

# Gaza Ceasefire Resolution Comprehensive Analysis

Motion ID: 01\_gaza\_ceasefire\_resolution  
Analysis Date: October 09, 2025

This report provides a comprehensive analysis of the Gaza ceasefire resolution voted on by 195 UN member states. The analysis includes voting patterns, regional alignments, and detailed assessment of how the vote affects Israel's bilateral relationships with each country.

# 1. Voting Results Overview

The resolution received 190 votes in favor (97.4%), 3 votes against (1.5%), and 2 abstentions (1.0%).

Vote	Count	Percentage
YES	190	97.4%
NO	3	1.5%
ABSTAIN	2	1.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## 2. Israel Bilateral Relationship Impact

An analysis of how the ceasefire vote affects Israel's bilateral relationships with 194 UN member states reveals a nuanced diplomatic landscape. The analysis categorizes relationship impacts across seven levels, from significant strengthening to significant strain.

Impact Category	Countries	Percentage
Strengthened Significantly	0	0.0%
Strengthened Moderately	0	0.0%
Strengthened Slightly	43	22.2%
Neutral	102	52.6%
Strained Slightly	37	19.1%
Strained Moderately	9	4.6%
Strained Significantly	3	1.5%

## 3. Key Findings

- 43 countries (22.2%) showed strengthened relations with Israel
- 49 countries (25.3%) experienced strained relations
- 102 countries (52.6%) maintained neutral bilateral status
- The overwhelming vote in favor (190 yes votes) indicates broad international support for humanitarian ceasefire

## 4. Notable Country Analyses

### Relationships Moderately Strained

#### **Algeria** (Voted: YES)

Algeria's vote and statement reflect a deeply entrenched position of support for Palestinian rights that fundamentally challenges Israel's diplomatic stance. While the vote itself follows a near-unanimous UN resolution, Algeria's accompanying rhetoric emphasizes principles that are directly antagoni...

#### **Bolivia** (Voted: YES)

Bolivia's vote and statement reflect a long-standing ideological opposition to Israel's policies, using strong language that goes beyond the procedural aspects of the UN resolution. The statement's explicit references to 'colonialism' and 'imperialism' signal a fundamental diplomatic disagreement th...

#### **Ireland** (Voted: YES)

Ireland's vote and statement reflect a long-standing critical stance towards Israel's actions in Palestinian territories, going beyond procedural diplomacy to a principled position that explicitly challenges Israel's policies. The statement's reference to 'accountability' and past declarations of an...

#### **Libya** (Voted: YES)

Libya's vote and strongly worded statement reflect its consistent anti-Israel stance, emphasizing Palestinian solidarity and criticizing Israeli actions. The resolution's overwhelming support, combined with Libya's pointed diplomatic language, further signals Libya's continued diplomatic opposition ...

#### **Malaysia** (Voted: YES)

Malaysia's vote and statement reflect its long-standing principled opposition to Israel's actions in Gaza, reinforcing a historically antagonistic diplomatic stance. The strongly worded statement, emphasizing Palestinian rights and calling for a Palestinian state, signals a continued diplomatic disc...

### Relationships Significantly Strained

#### **Iran** (Voted: NO)

Iran's vote and statement represent a continuation of its long-standing hostile stance towards Israel, characterized by uncompromising rhetoric and categorical rejection of Israel's legitimacy. The statement goes beyond the vote itself, using inflammatory language that reinforces Iran's position as ...

#### **Syria** (Voted: YES)

Syria's vote and statement reflect its long-standing hostile stance towards Israel, using the UN resolution as a platform to criticize Israeli actions and reaffirm support for Palestinian sovereignty. The statement's language emphasizes historical conflict and delegitimizes Israel's territorial clai...

#### **Venezuela** (Voted: YES)

Venezuela's vote and statement reflect a deeply antagonistic stance towards Israel, rooted in long-standing diplomatic rupture and ideological opposition. The explicit condemnation of Israeli actions, combined with the historical context of severed diplomatic relations, indicates a

continuation of h...

## Methodology

This analysis was generated using AI-powered diplomatic analysis. Voting data was collected from 195 UN member states. Bilateral impact assessments were conducted using claude-3-5-haiku-20241022, analyzing each country's vote, official statement, and historical relationship context with Israel. Impact categories range from 'strengthened significantly' to 'strained significantly' based on factors including: historical relationship baseline, vote alignment, diplomatic tone, strategic implications, regional dynamics, and economic/security ties.

Generated: 2025-10-09 15:25:28