

III - GENERAL ASSEMBLY: IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101-167 calls for analysis and discussion of “all such votes on issues which directly affected important United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” For the 53rd General Assembly in 1998, 10 votes meet these criteria.

Section III has five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 10 important votes at the 53rd UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the 17 important consensus resolutions adopted at the 53rd UNGA; (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important votes, arranged both alphabetically by country and in rank order of agreed votes; (4) voting coincidence percentages by UN regional groupings and other important groupings; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section II. Starting in 1996, an additional column has been included in the tables of important votes (parts 3 and 4 above). This column presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 17 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, these coincidence percentages were refined to reflect a country’s rate of participation in all UN voting overall. The participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes/No/Abstain votes cast by a UN member in plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total of plenary votes (82).

IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 10 important votes are identified by a short title, document number, date of vote, and results (Yes-No-Abstain), with the U.S. vote noted. The first paragraph summarizes the subject matter of each vote, and the second provides background and the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in the order adopted.

1. U.S. Embargo of Cuba

A/Res/53/4 October 14 157-2(US)-12

Calls on states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures, such as the “Helms-Burton Act,” the extraterritorial effects of which affect the sovereignty of other states, the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction, and the freedom of trade and navigation; and urges states that have such laws to repeal them.

This Cuba-sponsored resolution, couched in terms of blocking efforts to extend extraterritorially the effects of the U.S. embargo against Cuba, again in

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

1998 gained increased support. A number of countries, notably Argentina, Norway, and Costa Rica, while voting for the resolution, mentioned Cuba's poor human rights record in their explanations of vote. The European Union statement (by Austria) had a strong human rights focus, making clear that full cooperation with Cuba depended on improvement in human rights and political freedom. The U.S. concern with Cuba results from the Cuban Government's systematic denial of universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms to the people of Cuba. The United States believes that economic sanctions are an important foreign policy tool to be used in certain compelling cases. In the case of Cuba, sanctions are but one element of a broad policy aimed at promoting a peaceful transition to democracy. Year after year the Cuban Government has sought to manipulate the concerns expressed in the United Nations to claim support for its repressive and failed policies. The record of the Cuban Government is clear: dozens of dissidents and human rights advocates have been detained and arrested over the past year. Their only "crime" was to criticize the government's failed economic policies and to call for peaceful, democratic change. In addition to maintaining pressure on the Cuban Government for change, the United States believes it is particularly important to reach out to the Cuban people. Assisting the Cuban people to develop independent civil society will help ensure that the transition which will inevitably take place in Cuba will be peaceful and democratic. This effort to support the Cuban people recognizes that change in Cuba must come from within, led by Cubans on the island who recognize the problems and injustices of the current system. They need and deserve the support of the international community. Support for the Cuban people has been and remains a central thrust of U.S. policy. Thousands of Cuban doctors, scientists, environmentalists, academics, students, researchers, artists, religious workers, and others have traveled to the United States, and hundreds of U.S. citizens have legally traveled to Cuba for similar purposes. Dozens of nongovernmental groups in the United States are engaged in projects with independent Cuban groups, and the United States has licensed over \$2 billion in private humanitarian assistance from U.S. individuals and nongovernmental organizations to the people of Cuba. Much of the assistance licensed is medicines, medical equipment, and food. (Israel also voted against this resolution.)

2. Elimination of Coercive Economic Measures

A/Res/53/10

October 26

80-2(US)-67

Calls for the immediate repeal of unilateral extraterritorial laws that impose sanctions on corporations and nationals of other states; and urges all states not to recognize or apply extraterritorial coercive economic measures or legislative enactments unilaterally imposed by any state.

The United States, which regards economic sanctions as a legitimate instrument of foreign policy, opposed this Libya-sponsored resolution. In the

III - Important Votes

U.S. view, this resolution was an attempt by Libya to divert attention from its own noncompliance with terrorism-related sanctions and to shift the focus to states that seek to call states like Libya to account. It is the U.S. view that every sovereign state has the right to decide with whom it will or will not trade. The United States is by no means the only nation that resorts to economic sanctions when necessary. When faced with unacceptable international behavior, the United States resorts to unilateral action reluctantly, working whenever possible with other members of the global community to devise a collective response to egregious behavior that violates international norms or threatens international security, as with Iraq's armed aggression against Kuwait. But the United States has responded and will continue to respond when faced with policies and actions that pose unusual and extraordinary threats to its vital interests, including security (for example, state support for international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles, and massive human rights abuses). The high importance of the issues involved makes the U.S. Government willing to endure the real economic sacrifice that imposing economic sanctions entails also for the United States. When forced to act unilaterally, the United States makes it clear what policies need to be changed, and what the target state must do to have sanctions lifted. These sanctions also seek to target the subject government, while avoiding harm to vulnerable civilian populations. In responding to rogue state behavior, the United States is defending not only its own interests, but also the security of the international community as a whole. (Israel also voted against this resolution.)

3. IAEA Report

A/Res/53/21

November 2

113(US)-1-8

Affirms confidence in the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; commends IAEA's efforts to implement the safeguards agreement with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), expresses concern about the continuing noncompliance of the DPRK with the agreement, and urges the DPRK to cooperate fully with the IAEA in implementation of the agreement; calls upon Iraq to cooperate fully with the IAEA in accordance with its obligations under Security Council resolutions and the memorandum of understanding signed by Iraq and the Secretary General in February 1998; and welcomes the IAEA's measures to prevent illicit trafficking of nuclear materials.

The United States again supported this resolution endorsing the IAEA's efforts to promote peaceful use of atomic energy and guard against its use for military purposes. The United States also strongly supported inclusion of paragraphs calling upon North Korea and Iraq to comply with their obligations regarding peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

4. Nuclear Testing in South Asia

A/Res/53/77G December 4 118(US)-9-33

Expresses grave concern about and strongly deplores the recent nuclear tests conducted in South Asia (by India and Pakistan); notes the moratoriums on further testing declared by these states and their willingness to enter into legal commitments; and reiterates that those legal commitments should be expressed through signature and ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

Adoption of this resolution was a key U.S. objective at the General Assembly. The resolution addressed the deep-seated, worldwide, intense concern about the nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan earlier in the year.

5. New Agenda for Nuclear Disarmament

A/Res/53/77Y December 4 114-18(US)-38

Calls on nuclear-weapon states to demonstrate a commitment to total elimination of their nuclear weapons in fulfillment of their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; asks them to de-alert their nuclear weapons and remove nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles; urges them to examine further interim measures, including to review strategic doctrines; and considers that an international conference on nuclear disarmament could consolidate a new agenda for a nuclear-weapon-free world.

