for victims in 34 countries rated Not Free and in 50 countries rated Partly Free.

**Table 1: Scorecard of How Countries Voted**

*Examining 30 key UN Human Rights Council votes over the past year (3<sup>rd</sup> cycle, 2008-2009), we scored each Council member's position as positive (1), negative (-1) or neutral (0). The highest possible score is 30 and the lowest is -30. See full chart of resolutions at Table 4. The U.S. is not listed because it was not a member last year.*

Country	Score
Canada	23
Germany	18
Italy	18
Netherlands	18
France	17
Slovakia	17
Slovenia	17
United Kingdom	17
Japan	15
Switzerland	14
Ukraine	14
Boznia Herzegovina	12
Republic of Korea	12
Chile	-1
Mexico	-3
Argentina	-6
Mauritius	-7
Uruguay	-7
Brazil	-10
Zambia	-10
Cameroon	-12
Madagascar	-12
Nicaragua	-12
Burkina Faso	-13

Country	Score
Ghana	-14
India	-14
Bolivia	-15
Gabon	-15
Senegal	-15
Angola	-16
Azerbaijan	-16
Jordan	-16
Bangladesh	-17
Nigeria	-17
Bahrain	-18
Philippines	-18
Russia	-18
Saudi Arabia	-18
Cuba	-19
Djibouti	-19
Indonesia	-19
Malaysia	-19
Pakistan	-19
Qatar	-19
South Africa	-19
China	-20
Egypt	-20

**Table 2: UNHRC Membership in 2010**

*Elected by UN General Assembly on May 12, 2009. One third are up for election in May 2010.*

- Although UNGA Res 60/251 provides that countries should be elected based on their human rights records, 24 out of 47 current members (51%) fail to meet basic standards of democracy and human rights.

	Country	Freedom Rating	Human Rights Voting Record	Affiliations	Regional Group
1.	Angola	Not Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
2.	Cameroon	Not Free	Negative	OIC, NAM	Africa
3.	China	Not Free	Negative	NAM (observer)	Asia
4.	Cuba	Not Free	Negative	NAM	GRULAC
5.	Egypt	Not Free	Negative	OIC, Arab, NAM	Africa
6.	Kyrgyzstan	Not Free	Mixed*	None	Asia
7.	Qatar	Not Free	Negative	OIC, Arab, NAM	Asia
8.	Russia	Not Free	Negative	OIC (observer)	EE
9.	Saudi Arabia	Not Free	Negative	OIC, Arab, NAM	Asia
10.	Bahrain	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, Arab, NAM	Asia
11.	Bangladesh	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, NAM	Asia
12.	Bolivia	Partly Free	Negative	NAM	GRULAC
13.	Bosnia	Partly Free	Positive	OIC (observer)	EE
14.	Burkina Faso	Partly Free	Mixed	NAM	Africa
15.	Djibouti	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, Arab, NAM	Africa
16.	Gabon	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, NAM	Africa
17.	Jordan	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, Arab, NAM	Asia
18.	Madagascar	Partly Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
19.	Nicaragua	Partly Free	Negative	NAM	GRULAC
20.	Nigeria	Partly Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
21.	Philippines	Partly Free	Negative	NAM	Asia
22.	Senegal	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, NAM	Africa
23.	Zambia	Partly Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
24.	Pakistan	Partly Free	Negative	OIC, NAM	Asia
25.	Argentina	Free	Positive	None	GRULAC
26.	Belgium	Free	Positive*	EU	WEOG

	Country	Freedom Rating	Human Rights Voting Record	Affiliations	Regional Group
27.	Brazil	Free	Negative	NAM (observer)	GRULAC
28.	Chile	Free	Positive	NAM	GRULAC
29.	France	Free	Positive	EU	WEOG
30.	Ghana	Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
31.	Hungary	Free	Positive*	EU	WEOG
32.	India	Free	Negative	NAM, Arab (observer)	Asia
33.	Indonesia	Free	Negative	OIC, NAM	Asia
34.	Italy	Free	Positive	EU	WEOG
35.	Japan	Free	Positive	JUSCANZ	Asia
36.	Mauritius	Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
37.	Mexico	Free	Negative	NAM (observer)	GRULAC
38.	Netherlands	Free	Positive	EU	WEOG
39.	Norway	Free	Positive	JUSCANZ	WEOG
40.	Rep. of Korea	Free	Positive	None	Asia
41.	Slovakia	Free	Positive	EU	EE
42.	Slovenia	Free	Positive	EU	EE
43.	South Africa	Free	Negative	NAM	Africa
44.	Ukraine	Free	Positive	NAM (observer)	EE
45.	United Kingdom	Free	Positive	EU	WEOG
46.	United States	Free	Positive*	JUSCANZ	WEOG
47.	Uruguay	Free	Negative	NAM (observer)	GRULAC

- *Freedom Rating based on Freedom House annual survey, Freedom in the World.*
- *Voting record based on votes on key UN human rights proposals, as found in UN Watch analysis of 2007-2008 votes at the Human Rights Council and Democracy Coalition Project (DCP) analysis of 2008 votes at the UN General Assembly.*

*\* For countries that were non-members of HRC, voting record based on General Assembly votes on human rights proposals.*