The U.S. Government vigorously opposed this resolution because it calls into question a fundamental defense doctrine of the United States and its allies, nuclear deterrence, which kept the peace for half a century and won the Cold War. Moreover, the resolution would tend to delay, not advance, the nuclear disarmament agenda. By seeming to require a new commitment to nuclear disarmament as a prerequisite to further steps to reduce nuclear weapons, the resolution would only provide an excuse for delay. And by tending to undermine existing forums for disarmament, it would not promote the speedier progress desired.

6. Right to Development

A/Res/53/155 December 9 125-1(US)-42

Reaffirms the right to development for all peoples as a fundamental human right; urges all states to eliminate obstacles to development at all levels; and urges states to promote the right to development as a vital element in a balanced human rights program.

III - Important Votes

The U.S. delegation tried to negotiate compromises on contentious issues that would have permitted reaching consensus on this resolution. However, a few developing countries insisted on calling for initiation of negotiations on a new convention on right to development, while refusing to recognize the international consensus that lack of development may not be invoked to justify the abridgement of human rights. While many countries sought a consensus outcome, when the United States called for a vote on the resolution, no Western country was prepared to vote in favor. There is much in the resolution that the United States supports, but profoundly disagreed on several points: (1) International macroeconomic policy-making, globalization, and debt relief are not intrinsically human rights issues. (2) It is wrong, and dangerously misleading, to pin the blame for long-standing problems of food, health, education, and unemployment on the current global financial crisis. (3) While incorporation of a human rights-based approach adds to development policy, the reverse, a development-based approach to human rights, has added neither to development nor to human rights. A convention on the right to development is a diversion to serious work both on rights and on development. (4) A new mandate in the field of development should not be added to the work of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights because it would be wasteful and duplicative, and it would divert scarce resources from human rights activities for which the High Commissioner has an exclusive mandate.

7. Human Rights in Iraq

A/Res/53/157

December 9

103(US)-3-56

Strongly condemns the systematic and extremely grave violations of human rights in Iraq, including suppression of freedoms, summary and arbitrary executions, systematic torture, and mutilation as a penalty, including for petty crimes; and calls upon Iraq to: abide by international human rights treaties, provide an accounting for the clean-out of prisons, cooperate with UN human rights mechanisms, restore the independence of the judiciary and abrogate all laws granting impunity, cease repressive practices aimed at Iraqi Kurds in the north and the marsh Arabs in the south, cooperate with international agencies to provide humanitarian assistance, and ensure equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies purchased with the proceeds of Iraqi oil sales in implementation of Security Council resolutions.

The United States cosponsored this resolution, introduced by the European Union, to highlight and condemn the human rights situation in Iraq, where freedom of thought, expression, religion, association, assembly, and movement simply do not exist. And there is no protection from arbitrary arrest, torture, imprisonment, or summary execution at the hands of a repressive one-party regime.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

8. Human Rights in Iran

A/Res/53/158 December 9 64(US)-41-56

Expresses concern about continuing violations of human rights in Iran, especially the increasing number of executions and torture, discrimination against members of religious minorities, particularly the Baha'is, and lack of human rights for women; calls on Iran to abide by human rights instruments, eliminate discrimination in law and practice against women, and ensure that capital punishment will be imposed only for the most serious crimes; and calls on Iran to extend full cooperation to the Special Representative of the UN Commission on Human Rights.

The United States cosponsored this resolution, introduced by the European Union, to highlight once again the violations of human rights in Iran. The Government of Iran lacks a clear commitment to protect the human rights of religious minorities. The situation of the Baha'i community is of particular concern. Also of concern are problems with the administration of justice, including torture, cruel and degrading punishment, and the fact that apostasy continues to be a crime punishable by death. Iran's leadership has made positive statements in respect to freedom of expression, but recent set-backs have been disappointing. Steps have been taken against the media. Members of the press have been harassed, and publications have been arbitrarily closed. There is also a lack of progress on women's rights.

9. Human Rights in Parts of the Former Yugoslavia

A/Res/53/163 December 9 141(US)-0-21

Expresses disappointment about continuing human rights violations, and calls for full implementation of human rights provisions of the (Dayton) peace agreement; calls for an end to illegal detention by all parties, and calls on all parties to ensure that protection of human rights will be central elements in the new civilian structures; calls for cooperation with the International Tribunal and condemns the refusal of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (FRY) and Republika Srpska to arrest and surrender war criminals in their territories; calls on parties to the peace agreement to determine the fate of missing persons; urges Bosnia and Herzegovina to ensure full access to its territory to implement this resolution, to create conditions conducive to the voluntary return of refugees and internally displaced persons, and to provide humanitarian assistance; urges Croatia to implement its refugee return program; and urges the FRY to institutionalize democratic norms.

The United States again in 1998 introduced this resolution on human rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and the FRY. Extensive negotiation led to its passage with no votes in opposition. This resolution is one aspect of

III - Important Votes

the continuing, long-term effort to help these countries emerge from their terrible trials and develop democratic and tolerant civil societies with full respect for international standards of human rights. Some progress has been made in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Croatia, but the FRY remains largely unreconstructed. It has done little to meet its obligations under the Dayton agreement, and has taken steps backward with respect to international standards.

10. Human Rights in Kosovo

A/Res/53/164

December 9

122(US)-3-34

Condemns the overwhelming number of human rights violations by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (FRY) in Kosovo, violence by armed ethnic Albanian groups, and denial of appropriate access by nongovernmental organizations to Kosovo; expresses deep concern about all violations of human rights and repression of the ethnic Albanian population in Kosovo, and calls on the FRY to end all such violations, to allow unhindered access by humanitarian organizations, and to facilitate the return of internally displaced persons to their homes; calls on all parties to clear the area of landmines; and calls on the Special Rapporteur of the UN Human Rights Commission to continue to monitor closely the human rights situation in Kosovo.

The United States introduced this resolution, which calls international attention to the shocking injustices the people of Kosovo have suffered. The police and armed forces of the FRY have forced nearly 300,000 people to run in terror from their homes. Many were killed. Homes were destroyed. The FRY cannot justify the killing of innocent people in its effort to reestablish law and order. The FRY has perpetrated a policy intended to terrorize and cow an entire ethnic population, and this after more than 10 years of oppression. All parties to the conflict must respect the mandate of the war crimes tribunal. They must seek a peaceful settlement that includes democratic elections and genuine self-government for Kosovo. And the population of Kosovo must be permitted to enjoy their universally recognized human rights.

CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Of the 273 resolutions adopted by the 53rd UNGA in 1998, 213 (78.0%) were by consensus. In addition, 86 of 89 decisions were adopted by consensus. Combining resolutions and decisions, the percentage of those adopted by consensus was 82.6%. The percentage of resolutions adopted by consensus has remained fairly constantly in a range of 77-80% for the past eight years and is higher than in the earlier years for which these reports were compiled. The number of plenary votes is considerably below what it was just a few years ago and less than half the number at the 42nd UNGA.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

The following table illustrates these developments:

Resolutions and Decisions

UNGA	Votes	Consensus	Total	Percentage Consensus
53rd.....	63	299	362	82.6%
52nd.....	70	280	350	80.0%
51st.....	76	272	348	78.2%
50th.....	69	293	362	80.9%
49th.....	70	301	371	81.1%
48th.....	66	298	364	81.9%
47th.....	78	265	343	77.3%
46th.....	76	272	348	78.2%
45th.....	90	297	387	76.7%
44th.....	119	272	391	69.6%
43rd.....	138	245	383	64.0%
42nd.....	154	224	378	60.6%

IMPORTANT CONSENSUS RESOLUTIONS

The 17 important resolutions listed and discussed below were adopted by consensus at the 53rd UNGA. All were selected on the same basis used in determining important votes discussed above, i.e., they were “issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied intensively.” For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the resolution number, date of adoption, a summary description, and an explanation of the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in numerical order.

1. Information Technology and Security

A/Res/53/70 December 4

Considering that it is necessary to prevent misuse or exploitation of information resources or technologies for criminal or terrorist purposes: calls on member states to promote multilateral consideration of threats in the field of information security; and invites all member states to inform the Secretary General of their views on: (a) information security issues, (b) a definition of basic notions on information security, including interference with and misuse of information and systems, and (c) the advisability of developing international principles to enhance global information and telecommunication systems and help to combat information terrorism and criminality.

The United States was able to join consensus on this resolution after persuading its sponsors to omit phrases pointing to potential dangers of information weapons and information warfare. The U.S. delegation also pointed to the need to discuss issues of economic cooperation and trade, intellectual property

III - Important Votes

rights, law enforcement, and anti-terrorism cooperation in other committees of the General Assembly, where they would be provided the necessary perspective.

2. Support of Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT)

A/Res/53/77I December 4

Welcomes the decision by the Conference on Disarmament to establish a committee to negotiate a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

The United States cosponsored this resolution. Consensus adoption of the resolution—after a successful U.S. appeal to Pakistan to withdraw amendments putting FMCT negotiations in the context of a time-bound nuclear disarmament process and prejudicing the question of the scope of a future treaty—augurs well for reestablishment of the FMCT ad hoc committee in the Conference on Disarmament in 1999. This is the first time since 1993 that an FMCT resolution was adopted, moving forward the effort to stem the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

3. Causes of Conflict and Promotion of Peace and Development in Africa

A/Res/53/92 December 7

Welcomes the Secretary General's report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of peace and development in Africa for its holistic approach and concrete recommendations, and commends his efforts to mobilize the international community; notes that implementation of the Secretary General's recommendations will require increased political will and substantial increases in the flow of financial resources; urges the United Nations and others to assist in strengthening the institutions for promotion of transparency and accountability in public administration and good governance, in respect for human rights and the rule of law, and in strengthening democratic institutions; urges all states and parties to rely on peaceful means rather than military solutions to their problems, and, to that end, to promote preventive diplomacy and confidence-building measures; calls on member states and international financial institutions to help implement the five priority areas identified by the Secretary General, namely, market access, increased official development assistance, conversion of official debts into grants, liberalization of the heavily indebted poor countries initiative, and foreign direct investment flows; and emphasizes the need for the international community to assist African countries in promoting regional economic cooperation and integration.

The United States is committed to the partnership between Africa and the United Nations in such areas as development, food security, health, humanitarian aid, and electoral assistance. During President Clinton's trip to Africa in

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

April 1998, African economic leaders and business people made clear that Africa is open for business. The United States is heartened by the progress in Africa toward democracy, free markets, foreign investment, and open economies. The United States is committed to helping resolve the conflicts that still plague some nations in Africa. The U.S. Government agrees with the Secretary General that the international community must do more to broaden economic opportunities for all Africans. Africa wants and needs the world's trade, investment, and economic engagement. Opening markets to investment and trade is the most successful path to sustainable development. The United States is Africa's largest single export market, and it is the goal of the U.S. Government to increase both its imports and exports. The United States is committed to increasing development assistance to Africa, is helping control the spread of diseases, and is working to improve the quality of African education. The United States is a strong supporter of comprehensive debt relief, including through the heavily indebted poor country initiative, under which official creditors and the international financial institutions are providing coordinated debt relief to poor countries with unsustainable debt burdens. The United States calls on creditors to follow the example of the World Bank and the Paris Club in providing interim debt relief to support reforms to date, rather than delaying all debt relief until a future completion of an entire reform package.

4. Establishment of an International Criminal Court

A/Res/53/105 December 8

Asks the Secretary General to convene the preparatory commission envisioned in the Final Act of the Rome Conference to Establish an International Criminal Court to meet February 16-26, July 26-August 13, and November 29-December 17, 1999, to complete arrangements for implementation of the Statute and to discuss ways to enhance the effectiveness and acceptance of the court.

The United States participated actively in meetings at the United Nations and the Rome conference on establishment of an international criminal court, and, although it voted against adoption of the Statute, would support creation of a court that is fair and effective, did not impair U.S. law enforcement and military justice interests, and met all relevant standards of due process. The U.S. Government joined consensus on this resolution because it provides an opportunity to review the Rome treaty that created the court and to discuss ways to enhance the court's effectiveness and acceptance by countries with fundamental concerns, including the United States. The greatest U.S. concern is that the Rome treaty purports to give the court independent authority to assert jurisdiction over officials or the military of states that have not agreed to subject themselves to the jurisdiction of the court. Another major flaw is that those countries that do ratify the treaty can, in effect, decide among themselves

III - Important Votes

to create new war crimes, exempt themselves from prosecution, and have the new crimes apply to non-parties.

5. Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism

A/Res/53/108 December 8

Strongly condemns all acts, methods, and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomsoever committed; reiterates that criminal acts intended to provoke a state of terror for political purposes are unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other nature that may be invoked to justify them; reiterates its call on all states to prevent terrorism and to strengthen international cooperation in combating terrorism; reiterates its call on states to refrain from financing, encouraging, providing training for or otherwise supporting terrorist activities; urges states to become parties to the relevant counter-terrorism conventions and protocols and to enact domestic legislation necessary to implement their provisions; decides to address at the 54th session (1999) of the General Assembly the question of convening a high-level conference in 2000 to formulate a joint organized response of the international community to terrorism; and decides that the ad hoc committee of the General Assembly will continue to elaborate a draft international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism, will elaborate the draft of an international convention for the suppression of terrorist financing to supplement existing international instruments, and subsequently will address means of further developing a comprehensive legal framework of conventions dealing with international terrorism.

This resolution, in line with U.S. policy, reaffirms the condemnation of terrorist acts as criminal acts, and denies the validity of any justification for them. Further, the resolution does not stray into operational-type activities for the United Nations. The United States also supports the work of the ad hoc committee on a convention on the suppression of nuclear terrorism and the proposal to negotiate a convention on financing of terrorism, but continues to have reservations about the elaboration of a comprehensive convention on international terrorism, considering such a convention unnecessary and potentially undermining the effective legal framework provided by the several conventions already in effect.