**Table 3: How the UN Human Rights Council Addressed World’s Worst Abusers**  
*UNHRC 3rd Cycle, 2008-2009*

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Belarus</b>	<p>Repression of political dissent; media censorship; severe restrictions on freedom of association; systematic use of torture.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> In August 2008, Belarus imposed a new media law that further restricts journalists and newspapers in the country. Under the new law, state and local authorities can close independent publications for minor violations and require registration of all foreign journalists entering the country. In one example, the credentials of Andrzej Poczobut, a local correspondent for Poland’s largest newspaper, were not renewed after he reported on the policies of President Lukashenko and the Belarusian security service. Poczobut later received a threat letter warning him that he would face retribution if he continued reporting.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None. Was eliminated in June 2007 reform package.
<b>Burma (Myanmar)</b>	<p>Persecution of political activists, ethnic and religious minorities; extrajudicial killings; forced labor and conscription; land confiscation; media censorship; severe restrictions on freedom of association.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> In response to a devastating cyclone in May 2008, the Burmese government obstructed international relief organizations from entering the country and prevented the distribution of emergency relief aid. Nearly 85,000 people died and 54,000 people are still missing today.</p>	1	1 <i>A/HRC/10/27</i> <i>See details in Key Actions chart.</i>	None.	Expert on Myanmar.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Chad</b>	<p>Media censorship; extrajudicial killings; conscription of child soldiers; violence against women.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> In May 2009, conscripted child soldiers were used in a failed offensive by the rebel group, Union of Resistance Forces. Photographs taken after the attack show the scattered bodies of dead children and the faces of over 200 young prisoners who had been transferred to a jail in N'Djamena. Though Chad signed an agreement in 2007 to prevent the recruitment of child soldiers, children are still frequently used in Chad and across the border in Darfur.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>China</b>	<p>Persecution of ethnic minorities; repression of political dissent; media censorship; severe restriction on the freedoms of association, religion and expression; ongoing human rights violations in occupied Tibet and the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> China has continued its long-standing campaigns to repress religious and ethnic minorities. Tensions between the Muslim Uighur minority and Han Chinese in the province erupted in July 2009, when police began firing indiscriminately into at Uighur demonstrators. The Chinese government deployed paramilitary troops, closed mosques, established a curfew and arbitrarily arrested Muslim citizens. Websites and online forums discussing the clashes were shut down, preventing domestic and foreign media from covering the events.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
Cuba	<p>Imprisonment of journalists and pro-democracy advocates; restrictions on freedom of expression and association; media censorship; government economic control.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> On June 6, 2008, journalist Carlos Serpa Maceira was taken from his home by state security forces, threatened with deportation and forced to sign a document stating that he would stop all journalistic activities. Maceira was arrested for covering a demonstration in Havana commemorating the 19<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Tiananmen Square protests in China, an act that allegedly constituted “counter-revolutionary provocation.” Though he was released, at least 25 other journalist remain incarcerated under similar charges.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None. Was eliminated in June 2007 reform package.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Equatorial Guinea</b>	<p>Media censorship; systematic torture; forced evictions; absence of independent judiciary and political arrests.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Political prisoners in Equatorial Guinea are detained under inhumane conditions, such as solitary confinement up to several years at a time, denial of medication treatment and the permanent use of leg irons. In March 2009, Saturnino Ncogo, a former member of the Progress Party of Equatorial Guinea, died in prison within hours of his arrest. The authorities deny responsibility for his death and claim that he committed suicide by throwing himself from the top of a bunk bed. His death was not investigated and no autopsy was performed. Relatives who received his body three days later said that it was in a state of advanced decomposition and that his skull was fractured.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Eritrea</b>	<p>Media censorship; persecution of political activists and religious minorities; political arrests and arbitrary detention.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Detainees in Eritrea’s large network of prisons face routine torture, forced labor and lethal starvation. Some are kept in metal shipping containers or underground pits. In August 2009, a 43 year-old Christian man, Yemane Kahasay Andom, a member of the Kale-Hiwot church in Mendefera, died in a military prison after he was tortured and denied medical treatment. After refusing to recant his religion, he was placed in solitary confinement in an underground cell. Andom was one of three other Christians who died under similar circumstances in 2009.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>Iran</b>	<p>Media censorship; persecution of political activists; widespread use of political arrests, arbitrary detention and torture.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Following the disputed presidential election of June 2009, Iranian police and paramilitary forces used excessive force against protestors, including arbitrary arrests, witnessed beatings and point-blank shootings. Four thousand people were arrested and prison abuses have been reported widely. Some prisoners were beaten to death, had their fingernails ripped off and were forced to lick filthy toilet bowls. Young women and men were married and raped on the nights before their executions.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Laos</b>	<p>Severe media censorship; oppression of religious minorities.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Local officials announced a ban on Christianity in July 2009. A year earlier, over 80 Christians were arrested and detained without trial, threatened with death, incarceration and property confiscation if they did not renounce their faith. On July 21, 2008, residents seized a Christian identified only as Pew and poured rice wine down his throat until he died from asphyxiation.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>Libya</b>	<p>Severe restriction of freedoms of expression, association and assembly; media censorship; repression of political dissent.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Prominent political dissident Fathi Eljahmi was held under repeated counts of “trying to overthrow the government” after calling for the democratization of Libya in several public forums. In 2005, he was convicted of capital charges and was held in solitary confinement without medical treatment until falling into a coma. Eljahmi died soon thereafter on May 21, 2009 after being evacuated for emergency medical treatment.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Morocco (Western Sahara)</b>	<p>Media censorship; repression of political activity.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> In May 2008, Moroccan security forces used excessive force to stop a student protest at Cadi Ayyad Marrakesh University. After assaulting and arbitrarily arresting students, eighteen members of the National Union of Moroccan Students were sentenced to one year prison terms. The students have been tortured and abused while in police custody, but all requests for investigations into their treatment have been denied.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>North Korea</b>	<p>Severe political repression; systematic use of torture; inhumane prison conditions; severe media censorship; forced labor; forced prostitution.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> North Korea operates five large prison camps, which hold over 150,000 prisoners. Many were detained for insulting North Korean leader Kim Jong-il or attempting to defect from the country. Former prisoner Jung Gyoung-il described cases of torture, beatings, forced labor and starvation. In one instance, he saw a prisoner whose body was torn apart by attack dogs.</p>	1	<p>1</p> <p>A/HRC/10/16 <i>See details in Key Actions chart.</i></p>	None.	Expert on North Korea.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Russia (Chechnya)</b>	<p>Intimidation and repression of political activists and journalists; media censorship.</p> <p><i>Examples:</i> Prominent human rights activist, Natalia Estemirova, was abducted and forced into a van while leaving her home on July 15, 2009. Her body was later found in Ingushetia with gunshot wounds. She worked on several sensitive cases of human rights abuses in Chechnya and was known as a fierce opponent of Chechen government, which is widely believed to be linked to her death and the deaths of other journalists and political activists.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.
<b>Saudi Arabia</b>	<p>Systematic repression of women and non-Muslims; regular use of severe corporal punishment; use of torture and prison abuse; arbitrary detention</p> <p><i>Examples:</i> Saudi Arabia continues to deny women fundamental rights and enforces certain practices such as veiling, male guardianship and child marriage. In April 2009, a Saudi judge ruled that the marriage between an 8 year-old girl and a 47 year-old man was legal, rejecting a petition by the child's mother. The marriage was arranged by the child's father in order to settle debts with the man.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
Somalia	<p>Severe political corruption; media censorship and restrictions; continued use of extrajudicial killing, torture, and arbitrary detention.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Ongoing fighting between Islamist militias and government forces has resulted in over 16,000 civilian deaths since 2007 and 1.3 million internally displaced people. The al-Qaeda supported Al-Shahab militia has forced over 200,000 people to flee their homes into Kenya or pay human traffickers to go to Yemen. In southern Somalia, al-Shahab has wrested control from local government forces and instituted Sharia law. In one instance, the hands and legs of four teenagers were publicly amputated without due process. They were accused of stealing pistols and mobile phones.</p>	1	<p>1 resolution adopted, as a matter of “technical cooperation.” (A/HRC/10/32) The text was non-condemnatory and failed to name the perpetrators of violence. <i>See details in Key Actions chart.</i></p>	None.	Expert on Somalia.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
Sudan	<p>Sudanese president indicted for genocide in Darfur; mass rape; media censorship and restrictions; suppression of political freedom.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Fighting in Darfur has spread to Sudan’s border with Chad. In June 2009, Arab militias launched a “scorched earth” campaign to eradicate black ethnic tribes in the region, forcing civilians into crowded camps. Rebels torched homes, raped women and stole cattle. In some cases, women and girls were raped in and outside of the internally displaced persons camps as they collected water or firewood. Government security forces have also fired indiscriminately into crowds of displaced Darfurians when attempting to search for weapons and drugs in the camps. Over 200,000 Sudanese refugees have since fled to Chad.</p>	2	<p>2</p> <p>A/HRC/9/17 A/HRC/11/10</p> <p>Both failed to hold Sudan’s government accountable. One praised Sudan for its “progress” on human rights. <i>See details in Key Actions chart.</i></p>	None.	Expert on Sudan.
Syria	<p>Use of assassinations as a political tool; media censorship and restrictions; suppression of political activity; severe restrictions on freedom of association.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Mesh’al al-Tammo was arrested on August 15, 2008 for his activities as the spokesperson for the Kurdish Future Current group. Security forces held him incommunicado after charging him with conspiracy, which is punishable by death in Syria. The Damascus Criminal Court also convicted 12 pro-democracy activists on October 29, 2008 and sentenced them to 30 months in prison. Eight of the detainees were held incommunicado, were beaten and forced to sign false confessions.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	<p>Intimidation of and violence against journalists and political activists; severe restrictions on freedoms of speech, assembly and religion; forced relocation of ethnic minorities; severe restrictions on freedom of movement.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Turkmenistan maintains travel bans on activists and journalists, preventing human rights monitors from entering the country. The government has also censored internet access, blocking websites that detail human rights violations in the country. In April 2008, several journalists and their families were targeted. Journalist Gurbansultan Achilova was forced to sign an agreement with the Ministry of National Security that she would no longer report for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. She can be arrested if she continues working as a journalist. In November 2008, the mobile phones of all Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty contributors were blocked.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Country	Abuses	Resolutions Introduced	Resolutions Adopted	Special Sessions	Investigative Mandates
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	<p>Continued impunity regarding the Andijan massacre; intimidation of and violence against journalists and civil society activists; repression of political activity; severe media censorship.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> Poet and political dissident Yusuf Jumaev, exhibited new bruises, emaciation and other signs of abuse when his daughter visited him in prison on August 17, 2009. He was incarcerated for insulting President Karimov and calling for his resignation prior to the country’s national election in December 2007. Jumaev is locked in a quarantined cell with other prisoners carrying tuberculosis and regularly beaten by security guards. Several thousand other political prisoners continue to languish in prison.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None. Scrutiny under confidential complaint procedure discontinued in 2006.
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	<p>Violence and intimidation of journalists and government opposition; media censorship; extrajudicial killings and torture.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> In September 2009, 31 year-old Mncedisi Thalwa reported to Zimbabwean police that he was sodomized by ruling party chairman John Nkomo, a close ally of President Robert Mugabe. The police refused to investigate the claim, press charges against Nkomo and have arrested Thalwa for “obstructing the course of justice” by making a false report.</p>	None.	None.	None.	None.

**Table 4: Key Actions by UN Human Rights Council**  
*3<sup>rd</sup> year of UNHRC, September 2008 to June 2009*

	<b>Title</b>	<b>Sponsors</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Desired Vote</b>
1.	HRC 9/2: Human rights and international solidarity	Cuba with 23 co-sponsors, including Belarus, China, North Korea, the Congo, Iran, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe	<p>“Expressing concern at the fact that the immense benefits resulting from the process of globalization and economic interdependence have not reached all countries...”</p> <p>“Urges the international community to consider urgently concrete measures to promote and consolidate international assistance to developing countries...”</p>	Cuban-led exercise to shift focus of the Council away from state obligations and legally enforceable civil, religious, and political rights, towards abstract groups and state interests.	<p>Adopted 9/24/08</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 33 No: 13</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
2.	HRC 9/4: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures	Cuba for the Non-Aligned Movement	<p>“Condemns the continued unilateral application and enforcement by certain powers of such [unilateral coercive] measures as tools of political or economic pressure against any country, particularly against developing countries, with a view to preventing these countries from exercising their right to decide, of their own free will, their own political, economic and social systems”</p> <p>“Requests: (a) The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights... to pay due attention and give urgent consideration to the present resolution; (b) The Secretary General to bring the present resolution to the attention of all States...”</p>	<p>Cuban-sponsored text fails to distinguish between unilateral coercive measures, such as economic or non-economic sanctions that are acceptable under international law, and extraterritorial measures that are contrary to international law.</p> <p>Argues that governments, and not their people, have a right to decide on political, economic, and social systems.</p> <p>Politically-motivated text imposes hierarchy of issues upon the Council, High Commissioner, and Secretary General on the basis of political interests of sponsoring states, particularly Cuba’s opposition to the U.S. embargo.</p>	<p>Adopted 9/24/08</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 33 No: 11 Abstain: 2</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
3.	HRC 9/16: Advisory services and technical assistance to Liberia	France for the European Union	<p>“Encourages the Government of Liberia to continue its work to improve the promotion and protection of human rights to enable the people of Liberia to have full enjoyment of their human rights, including in areas highlighted by the independent expert...”</p> <p>“Urges the international community to provide the Government with appropriate funding and assistance...”</p> <p>“Invites the Office of the High Commissioner to report to the Council at its twelfth session on the progress made in the situation of human rights in Liberia...”</p>	<p>Killed the mandate on Liberia.</p> <p>Welcomes “decisive steps” taken by Liberia to improve human rights situation and calls on international community to increase assistance to the country.</p> <p>Welcomes the work of the independent expert on Liberia, yet fails to extend her mandate. Instead calls only on the Office of the High Commissioner to report on the country’s “progress.”</p>	Adopted without vote 9/24/08	Abstain