6. International Cooperation Against the World Drug Problem

A/Res/53/115 December 9

Reaffirms that the fight against the world drug problem is a common and shared responsibility that must be addressed in a multilateral setting; calls on all states to take further actions to promote effective cooperation to combat the world drug problem; urges competent authorities at the international, regional,

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

and national levels to implement the outcome of the June 1998 Special Session of the General Assembly on drugs, in particular practical measures on demand reduction, measures to prevent illicit manufacture and distribution of precursors, measures to promote judicial cooperation, measures to counter money-laundering, steps to eradicate illicit drug crops, and plans for alternative development; and calls on all states to adopt effective measures, including national laws, to meet the 5- and 10-year targets as mandated by the Special Session on drugs.

The United States cosponsored this resolution. The fight against illicit drugs remains a high priority for the U.S. Government. President Clinton has underscored the importance of the international effort against illicit drugs in his addresses to the General Assembly. Despite significant reductions in drug abuse in the United States, the U.S. Government remains concerned about drug consumption as well as the serious national and international security threat of the drug trade. Drug abuse is escalating on almost every continent. Governments now face the insidious threat of powerful drug syndicates with enough wealth to buy themselves protection through some governments, thereby manipulating the machinery of democratic government to serve their own purposes. Drug money in some nations is so pervasive that it taints legitimate investment and disrupts economies. All countries must act to develop strategies and implement goals and meet the deadlines set by the General Assembly's Special Session on drugs. UN efforts require resources. The U.S. Government hopes to increase its support significantly, and urges other governments to do so as well. No nation can afford to ignore the responsibility to fight drugs; the U.S. Government has requested a multi-billion dollar anti-drug budget to educate youth to reject drugs, to shield the country's frontiers, and to break up foreign and domestic sources of drug supply.

7. Follow-Up to the Fourth World Conference on Women

A/Res/53/120

December 9

Calls again on states, the UN system, and others to implement the Platform for Action adopted at the Fourth World Conference on Women, in particular by promoting an active and visible policy of mainstreaming a gender perspective; welcomes the progress achieved and calls for further efforts to integrate the equal status and all human rights of women into the mainstream of UN system-wide activity; urges the Secretary General to ensure that managers are held accountable for gender mainstreaming in their areas of responsibility; directs UN committees and bodies to mainstream a gender perspective into all their areas of work; urges governments to establish or strengthen national machineries for the advancement of women at the highest political level; invites the Secretary General to pay special attention to the needs and role of women as actors and beneficiaries in the development process in Africa; reaffirms that adequate mobilization of resources, as well as new and additional

III - Important Votes

resources from all available funding sources, will be required; stresses that implementation of the Platform for Action will require a political commitment to making available human and financial resources for the empowerment of women, the integration of a gender perspective in budgetary decisions, and adequate financing of programs for securing equality between women and men; calls on states to aim at gender balance in the composition of delegations to the United Nations and other international forums; asks the Secretary General to ensure that a gender perspective is integral to all UN operational activities; and reiterates that the special session of the General Assembly in June 2000 should review and appraise progress and identify further actions for achieving gender equality in the next millennium, and that participation in the session should be at a high political level.

The U.S. Government strongly supports implementation of the Platform for Action adopted at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, and worked for adoption of this resolution. This resolution advances the U.S. goal of promoting the policy of mainstreaming a gender perspective throughout the UN system.

8. Human Rights in Myanmar (Burma)

A/Res/53/162 December 9

Deplores the continuing violations of human rights in Myanmar, including extrajudicial and arbitrary executions, rape, torture, inhuman treatment, mass arrests, forced labor, forced relocation, and denial of freedom of expression, assembly, association, and movement; notes with deep concern the increased restrictions on freedom of movement and the large number of arbitrary detentions and harassment of political activists; urges the Government of Myanmar to release detained political leaders and all political prisoners; urges the Government of Myanmar to engage in a substantive political dialogue with General Secretary Aung San Suu Kyi of the National League for Democracy and other political leaders to promote national reconciliation and restoration of democracy; urges the Government of Myanmar to allow all citizens to participate freely in the political process and to accelerate the process of transition to democracy; and calls on the Government of Myanmar to create conditions to ensure an end to movement of refugees to neighboring countries and to create conditions conducive to their voluntary return and full reintegration in safety and dignity.

The United States cosponsored this resolution, as did the Republic of Korea, the first Asian country to do so. The resolution calls international attention to the systematic and persistent record of human rights abuses by the Government of Burma over many years and calls on that government to reverse its abysmal behavior, particularly with regard to the restoration of democracy. The Government of Burma, one of the most repressive authoritarian military regimes in the world, is engaged in an intense campaign of threats, intimidat-

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

tion, and detentions designed to weaken and isolate its rival political party and to prevent establishment of a freely elected parliament. It has adopted a policy of systematically depriving its citizens of the fundamental right of free association and individual political beliefs. Once Burma embraces a meaningful national dialogue with the democratic opposition, the international community can support Burma's transition to democracy.

9. Promoting Development in the Context of Globalization

A/Res/53/169 December 15

Reaffirms that the United Nations has a central role to play in promoting international cooperation for development and in providing guidance on global development issues, including in the context of globalization and interdependence; reemphasizes the importance of recognizing the needs of developing countries, particularly the least developed countries and the small island developing states, in the context of globalization, and urges the international community to continue to grant more preferential treatment to developing countries; welcomes the efforts of the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to help developing countries, in particular through technology-related assistance in the fields of trade, policy, and trade efficiency; emphasizes that efforts should be made to minimize the negative impacts and maximize the benefits of globalization for the developing countries; stresses the importance, at the national level, of maintaining sound macroeconomic policies; strongly underlines the importance of an enabling environment for investment, in particular foreign direct investment, market access, good governance, increase in the volume and effectiveness of official development assistance, tackling unsustainable debt burdens, and support for regional cooperation and integration in African countries; and stresses the need for continued and constructive dialogue among developed and developing countries on strengthening and reforming the international financial architecture.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution after extensive negotiations to shift the emphasis from marginalization of developing countries as a result of globalization to marginalization from globalization, making it clear that the problem was not globalization itself—which has generated unprecedented levels of trade for developing countries—but the inability of some countries to reap the benefits of globalization. The resolution, in line with U.S. views, recognizes the importance of sound macroeconomic policies at the national level and emphasizes the importance of creating an enabling environment for foreign investment and market access.

10. International Trade and Development

A/Res/53/170 December 15

Recognizes the importance of the expansion of international trade as an engine of growth and development; renews the commitment to uphold and strengthen an open, rule-based, equitable, nondiscriminatory, transparent, and predictable multilateral trade system which promotes the liberalization and expansion of trade; deplores any attempt to bypass or undermine multilaterally agreed procedures on the conduct of international trade; reiterates the importance of continued trade liberalization through (a) reductions of tariffs, (b) elimination of trade-distorting policies, protectionist practices, and non-tariff barriers, (c) ensuring that duties and standards are subjected to effective multilateral surveillance and not used for protectionist purposes, and (d) improvement of generalized system of preference schemes; and reiterates that it is an ethical imperative for the international community to arrest and reverse the marginalization of the least developed countries and to promote their expeditious integration into the world economy.

The United States cosponsored this resolution, which reflects U.S. policies regarding an open, rule-based trading system and the need for continued liberalization of trade. The resolution also contains very positive language about the dispute settlement mechanism of the World Trade Organization (WTO) as well as the need for developing countries to accede to the WTO. The resolution also stresses the need for improved measures to address the effects of the financial crisis on the international trading system and the development prospects of developing countries, while emphasizing that keeping all markets open and maintaining continued growth in world trade are key elements in overcoming the crisis—and rejecting the use of protectionist measures. The resolution also emphasizes that each country is responsible for its own economic policies for sustainable development.

11. The Financial Crisis and Its Impact on Growth and Development

A/Res/53/172 December 15

Expresses concern about the negative effects of the financial crisis on international trade, in particular the sharp reduction in commodity prices and its negative effects on the development prospects for developing countries and some economies in transition, and emphasizes that keeping all markets open and maintaining continued growth in world trade are key elements in overcoming the crisis, and in this context rejects the use of any protectionist measures; stresses the importance of having an enabling international environment and a strong cooperative effort by all countries and institutions to support crisis-hit countries; also stresses the importance at the national level of sound macroeconomic policies and policies aimed at strengthening the institutional capacities

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

and regulatory frameworks, especially in the domestic financial and banking sectors; stresses the need for strengthening and reforming the international financial architecture; stresses the need for the international community to formulate a global approach toward financial crises; recognizes the need to improve the capacities of the international financial institutions in prevention, management, and resolution of international financial crises; stresses the need to endow the International Monetary Fund (IMF) with adequate resources to provide emergency financing to countries affected by financial crises; stresses the need to strengthen the international and national financial systems through more effective surveillance of both public and private sectors; invites the IMF and others to consider measures to ensure greater transparency of financial market participants, including international institutional investors, particularly of highly leveraged operations; encourages the IMF to expedite work on greater involvement of the private sector in preventing and resolving financial crises; calls on the international community to contribute to minimizing the excessive volatility of global financial flows, and to distribute in a more equitable manner the costs of systemic adjustments between the public and private sectors; invites the IMF to facilitate dialogue on establishing regulatory frameworks for short-term capital flows and trade in currencies; and asks the Secretary General and relevant entities to analyze the current trend in global financial flows and modalities to improve early warning, prevention, and response capabilities for dealing with financial crises in a timely manner.

This resolution addresses the concerns of developing countries impacted by the financial crisis in Asia and elsewhere. In line with U.S. views, it emphasizes that keeping all markets open and maintaining continued growth in world trade are key elements in overcoming the financial crisis, and rejects the use of protectionist measures. It also stresses the importance of sound domestic economic and financial policies, and of a healthy domestic banking sector. It does not call for a return to managed trade.

12. External Debt Problem of Developing Countries

A/Res/53/175 December 15

Stresses the importance for developing countries of continuing to promote a favorable environment for attracting foreign investment, thereby promoting economic growth, so as to favor their exit from debt and debt-servicing problems, and stresses the need for the international community to promote a conducive external environment through improved market access, stabilization of exchange rates, increased resource flows, access to international financial markets, and improved access to technology for the developing countries; stresses the need for various debt conversion programs, such as debt-equity swaps and debt-for-development swaps; welcomes the progress made in the heavily indebted poor countries debt initiative and stresses that it offers an important opportunity for these countries to reach a sustainable external debt position;

III - Important Votes

welcomes the implementation since 1994 by the Paris Club of the Naples terms, as well as the decision to go beyond the Naples terms to provide debt reduction for eligible countries; encourages the international creditor community to consider appropriate measures in cases with a very high level of debt overhang in order to contribute to the common objective of debt sustainability; invites creditor countries, private banks, and multilateral financial institutions to continue to address the commercial debt problems of the least developed countries to help them reduce their commercial debt; stresses the need for new financial flows, in addition to debt relief measures, to support implementation of economic reforms and stabilization and structural adjustment programs that will enable developing countries to extricate themselves from the debt overhang and attract new investment; stresses the importance of providing adequate resources for debt relief in light of the adverse effects of the current international financial crisis on development, and welcomes unilateral debt relief measures; and stresses the need to strengthen the institutional capacity of developing countries in debt management and calls on the international community to support their efforts toward that end.

This resolution, which addresses the needs of developing countries with external debt problems, is consistent with the current strategy for debt relief. It endorses the current strategy of the international financial institutions of supporting commercial debt-reduction agreements in the context of structural adjustment efforts by the developing countries. It also stresses the importance for the developing countries of promoting a favorable environment for attracting foreign investment. Language condoning unilateral suspension of debt payments by developing countries was successfully resisted. Also, language calling for wholesale debt forgiveness for some of the poorest countries was excluded.

13. Corruption and Bribery in International Commercial Transactions

A/Res/53/176 December 15

Welcomes recent multilateral initiatives to combat corruption; commends the work of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the Center for International Crime Prevention in combating corruption and bribery in international commercial transactions; calls on member states to take all possible measures to further the implementation of the UN Declaration against Corruption and Bribery in International Commercial Transactions; and asks the UN Conference on Trade and Development and other UN bodies to assist states, at their request, in implementing national programs to strengthen accountability and transparency and in implementing relevant conventions and other instruments to combat corruption and bribery in international commercial transactions.

This resolution—introduced and strongly supported by the United States—is part of a high-priority effort to implement the anti-crime, anti-cor-

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

ruption initiative put forward by President Clinton at the UN General Assembly in 1995. A large number of cosponsors, especially from Latin America and central Europe, worked hard to build support for this measure. It helps to maintain the momentum generated by the UN Declaration against Corruption and Bribery in International Commercial Transactions in further combating corruption and bribery, which are critical impediments to development and should remain under active consideration by the General Assembly.

14. Renewal of Dialogue on Economic Cooperation for Development

A/Res/53/181 December 15

Reaffirms the continuing need to strengthen constructive dialogue and genuine partnership to promote further international economic cooperation for development; stresses that such dialogue should be conducted in response to the imperatives of mutual interests and benefits, genuine interdependence, shared responsibility, and partnership for achieving development and improving the international economic environment so that it is conducive to such development; decides to hold a high-level dialogue biennially in the General Assembly; and asks the Secretary General, in consultation with governments, relevant parts of the UN system, and relevant intergovernmental organizations, to propose themes for the second high-level dialogue for consideration at the 54th session of the UN General Assembly.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which avoids the North-South polemics of previous resolutions. The resolution affirms the need to cooperate in development on the basis of mutual interests and benefits, genuine interdependence, and shared responsibilities. The United States also supports the biennialization of this high-level dialogue.