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
4.	HRC 9/17: Situation of human rights in the Sudan	Egypt for the African Group and France for the European Union (compromise text)	<p>“Acknowledges the progress made in the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the steps taken by the Government of Sudan...”</p> <p>“Expresses its deep concern at the overall situation of human rights in the Sudan... at the serious violations of human rights law and international humanitarian law in Darfur”</p> <p>“Decides to extend until June 2009 the mandate of the Special Rapporteur...”</p>	<p>Praises Sudan for “progress.”</p> <p>Expresses deep concern at the human rights situation, highlighting Darfur. Holds government responsible for protecting civilians, yet fails to hold government accountable for violations.</p> <p>“Takes note,” but does not “welcome,” the reports of the Special Rapporteur which criticized Sudan’s actions against human rights activists, aid workers, and the people of Darfur.</p> <p>Extends the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for only 6 months, instead of the customary one-year term.</p>	Adopted without vote 9/24/08	Abstain
5.	HRC 9/18: Human rights situation in Palestine and other occupied Arab territories: Follow-up to resolution S-31	Egypt for the Arab Group, Morocco for the African Group, and Pakistan for the Islamic Group	<p>“Welcomes the report of the high-level fact-finding mission on Beit Hanoun... Regrets the delay in the fulfillment of the mission owing to the non-cooperation of Israel, the occupying power...”</p> <p>“Calls upon the occupying Power, Israel, to end its occupation of all Palestinian lands occupied since 1967 and to respect its commitment within the peace process...”</p>	<p>Endorses report by one-sided inquiry that refused to investigate Hamas rocket attacks. Criticizes Israel for non-cooperation and requests follow-up report.</p> <p>Fails to recognize Israel’s right to defend against Palestinian terrorism that deliberately targets innocent civilians. Distorts facts and exploits tragic accident for political agenda.</p>	Adopted 9/24/08  Vote: 32 Yes 9 No 5 Abstain	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
6.	HRC S-8/1: Situation of human rights in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo	Egypt for the African Group	<p>“Expresses its serious concern at the deteriorating human rights and humanitarian situation in North Kivu...”</p> <p>“Underlines that the Government has the primary responsibility to make every effort to strengthen the protection of the civilian population...”</p> <p>“Welcomes the cooperation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with thematic special procedures of the Council...”</p> <p>“Invites the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to report to the Council in its tenth session on the human rights situation in the east of the Democratic Republic of the Congo...”</p>	<p>Fails to reinstate independent expert to monitor the crisis, calling only for the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to report on the situation.</p> <p>Expresses concern at the humanitarian situation in the Congo, condemns acts of sexual violence and recruitment of child soldiers, and holds the government responsible for protecting the civilian population.</p> <p>Fails to condemn government actions. Instead, praises government for supposed cooperation with the U.N.</p>	Adopted without a vote 12/01/08	Abstain