15. Triennial Policy Review of UN Operational Activities for Development

A/Res/53/192 December 15

Stresses the need for all UN development organizations to focus their efforts at the field level on priority areas; regrets that there has not been any increase in core resources for operational activities on a predictable, continuous, and assured basis; expresses serious concern about the persistent insufficiency of resources; urges developed countries to increase substantially their official development assistance; emphasizes that the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) should promote a country-driven, collaborative, and coherent response by the UN system to achieve greater impact at the country level; stresses the importance of full government participation in the formulation of the UNDAF and its full ownership through the agreement of the recipient governments concerned to the finalized framework, bearing in mind that the responsibility for coordination of all assistance and developmental activities rests with the national government; asks the Secretary General to

III - Important Votes

continue to make the resident coordinator system more participatory in its functioning at the field level; stresses that the needs and priorities of recipient countries require flexibility and decentralization of operational activities to the country level; calls for further simplification and harmonization of procedures for operational activities of the UN development system at the field level; encourages greater cooperation between the World Bank, regional development banks, and all funds and programs with a view to increased complementarity and better division of labor; reaffirms that capacity-building and its sustainability should be an explicit goal of technical assistance at the country level, with the aim of strengthening national capacities in program formulation, development management, coordination, monitoring, and review; recognizes that the phases of relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and development often overlap and occur simultaneously, and notes the need to develop a comprehensive approach to countries in crisis, and stresses that contributions to humanitarian assistance should not be provided at the expense of development assistance; decides that the UN system should use to the fullest extent possible the available national expertise and indigenous technologies in its operational activities; and calls on funds and programs to consider ways, within existing regulations, to increase procurement of goods and services from developing countries, both as a mechanism to promote South-South cooperation and for enhancing national execution.

This triennial review resolution is a forward-looking document and addressed a number of key U.S. policy concerns. It will help to maintain momentum for development of the UNDAF, the Secretary General's initiative to improve program delivery at the field level through improved coordination of funds and programs. The review can provide a useful vehicle for the friends of reform in the UN system. The review also includes, for the first time, language, albeit qualified, on the work of the UN development agencies in promoting human rights, as well as helpful language on bridging the relief-to-development gap and on promoting civil society. The resolution emphasizes that developing countries are responsible for their development processes, and have the primary responsibility for coordinating all types of external assistance. It also urges that duplication be avoided, and that the programs of different organs and bodies complement each other.

16. Proposed Program Budget Outline for 2000-2001

A/Res/53/206 December 18

Invites the Secretary General to prepare his program budget for the biennium 2000-2001 on the basis of a total preliminary estimate of \$2.545 billion at revised 1998-1999 rates; decides that this proposed program budget shall contain provisions for recosting on the basis of the existing methodology; and decides that the contingency fund shall be set at the level of 0.75 per cent of the preliminary estimate, namely at \$19.1 million.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

The United States dissociated itself from this resolution because it could not accept a budget outline level that is over the 1998-1999 budget level. In particular, this outline did not take account of potential savings that may be realized for the upcoming biennium. However, the outline is only the first step in the 2000-2001 budget process; the actual budget will not be approved until December 1999. The United States will be working to have all possible savings included in the budget and to ensure that budget discipline is maintained, and will review the Secretary General's detailed budget estimates when they are released in mid-1999. These estimates should fully reflect the benefits of the reform and efficiency measures while also providing a realistic perspective of UN resource requirements for the biennium.

17. Program Budget for 1998-1999

A/Res/53/215A December 18

Revises budget appropriations for the biennium 1998-1999 downward from \$2,532,331,200 to \$2,526,703,500.

The 1998-1999 budget of \$2,532,331,200 approved in 1997 was within the amount sought by the United States, and achieved a major U.S. objective. Preventing an overrun of the budget was a major goal achieved in 1998. Favorable exchange rates, lower inflation, and a higher than anticipated vacancy rate for professional staff kept this budget below the cap of \$2.533 billion.

COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables which follow summarize UN member performance at the 53rd UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 10 important votes. In these tables, “Identical Votes” is the total number of times the United States and the listed state both voted Yes or No on these issues. “Opposite Votes” is the total number of times the United States voted Yes and the listed state No, or the United States voted No and the listed state Yes. “Abstentions” and “Absences” are totals for the country being compared on these 10 votes. “Voting Coincidence (Votes Only)” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes. The column headed “Voting Coincidence (Including Consensus)” presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 17 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the section on format and methodology in the Introduction.)

The first table lists all UN member states in alphabetical order. The second lists them by number of identical votes in descending order; those states with the same number of identical votes are further ranked by the number of opposite votes in ascending order. Countries with the same number of both identical votes and opposite votes are listed alphabetically. Subsequent tables are comparisons of UN members by regional and other groupings to which they belong, again ranked in descending order of identical votes.

All Countries (Alphabetical)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	3	4	1	2	78.5%	42.9%
Albania	4	0	3	3	100.0%	100.0%
Algeria	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Andorra	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Angola	2	5	2	1	77.8%	28.6%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Argentina	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Armenia	3	2	3	2	90.6%	60.0%
Australia	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Austria	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Azerbaijan	4	3	0	3	86.7%	57.1%
Bahamas	5	3	0	2	87.6%	62.5%
Bahrain	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Bangladesh	3	4	2	1	82.9%	42.9%
Barbados	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Belarus	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Belgium	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Belize	3	3	1	3	85.5%	50.0%
Benin	3	5	1	1	79.8%	37.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Bhutan	2	3	5	0	83.0%	40.0%
Bolivia	5	3	1	1	87.6%	62.5%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	0	0	0	10	*	*
Botswana	3	4	3	0	83.2%	42.9%
Brazil	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Bulgaria	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Burkina Faso	1	4	0	5	79.3%	20.0%
Burundi	0	3	0	7	79.5%	0.0%
Cambodia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Canada	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Cape Verde	3	4	2	1	82.3%	42.9%
Central African Rep. ...	2	4	3	1	80.5%	33.3%
Chad	4	4	2	0	83.0%	50.0%
Chile	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
China	1	4	5	0	80.5%	20.0%
Colombia	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
Comoros	4	4	0	2	78.9%	50.0%
Congo	0	0	0	10	*	*
Costa Rica	6	3	1	0	86.8%	66.7%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	4	4	0	82.5%	33.3%
Croatia	5	2	2	1	91.4%	71.4%
Cuba	1	5	4	0	76.3%	16.7%
Cyprus	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Czech Republic	7	1	1	1	96.0%	87.5%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	4	3	2	74.7%	20.0%
DPR of Korea	0	5	2	3	71.3%	0.0%
Denmark	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Djibouti	4	5	1	0	80.5%	44.4%
Dominica	0	1	0	9	17.2%	0.0%
Dominican Republic ...	6	3	0	1	85.3%	66.7%
Ecuador	6	3	1	0	88.3%	66.7%
Egypt	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
El Salvador	5	2	2	1	91.0%	71.4%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	2	1	82.6%	42.9%
Eritrea	0	4	5	1	79.1%	0.0%
Estonia	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Ethiopia	2	4	4	0	82.1%	33.3%
Fiji	2	4	2	2	80.3%	33.3%
Finland	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
France	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
Gabon	1	4	4	1	78.3%	20.0%
Gambia	3	4	0	3	82.3%	42.9%
Georgia	4	1	3	2	95.3%	80.0%
Germany	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Ghana	1	5	4	0	78.3%	16.7%
Greece	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Grenada	0	3	1	6	82.0%	0.0%
Guatemala	5	3	0	2	87.0%	62.5%
Guinea	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	4	4	0	81.3%	33.3%
Guyana	4	4	2	0	83.5%	50.0%
Haiti	5	3	0	2	87.1%	62.5%
Honduras	5	2	1	2	89.4%	71.4%
Hungary	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Iceland	5	1	3	1	95.6%	83.3%
India	1	6	3	0	75.0%	14.3%
Indonesia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Iran	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Iraq	0	0	0	10	*	*
Ireland	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Israel	8	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Italy	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Jamaica	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Japan	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Jordan	2	4	3	1	81.6%	33.3%
Kazakhstan	5	2	2	1	91.6%	71.4%
Kenya	1	4	4	1	81.1%	20.0%
Kuwait	5	4	0	1	84.2%	55.6%
Kyrgyzstan	4	1	4	1	95.2%	80.0%
Laos	0	4	5	1	77.1%	0.0%
Latvia	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Lebanon	2	5	2	1	76.5%	28.6%
Lesotho	5	3	0	2	84.5%	62.5%
Liberia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Libya	3	6	1	0	76.0%	33.3%
Liechtenstein	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Lithuania	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Luxembourg	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Madagascar	2	4	0	4	79.0%	33.3%
Malawi	3	5	0	2	79.5%	37.5%
Malaysia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Maldives	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Mali	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Malta	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Marshall Islands	5	0	2	3	100.0%	100.0%
Mauritania	2	4	2	2	81.6%	33.3%
Mauritius	5	2	2	1	91.2%	71.4%
Mexico	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
Micronesia	6	0	3	1	100.0%	100.0%
Monaco	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
Mongolia	6	4	0	0	84.5%	60.0%
Morocco	3	4	3	0	82.9%	42.9%
Mozambique	2	4	4	0	81.6%	33.3%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	4	3	0	83.0%	42.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Namibia	1	5	4	0	76.8%	16.7%
Nepal	1	2	6	1	89.9%	33.3%
Netherlands	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
New Zealand	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Nicaragua	5	2	2	1	91.1%	71.4%
Niger	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Nigeria	2	7	0	1	72.9%	22.2%
Norway	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Oman	3	4	1	2	82.4%	42.9%
Pakistan	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Palau	0	0	0	10	*	*
Panama	4	3	2	1	87.4%	57.1%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	2	2	85.7%	50.0%
Paraguay	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Peru	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Philippines	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Poland	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Portugal	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Qatar	3	5	0	2	79.1%	37.5%
Republic of Korea	5	0	5	0	100.0%	100.0%
Republic of Moldova	5	1	4	0	95.6%	83.3%
Romania	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Russia	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Rwanda	0	2	0	8	57.4%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	3	2	2	3	87.3%	60.0%
St. Lucia	2	3	4	1	86.0%	40.0%
St. Vincent/Gren.	1	2	0	7	82.0%	33.3%
Samoa	5	3	0	2	87.7%	62.5%
San Marino	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	10	*	*
Saudi Arabia	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Senegal	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Seychelles	1	2	0	7	81.3%	33.3%
Sierra Leone	3	5	1	1	79.1%	37.5%
Singapore	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
Slovak Republic	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Slovenia	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Solomon Islands	5	3	1	1	86.2%	62.5%
Somalia	0	0	0	10	*	*
South Africa	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
Spain	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Sri Lanka	2	5	3	0	79.2%	28.6%
Sudan	3	6	1	0	76.4%	33.3%
Suriname	4	4	2	0	83.7%	50.0%
Swaziland	5	3	2	0	87.1%	62.5%
Sweden	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Syria	1	5	3	1	75.1%	16.7%
Tajikistan	4	4	1	1	80.6%	50.0%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
TFYR Macedonia	4	1	5	0	95.4%	80.0%
Togo	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	3	3	3	1	86.3%	50.0%
Tunisia	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Turkey	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Turkmenistan	0	3	0	7	71.9%	0.0%
Uganda	0	4	1	5	69.0%	0.0%
Ukraine	4	2	4	0	91.3%	66.7%
United Arab Emirates .	3	4	2	1	82.4%	42.9%
United Kingdom	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
UR Tanzania	1	4	5	0	81.1%	20.0%
Uruguay	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Uzbekistan	4	0	4	2	100.0%	100.0%
Vanuatu	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Venezuela	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Vietnam	0	5	3	2	73.8%	0.0%
Yemen	1	4	1	4	80.1%	20.0%
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	10	*	*
Zambia	2	4	1	3	81.3%	33.3%
Zimbabwe	0	6	3	1	72.7%	0.0%
Average	3.7	2.9	2.0	1.4	86.4%	55.8%