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
7.	HRC S-9/1: The grave violations of human rights in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, particularly due to the recent Israeli military attacks against the occupied Gaza Strip	Cuba, Egypt for the Arab and African Groups, and Pakistan for the Islamic Group	<p>“Recognizing that the massive ongoing Israeli military operation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, particularly in the occupied Gaza Strip, has caused grave violations of the human rights of the Palestinian civilians therein, exacerbated the severe humanitarian crisis in the Occupied Palestinian Territory and undermined international efforts towards achieving a just and lasting peace in the region...”</p> <p>“Demands that the occupying Power, Israel, stop the targeting of civilians and medical facilities and staff and the systematic destruction of the cultural heritage of the Palestinian people, in addition to the destruction of public and private properties...”</p>	<p>Gives verdict in advance by declaring Israel guilty of “massive violations” as it establishes “fact-finding mission” with mandate to examine only one side. (Although Richard Goldstone, who headed the inquiry, claimed this mandate was changed, in fact the General Assembly 3<sup>rd</sup> Committee ratified S-9/1, unchanged, in November 2009.)</p> <p>Condemns only Israeli conduct. Neglects to name Hamas as aggressor for launching 10,000 rocket attacks over 8 years that deliberately targeted Israeli citizens. Fails to mention that Hamas used civilians as human shields and attacked from residential areas.</p> <p>Expressly downplays nature of rocket attacks (“crude”) and suffering (“some”) of Israeli civilians. Mentions number of Israelis killed by rocket fire only to emphasize that more Palestinians have died, and to suggest simplistically that Israel is therefore to blame for the conflict.</p> <p>Falsely accuses Israel of “targeting” civilians despite Israel’s documented efforts to avoid civilian casualties.</p>	<p>Adopted 1/12/09</p> <p>Vote: 33 Yes 1 No 13 Abstain</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
8.	HRC 10/5: Composition of the staff of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	Cuba with Belarus, Bolivia, China, North Korea Ecuador, Iran, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Syria, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe	<p>“Expressing its concern that, despite the repeated requests to correct the unbalanced geographical distribution of the staff, the situation remains that one region accounts for more than half of the posts of the Office of the High Commissioner...”</p> <p>“Requests the High Commissioner to submit a comprehensive and updated report to the Council...with a special focus on further measures taken to correct the imbalance in geographical composition of the staff...”</p>	<p>Reiterates last’s year resolution seeking HRC control of OHCHR, thus limiting the independence of the High Commissioner.</p> <p>Focuses on “geographic balance” at the expense of Charter principles of staff efficiency, competence and integrity.</p> <p>Promotes piecemeal approach to human resources management.</p>	<p>Adopted 9/28/07</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 28 No: 13 Abstain: 5</p>	No
9.	A/HRC/10/11: The use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination	Cuba with Belarus, Bolivia, North Korea, The Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Russia, Syria Uruguay, and Zimbabwe	<p>“Reaffirming...the principles of sovereign equality, political independence, the territorial integrity of States, the self-determination of peoples, the non-use of force or threat of use of force in international relations and non-interference in affairs within the domestic jurisdiction of States”</p> <p>“Reaffirms that the use of mercenaries and their recruitment, financing and training are causes for grave concern...”</p> <p>“Condemns recent mercenary activities in developing countries...”</p>	<p>Politically motivated text from Cuba, fails to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate uses and threats of force.</p> <p>Reaffirms principle of “non-interference” in internal matters of States, which contradicts the mandate of the Human Rights Council to hold States accountable for violating the universal rights of individuals.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/26/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 32 No: 12 Abstain: 3</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
10.	A/HRC/10/16: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	The Czech Republic and Japan with 32 other Western countries, including Canada, France, Germany, Israel, Turkey, South Korea, Switzerland, the U.K., and the U.S.A.	<p>“Deeply concerned at the continuing reports of systematic, widespread and grave violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights...”</p> <p>“Deploring the grave, widespread and systematic human rights abuses in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in particular the use of torture and labour camps against political prisoners and repatriated citizens...”</p> <p>“Decides to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur...for a period of one year”</p>	<p>Criticizes grave human rights violations committed by the government of North Korea.</p> <p>Extends mandate of Special Rapporteur for one year.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/26/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 26 No: 6 Abstain: 15</p>	Yes
11.	A/HRC/10/17: Human Rights in the Occupied Syrian Golan	Belarus, Bolivia, Cuba, North Korea, Nicaragua, Pakistan for the Islamic Group, Yemen for the Arab Group, Zimbabwe	<p>“Deeply concerned at the suffering of the Syrian citizens in the occupied Syrian Golan due to the systematic and continuous violation of their fundamental and human rights by Israel since the Israeli military occupation of 1967...”</p> <p>“Also calls upon Israel to desist from changing the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure and legal status of the occupied Syrian Golan...”</p>	<p>Addresses territorial dispute bearing no genuine connection to issues of individual rights.</p> <p>Neglects to mention Syria's role as key host and supporter of the enemies of the peace process and its active sponsorship of terrorism and terrorist organizations.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 33 No: 1 Abstain: 13</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
12.	A/HRC/10/18: Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and in the occupied Syrian Golan	Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Pakistan for the Islamic Group, Venezuela, Yemen for the Arab Group	<p>“Affirming that the Israeli settlement activities in the Occupied Palestinian Territory constitute very serious violations of international humanitarian law...”</p> <p>“Expressing grave concern at the continuing construction, contrary to international law, by Israel of the wall inside the Occupied Palestinian Territory...”</p> <p>“Expressing its concern at the failure of the Government of Israel to cooperate fully with the relevant United Nations mechanisms, in particular the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967...”</p>	<p>One-sided text focuses selectively on one issue in the peace process yet ignores Palestinian terrorism, incitement and other human rights violations.</p> <p>Condemns Israel’s security barrier without noting its success in protecting the right to life by stopping terrorist attacks.</p> <p>Chastises Israel for failing to cooperate with investigator, yet omits to note he is subject to one-sided mandate which presumes Israeli actions to be guilty in advance.</p>	<p>Adopted 12/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 46 No: 1</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
13.	A/HRC/10/19: Human rights violations emanating from the Israeli military attacks and operations in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, particularly the recent ones in the occupied Gaza Strip	Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Pakistan for the Islamic Group, Venezuela, Yemen for the Arab Group	<p>“Recognizing also that the Israeli siege imposed on the occupied Gaza Strip, including the closure of border crossings, leads to disastrous humanitarian, economic and environmental consequences...”</p> <p>“Strongly condemns the Israeli military attacks and operations in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, particularly the recent ones in the occupied Gaza Strip, which have resulted in the killing and injury of thousands of Palestinians civilians, including a large number of women and children, and also condemns the firing of crude rockets on Israeli civilians...”</p> <p>“Demands that the occupying Power, Israel, stop the targeting of civilians...and the targeting of United Nations facilities... Demands that the occupying Power, Israel, release Palestinian prisoners and detainees... Calls upon the occupying Power, Israel, to lift checkpoints and to open all crossing points and borders in accordance with international agreements...”</p>	<p>One-sided resolution condemns Israel’s operation to prevent Kassam and Grad missile attacks, while downplaying the nature of Hamas rockets as “crude.”</p> <p>Blames Israel for failure of the peace process, omitting mention of Palestinian rejection of Olmert peace plan.</p> <p>Demands release of Palestinian prisoners, without specifying nature of crimes for which they were convicted or grounds for release.</p> <p>Requests lifting of checkpoints in Palestinian territories, but fails to address human rights issue of preventing suicide bombing attacks.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 35 No: 4 Abstain: 8</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
14.	A/HRC/10/20: Right of the Palestinian people to self-determination	Bolivia, Cuba, Nicaragua, Pakistan for the Islamic Group, Switzerland, Venezuela, Yemen for the Arab Group	<p>“Reaffirms the inalienable, permanent and unqualified right of the Palestinian people to self-determination...”</p> <p>“Stresses the need for respect for and preservation of the territorial unity, contiguity and integrity of all of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem...”</p>	<p>Breaches non-selectivity principle by endorsing self-determination claim against only one member state. There is no resolution, for example, for Kashmiri, Tibetan, or Basque independence. The selectivity is even more pronounced given that Israel has officially recognized the Palestinian right of self-determination.</p> <p>Resolution fails to reference right of Jewish people to self-determination, which is expressly rejected by Hamas. Fails to mention role of Palestinian terrorism in impeding the right to self-determination of both Palestinians and Israelis.</p>	<p>Adopted without a vote 3/27/09</p> <p>*Canada “withdrew” itself from the consensus</p>	Abstain
15.	A/HRC/10/21: Follow-up to Council resolution S-9/1	Cuba, Pakistan for the Islamic Group, Yemen for the Arab Group	<p>“Expressing regret that resolution S-9/1 has not been fully implemented to date...”</p>	<p>Seeks implementation of one-sided resolution S-9/1 (<i>see above</i>).</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 33 No: 1 Abstain: 13</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
16.	A/HRC/10/24: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment: the role and responsibility of medical and other health personnel	Denmark with about 50 other European countries, seven Latin American countries, Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, and Turkey	<p>“Reaffirming that no one shall be subjected to torture or to other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”</p> <p>“Noting the duty of all medical and other health personnel to report or denounce acts of torture...”</p> <p>“Takes note of the report of the Special Rapporteur (A/HRC/10/44).”</p>	<p>Condemns use of torture and other degrading treatment, urges medical examinations of detainees to monitor torture, holds medical personnel responsible for reporting torture, and urges States to respect the independence of medical personnel.</p> <p>“Takes note,” but does not “welcome,” report that condemns the death penalty.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 34 Abstain: 13</p>	Yes
17.	A/HRC/10/25: Discrimination based on religion or belief and its impact on the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights	The Czech Republic for the European Union with more than 30 other Western and Latin American countries	<p>“Stresses that the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion applies equally to all people...”</p> <p>“Emphasizes that discrimination based on religion or belief often has an adverse impact on the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, particularly with regard to persons belonging to religious minorities and other persons in vulnerable situations”</p> <p>“Urges States...to devote particular attention to discriminatory practices against women on the basis of their religion or belief...”</p>	<p>Condemns all forms of intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief.</p> <p>Welcomes report by Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief and extends her mandate for one year.</p> <p>To appease non-democratic countries, injects additional reference in title and text to violations of “economic, social, and cultural rights,” which bear no meaningful nexus to freedoms of religion and belief, being rather matters of civil and political rights.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/08</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 22 No: 1 Abstain: 24</p>	Yes

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
18.	A/HRC/10/22: Combating defamation of religions	Pakistan for the Islamic Group with Belarus and Venezuela	<p>“Notes with deep concern the intensification of the overall campaign of defamation of religions...including the ethnic and religious profiling of Muslim minorities in the aftermath of the tragic events of 11 September 2001”</p> <p>“Expresses deep concern in this respect that Islam is frequently and wrongly associated with human rights violations and terrorism...”</p> <p>“Deplores the use of the print, audio-visual and electronic media...[in] the targeting of religious symbols and venerated persons”</p> <p>“Requests the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism...to report on all manifestations of defamation of religions, and in particular on the serious implications of Islamophobia...”</p>	<p>Seeks to limit individual freedoms of speech and religion by shielding beliefs from critical inquiry.</p> <p>By endorsing report regarding new “legal strategies” to combat “defamation of religions,” seeks to criminalize critique of or dissenting opinions on religion.</p> <p>Singles out one specific religious faith and community for special treatment with seven exclusive references to Islam, Muslims, and Islamophobia. Fails to mention serious plight of adherents to other minority religions, including non-Muslims living in predominantly Muslim countries.</p> <p>Alleges “campaign” against Muslim minorities, implicitly pointing finger at Western governments, in which the tragic “events” of September 11, 2001 are purportedly exploited to persecute Muslims.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/08</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 23 No: 11 Abstain: 13</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
19.	A/HRC/10/27: Situation of human rights in Myanmar	The Czech Republic for the European Union with about 40 Western countries and Peru	<p>“Strongly urges the Government of Myanmar to desist from further politically motivated arrests, to release without delay and without conditions all political prisoners...”</p> <p>“Notes with appreciation the cooperation of the Government of Myanmar with the international community, including the United Nations...”</p> <p>“Calls on the Government of Myanmar to ensure free and fair electoral process that is transparent and inclusive...”</p> <p>“Urges the Government of Myanmar to guarantee the rights to the freedom of assembly, association and freedom of expression...”</p>	<p>Condemns Myanmar’s arbitrary arrests and crackdown on peaceful demonstrations and ethnic minority members. Urges release of political prisoners and democratic reforms.</p> <p>But also praises Myanmar’s efforts and “cooperation” with the U.N. and international community.</p> <p>Extends mandate of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar.</p>	<p>Adopted without vote 3/27/08</p> <p>*China and Russia expressed reservations</p>	Yes

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
20.	A/HRC/10/30: Elaboration of complementary standards to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	South Africa for the African Group	“Recalling its decision 3/103 of 8 December 2006 by which...it decided to establish the Ad Hoc Committee of the Human Rights Council on the Elaboration of Complementary Standards, with a mandate to elaborate...complementary standards in the form of either a convention or additional protocol(s) to the International Convention on the elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, filling the existing gaps in the Convention and also providing new normative standards aimed at combating all forms of contemporary racism, including incitement to racial and religious hatred.”	<p>Falsely claims that mandate of the Durban-related “Ad Hoc Committee on Complementary Standards” is to create new legal instruments to address “gaps” in the protection of minorities under international law. In fact this was never agreed upon during the committee’s past sessions. Text supports initiative of committee’s Algerian chair who is seeking to define criticism of religion as a human rights violation, unjustifiably restricting freedoms of religion and speech.</p> <p>Implies that existing prohibitions against incitement to hatred are insufficient, instead of addressing problems in implementation.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 34 No: 13</p>	No
21.	<u>Amendment</u> to draft of A/HRC/10/33: Situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the strengthening of technical cooperation and consultative services (see next)	The European Union	<p>“Alarmed by the deteriorating human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo...in particular the recruitment of child soldiers by armed groups and the ongoing and widespread acts of sexual violence against women and children, which in the majority of cases are committed by members of armed groups or security forces and used as a weapon of war”</p> <p>“Decides to appoint, for a period of one year, an independent expert...whose tasks will be to provide assistance to the Government...”</p>	<p>This rejected amendment introduced by the EU sought to express the gravity of the human rights situation in the Congo, and highlight the plight of child soldiers and women and children subjected to rape.</p> <p>Emphasized that the government has the primary responsibility to protect the civilian population.</p> <p>Would have reinstated the mandate of an independent expert on the Congo, though tasking it only with providing “assistance” to the government in tackling human rights violations.</p>	<p><u>Rejected</u> 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 18 No: 21 Abstain: 8</p>	Yes

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
22.	A/HRC/10/33: Situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the strengthening of technical cooperation and consultative services	Egypt for the African Group	<p>“Welcomes the commitment of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to pursuing technical cooperation with the various thematic representatives and special rapporteurs...”</p> <p>“Notes with satisfaction the decision by the Government to establish a national agency to combat sexual violence against women and children as part of its polity to fight impunity”</p> <p>“Calls on the international community to increase the various forms of assistance...”</p> <p>“Invites the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to inform and update the Council, at its future session...”</p> <p>“Calls on the international community to support the establishment of a local cooperation mechanism...”</p>	<p>Fails to reinstate mandate of the independent expert on the Congo, instead inviting the Government to report on itself with the assistance of a “local cooperation mechanism” with U.N. bodies.</p> <p>Criticizes violations of human rights in the Congo, yet fails to condemn government’s actions.</p> <p>Fails to reflect gravity of the situation, “noting with satisfaction” the government’s actions to combat sexual violence rather than encouraging needed additional measures.</p> <p>Praises Congo for cooperation with the international community and calls for increased assistance to the country.</p> <p>“Takes note of,” but does not “welcome,” reports of the special procedures mandate holders and the High Commissioner.</p>	<p>Adopted 3/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 33 Abstain: 14</p>	No
23.	No-action motion (Rules of Procedure 117) to end discussion on the European Union amendments to A/HRC/S-11/1 (See next)	Cuba	<p>Motion to halt debate on the proposed amendments by the European Union to the resolution of the Special Session on Sri Lanka.</p>	<p>Prevented debate and vote on amendments that would express grave concern at the situation in Sri Lanka, call on it to respect international law and ensure “full, rapid and unimpeded access of humanitarian assistance,” and demand accountability and follow-up.</p>	<p>Adopted 5/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 22 No: 17 Abstain: 7</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
24.	A/HRC/S-11/1: Assistance to Sri Lanka in the promotion and protection of human rights	Sri Lanka with about 40 others, including Belarus, China, Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran, Myanmar, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Venezuela	<p>“Welcoming the conclusion of hostilities and the liberation by the Government of Sri Lanka of tens of thousands of its citizens that were kept by the LTTE [Tamil Tigers] against their will as hostages...”</p> <p>“Commends the measures taken by the Government of Sri Lanka to address the urgent needs of the Internally Displaced Persons”</p> <p>“Welcomes the continued commitment of Sri Lanka to the promotion and protection of all human rights...”</p> <p>“Urges the international community to cooperate with the Government of Sri Lanka in the reconstruction efforts, including by increasing the provision of financial assistance...”</p>	<p>Extensively praises government of Sri Lanka instead of holding it accountable for massive killing of civilians; confining innocent Tamils to camps behind barbed wire; denying access to such camps by international aid workers; and cracking down on internal dissent.</p> <p>Calls for financial aid to Sri Lanka.</p> <p>Reaffirms alleged principle of “non-interference” in internal matters of States. This contradicts the mandate of the Human Rights Council to hold States accountable for violating the rights of individuals.</p>	<p>Adopted 5/27/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 29 No: 12 Abstain: 6</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
25.	A/HRC/11/4: Promotion of the right of peoples to peace	Cuba with Algeria, Belarus, Bolivia, China, Honduras, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Sri Lanka, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Vietnam	<p>“Convinced that a life without war is the primary international prerequisite for...fundamental human freedoms...”</p> <p>“Emphasizes that ensuring the exercise of the right of peoples to peace and its promotion demand that the policies of states be directed towards the elimination of the threat of war, particularly nuclear war, the renunciation of the use or threat of use of force in international relations...”</p>	<p>Seeks to focus HRC attention away from violations by States against their own people. Implies that absence of peace justifies failure to address human rights.</p> <p>Condemns all threats or use of force in international relations, failing to exclude just wars of self-defence and humanitarian military intervention.</p>	<p>Adopted 6/17/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 32 No: 13 Abstain: 1</p>	No
26.	A/HRC/11/5: The effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights	Cuba, Algeria, Bolivia, Iran, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Uruguay	<p>“Affirming that debt burden further complicates the numerous problems facing developing countries...and is thus a serious impediment to the realization of all human rights”</p> <p>“Recalls that every State...should not be subject to external specific prescription for economic policy”</p> <p>“Reiterates its request to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to pay more attention to the problem of the debt burden of developing countries...”</p>	<p>Addresses economic issues that are beyond the competence and expertise of the Council. Duplicates work of other international organizations that deal with debt issues, economic reform and millennium development goals.</p> <p>Emphasizes collective rights over rights of individuals.</p>	<p>Adopted 6/17/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 31 No: 13 Abstain: 2</p>	No

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
27.	Amendments to draft of A/HRC/11/10: Situation of human rights in the Sudan (see next)	The Czech Republic for the European Union, Canada, Croatia, Norway, and Switzerland	<p>“Reiterates its call upon the signatories of the Darfur Peace Agreement to comply with their obligations...”</p> <p>“Decides to create the mandate of independent expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan for a period of one year...”</p>	<p>Urges Sudan to intensify efforts to implement past resolutions and recommendations seeking to improve its human rights situation.</p> <p>Extends mandate of independent monitor on human rights in Sudan for one year.</p>	<p>Adopted 6/18/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 20 No: 19 Abstain: 8</p>	Yes
28.	A/HRC/11/10: Situation of human rights in the Sudan	Egypt for the African Group	<p>“Acknowledges the progress made in the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the steps taken by the Government of National Unity to strengthen the human rights legal and institutional framework, principally in law reform, and urges the Government to intensify those efforts.”</p> <p>“Welcomes the initial measures taken by the Government of National Unity to implement the recommendations of the Group of Experts and to address human rights concerns...but notes that a number of the recommendations have not yet been implemented”</p> <p>“Decides to create the mandate of independent expert on the situation of human rights in the Sudan for a period of one year...”</p>	<p>Extends mandate of independent expert on Sudan for one year.</p> <p>Praises Sudan’s “progress” on human rights.</p> <p>Fails to convey gravity of the situation or hold the government accountable for human its rights violations.</p>	<p>Adopted 6/19/09</p> <p>Vote: Yes: 20 No: 18 Abstain: 9</p>	Yes

2010 SCORECARD: U.S. AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

	Title	Sponsors	Text	Analysis	Result	Desired Vote
29.	A/HRC/11/11: The System of Special Procedures	China, Cuba for the Non-aligned Movement, and Russia	<p>“Recalling the need for all States to cooperate with, and assist, the special procedures in the performance of their tasks...”</p> <p>“Recalls that it is incumbent on special procedures mandate holders to exercise their functions in full respect for and strict observance of their mandates ad outlined in the relevant Council resolutions providing such mandates, as well as to comply fully with the provisions of the Code of Conduct...”</p>	<p>Emphasizes “Code of Conduct” applicable to human rights monitors in veiled attempt to intimidate them.</p> <p>During session in which the resolution was passed, several authoritarian states criticized certain mandate-holders for “violating” the Code of Conduct, underscoring dangerous uses of this resolution.</p>	<p>Adopted without vote 6/18/09</p> <p>*Canada withdrew itself from the consensus</p>	No
30.	A/HRC/11/12: Intergovernmental Working Group on the effective implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action	Nigeria for the African Group	<p>“Stressing that the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action...provides a solid basis for combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance”</p> <p>“Acknowledging with appreciation the outcome of the Durban Review Conference...”</p>	<p>Endorses the flawed Durban Declaration and follow-up Review Conference documents, both purporting to serve as mechanisms to tackle racism and intolerance, but which actually singled out Israel with false and inflammatory accusations of racism, while neglecting mention of any other country or conflict.</p>	<p>Adopted without vote 6/18/09</p> <p>*Canada and Italy withdrew themselves from the consensus</p>	No

## **Recommendations to the U.S. Government For Refocusing the Work of the UN Human Rights Council**

The U.S. is the de facto leader of the opposition at the UNHRC, a group of approximately 12 democracies on the 47-member council that routinely oppose regressive measures and defend legitimate human rights principles and positions. As such, the U.S. bears the chief responsibility to refocus the work of the council and ensure that it fulfills its promise to effectively protect human rights around the globe. Toward that end, UN Watch urges the U.S. to take the following concrete steps.

### **Hold Worst Violators to Account**

- **The U.S. should lead its friends and allies at the UNHRC to seek accountability from—at a minimum—the world’s most serious violators.** Strong U.S. leadership is required to refocus the council’s program of work toward a more objective set of priorities that will address the most pressing human rights abuses. The U.S. in concert with its allies should seek ways to break the system of regional and ideological bloc voting, encouraging countries to vote according to human rights criteria. Accountability should be achieved by initiating measures that can be effective with or without majority support.
- **The U.S. should introduce country-specific resolutions.** At every regular session, the U.S. and its allies should initiate measures that meaningfully name rights-abusing countries, unequivocally condemn their abuses, and directly attribute responsibility to the perpetrators.<sup>1</sup> Alarming, the program of work for the upcoming March 2010 session indicates the UNHRC’s continuation of its policy of neglecting urgent human rights situations that require attention. Instead it remains focused on counter-productive resolutions, such as those curbing freedom of speech regarding discussion of terrorism committed in the name of Islam. Determined U.S. diplomacy proved its potential in June 2009 when it led adoption of a resolution on Sudan that, while flawed, successfully preserved the investigative mandate on the Khartoum regime. At the same time, it is a reality that a large bloc at the UNHRC—comprised of the 51% of council member states who are non-democracies, along with several free countries that vote with them—systematically oppose country censures. (They make an exception, however, for resolutions against Israel.) Even if these resolutions are likely to be defeated, however, the very tabling of resolutions, with the ensuing diplomatic commotion and media attention, can accomplish the desired goal of turning a needed spotlight on abuses.
- **The U.S. should convene special sessions to address urgent situations of gross human rights violations.** Support from only one third of the membership, or

---

<sup>1</sup> To date, except for a handful of resolutions on North Korea and Burma, the UNHRC has granted effective immunity to all of the world’s worst abusers. The UNHRC’s few resolutions on Sudan employed weak and vague language, failed to attribute direct responsibility for abuses to the Al-Bashir government, and even complimented the regime for its “cooperation.” A May 2009 resolution on Sri Lanka praised the government instead of condemning it for causing the deaths of an estimated 20,000 civilians.

16 states, is sufficient to convene a special session. While obtaining this amount of signatures is never guaranteed, it is certainly achievable with a modest amount of U.S. diplomacy. Once the session is convened, it is true that any attempt to adopt a censure resolution may well be defeated, as happened at the May 2009 special session on Sri Lanka. Yet the very convening of an urgent session turns a powerful international spotlight on the violator.

- The U.S. should oppose, however, the increasing convening of special sessions that serve no meaningful purpose. Sessions on the world financial and food crises—issues lying far outside the competence of the UNHRC—were designed to point an accusing finger at the West, and to create the false image of a council that seriously responds to pressing developments. The January 2010 session concerning the Haiti earthquake, initiated by Brazil, also fell in this category.
- The U.S. should initiate the creation of new country-specific mandates for countries that commit gross violations of human rights, and reinstate those mandates that were wrongly eliminated (e.g., Cuba, Belarus, Liberia, DRC).
- The U.S. should take the floor more often and more strongly to denounce gross human rights violations. While resolutions, special sessions and mandates are more powerful remedies, every speech has its own impact.

### **Vigorously Protect Freedom of Speech**

- The U.S. should defend freedom of speech and vigorously oppose the OIC-sponsored campaign to ban the ““defamation of religion,” an effort to silence any discussion on Islam and women’s rights, to silence debate of Islamic-related terrorism by characterizing it as a form of “defamation” and “racism,” and to legitimize anti-blasphemy laws. This OIC campaign includes (1) annual UNHRC resolutions; (2) a latest attempt, led by the UNHRC’s Algerian-chaired “Ad Hoc Committee on Complementary Standards,” to alter the International Covenant on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) through adoption of a new protocol; (3) the repeated commissioning of reports on “defamation” from the Special Rapporteur on racism and other UN officials; and (4) the twisting of the mandate on freedom of expression by requiring the Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression to investigate the so-called “abuse” of that freedom.

### **End Unequal Treatment of Israel**

- The U.S. should fight the council’s obsessive adoption of one-sided and unconstructive resolutions and special sessions against Israel. To date, more than 80% of all the UNHRC’s condemnatory resolutions (27 out of 33) have been against Israel, while Hamas, Hezbollah and other violators enjoy exculpatory immunity. The U.S. should demand that the council move to a balanced approach consistent with its founding principles of “ensuring universality, objectivity and non-selectivity in the consideration of human rights issues, and the elimination of double standards and politicization.” In

dealing with the Middle East in a non-selective manner, the council should hold Israelis and Palestinians alike accountable for their human rights records.

- The U.S. should continue to oppose the UNHRC's Agenda Item No. 7, which permanently singles out Israel for differential and discriminatory treatment at every session. This item was adopted in June 2007 over the objections of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the European Union and Canada. The U.S. should preface its interventions delivered under this agenda item with an objection on principle to the item itself.
- The U.S., which recently played a noteworthy role in the successful admission of Israel into the JUSCANZ consulting group of non-EU Western democracies at the UNHRC, should continue to work toward including Israel in the council's group of Western and other nations (the Western Human Rights Group), ending the anomaly whereby Israel is the only country excluded from participation in any of the UNHRC's regional groups.

### **Defend the Rights of NGOs**

- The U.S. should forcefully defend human rights NGOs at the council, and preserve their historic role as independent voices at the UNHRC that can hold governments accountable.
- Specifically, the U.S. should strongly object whenever states interrupt and harass NGOs during oral interventions, and encourage the UNHRC President to discipline such abusive behavior. Egypt, Pakistan, Cuba, Iran and China are some of the states that have often interrupted legitimate NGO interventions.
- The U.S. should defend NGOs from intimidation by the UN's 19-government Committee on NGOs in New York, which is increasingly misusing its approval and quadrennial review procedures, unduly politicizing what should be a strictly professional and technical process.

### **Oppose Election of Violators to the Council**

- The U.S. should encourage countries with the strongest record of commitment to human rights to run for UNHRC election in their respective regional groups.
- The U.S. should encourage countries to choose candidates based on their record of protecting human rights at home and at the UN, and not based on political factors.
- The U.S. should lobby UN member states to defeat the election of unqualified candidates such as Iran, which is running for one of the Asian Group's seats in the May 2010 election.

**Encourage Positive Work of the High Commissioner**

- The US should defend the positive and independent work of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) from escalating attempts by the UNHRC to control its activities and agenda.
- The U.S. should encourage High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay to speak out more often and more forcefully to defend victims of the most serious violations. Her record in this regard is mixed, and needs improvement. Ms. Pillay, since being appointed in 2008, criticized 25 countries rated Free by Freedom House. Yet she has only criticized 14 countries rated Not Free, and only 9 countries rated Partly Free. She failed to make any statements whatsoever for victims in 34 countries rated Not Free and in 50 countries rated Partly Free.

**Special Rapporteurs**

- The U.S. should continue to defend the UNHRC's independent rights monitors (the special procedures) from efforts to intimidate them or influence their work.

**Strengthen the Universal Periodic Review (UPR)**

- The U.S. should use the UPR to ask meaningful questions of every country reviewed, pointedly addressing violations and providing constructive recommendations.
- The U.S. should call out those countries that systematically misuse the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) procedure by legitimizing human rights abusers instead of holding them to account. Too many countries at the UNHRC are not only failing to fulfill the stated objective of UPR, but act to undermine it.

The U.S. should support granting NGOs the right to participate in the oral debate of the UPR working group. Moreover, in the modest time currently allotted to NGOs during the Human Rights Council's plenary sessions that treat each UPR report, the U.S. should ensure that freedom of speech of NGOs is protected.