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	8	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Estonia	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Latvia	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Lithuania	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Bulgaria	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Czech Republic	7	1	1	1	96.0%	87.5%
France	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
Hungary	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Monaco	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
Poland	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Romania	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Slovak Republic	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
United Kingdom	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Micronesia	6	0	3	1	100.0%	100.0%
Andorra	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Australia	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Belgium	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Canada	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Finland	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Germany	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Greece	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Italy	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Japan	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Luxembourg	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Netherlands	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Norway	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Portugal	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Slovenia	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Spain	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Argentina	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Austria	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Ireland	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Liechtenstein	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
New Zealand	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
San Marino	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Sweden	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Brazil	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Chile	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Costa Rica	6	3	1	0	86.8%	66.7%
Dominican Republic ...	6	3	0	1	85.3%	66.7%
Ecuador	6	3	1	0	88.3%	66.7%
Malta	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Paraguay	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Mongolia	6	4	0	0	84.5%	60.0%
Marshall Islands	5	0	2	3	100.0%	100.0%
Republic of Korea	5	0	5	0	100.0%	100.0%
Iceland	5	1	3	1	95.6%	83.3%
Republic of Moldova ..	5	1	4	0	95.6%	83.3%
Croatia	5	2	2	1	91.4%	71.4%
El Salvador	5	2	2	1	91.0%	71.4%
Honduras	5	2	1	2	89.4%	71.4%
Kazakhstan	5	2	2	1	91.6%	71.4%
Mauritius	5	2	2	1	91.2%	71.4%
Nicaragua	5	2	2	1	91.1%	71.4%
Bahamas	5	3	0	2	87.6%	62.5%
Barbados	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Bolivia	5	3	1	1	87.6%	62.5%
Guatemala	5	3	0	2	87.0%	62.5%
Haiti	5	3	0	2	87.1%	62.5%
Lesotho	5	3	0	2	84.5%	62.5%
Peru	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Samoa	5	3	0	2	87.7%	62.5%
Senegal	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Solomon Islands	5	3	1	1	86.2%	62.5%
Swaziland	5	3	2	0	87.1%	62.5%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Turkey	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Uruguay	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Vanuatu	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Kuwait	5	4	0	1	84.2%	55.6%
Mexico	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
South Africa	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
Albania	4	0	3	3	100.0%	100.0%
Uzbekistan	4	0	4	2	100.0%	100.0%
Georgia	4	1	3	2	95.3%	80.0%
Kyrgyzstan	4	1	4	1	95.2%	80.0%
TFYR Macedonia	4	1	5	0	95.4%	80.0%
Ukraine	4	2	4	0	91.3%	66.7%
Algeria	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Azerbaijan	4	3	0	3	86.7%	57.1%
Cyprus	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Panama	4	3	2	1	87.4%	57.1%
Bahrain	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Chad	4	4	2	0	83.0%	50.0%
Comoros	4	4	0	2	78.9%	50.0%
Egypt	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Guyana	4	4	2	0	83.5%	50.0%
Jamaica	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Maldives	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Russia	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Suriname	4	4	2	0	83.7%	50.0%
Tajikistan	4	4	1	1	80.6%	50.0%
Thailand	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Togo	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Venezuela	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Djibouti	4	5	1	0	80.5%	44.4%
Indonesia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Iran	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Malaysia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Saudi Arabia	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Armenia	3	2	3	2	90.6%	60.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	3	2	2	3	87.3%	60.0%
Belize	3	3	1	3	85.5%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	2	2	85.7%	50.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	3	3	3	1	86.3%	50.0%
Afghanistan	3	4	1	2	78.5%	42.9%
Bangladesh	3	4	2	1	82.9%	42.9%
Botswana	3	4	3	0	83.2%	42.9%
Cape Verde	3	4	2	1	82.3%	42.9%
Colombia	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	2	1	82.6%	42.9%
Gambia	3	4	0	3	82.3%	42.9%
Morocco	3	4	3	0	82.9%	42.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Myanmar (Burma)	3	4	3	0	83.0%	42.9%
Oman	3	4	1	2	82.4%	42.9%
Singapore	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
United Arab Emirates ..	3	4	2	1	82.4%	42.9%
Belarus	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Benin	3	5	1	1	79.8%	37.5%
Malawi	3	5	0	2	79.5%	37.5%
Niger	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Pakistan	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Philippines	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Qatar	3	5	0	2	79.1%	37.5%
Sierra Leone	3	5	1	1	79.1%	37.5%
Tunisia	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Libya	3	6	1	0	76.0%	33.3%
Sudan	3	6	1	0	76.4%	33.3%
Bhutan	2	3	5	0	83.0%	40.0%
St. Lucia	2	3	4	1	86.0%	40.0%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Central African Rep. ..	2	4	3	1	80.5%	33.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	4	4	0	82.5%	33.3%
Ethiopia	2	4	4	0	82.1%	33.3%
Fiji	2	4	2	2	80.3%	33.3%
Guinea	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	4	4	0	81.3%	33.3%
Jordan	2	4	3	1	81.6%	33.3%
Madagascar	2	4	0	4	79.0%	33.3%
Mali	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Mauritania	2	4	2	2	81.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	2	4	4	0	81.6%	33.3%
Zambia	2	4	1	3	81.3%	33.3%
Angola	2	5	2	1	77.8%	28.6%
Lebanon	2	5	2	1	76.5%	28.6%
Sri Lanka	2	5	3	0	79.2%	28.6%
Nigeria	2	7	0	1	72.9%	22.2%
Nepal	1	2	6	1	89.9%	33.3%
Seychelles	1	2	0	7	81.3%	33.3%
St. Vincent/Gren.	1	2	0	7	82.0%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	1	4	0	5	79.3%	20.0%
China	1	4	5	0	80.5%	20.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	4	3	2	74.7%	20.0%
Gabon	1	4	4	1	78.3%	20.0%
Kenya	1	4	4	1	81.1%	20.0%
UR Tanzania	1	4	5	0	81.1%	20.0%
Yemen	1	4	1	4	80.1%	20.0%
Cuba	1	5	4	0	76.3%	16.7%
Ghana	1	5	4	0	78.3%	16.7%
Namibia	1	5	4	0	76.8%	16.7%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCE S	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Syria	1	5	3	1	75.1%	16.7%
India	1	6	3	0	75.0%	14.3%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	0	0	0	10	*	*
Cambodia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Congo	0	0	0	10	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	10	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Palau	0	0	0	10	*	*
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	10	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	10	*	*
Dominica	0	1	0	9	17.2%	0.0%
Rwanda	0	2	0	8	57.4%	0.0%
Burundi	0	3	0	7	79.5%	0.0%
Grenada	0	3	1	6	82.0%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	3	0	7	71.9%	0.0%
Eritrea	0	4	5	1	79.1%	0.0%
Laos	0	4	5	1	77.1%	0.0%
Uganda	0	4	1	5	69.0%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	5	2	3	71.3%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	5	3	2	73.8%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	6	3	1	72.7%	0.0%
Average	3.7	2.9	2.0	1.4	86.4%	55.8%

UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 10 important votes. They list countries by UN regional groups.

African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCE S	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritius	5	2	2	1	91.2%	71.4%
Lesotho	5	3	0	2	84.5%	62.5%
Senegal	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Swaziland	5	3	2	0	87.1%	62.5%
South Africa	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
Algeria	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Chad	4	4	2	0	83.0%	50.0%
Comoros	4	4	0	2	78.9%	50.0%
Egypt	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

African Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Togo	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Djibouti	4	5	1	0	80.5%	44.4%
Botswana	3	4	3	0	83.2%	42.9%
Cape Verde	3	4	2	1	82.3%	42.9%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	2	1	82.6%	42.9%
Gambia	3	4	0	3	82.3%	42.9%
Morocco	3	4	3	0	82.9%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	1	1	79.8%	37.5%
Malawi	3	5	0	2	79.5%	37.5%
Niger	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Sierra Leone	3	5	1	1	79.1%	37.5%
Tunisia	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Libya	3	6	1	0	76.0%	33.3%
Sudan	3	6	1	0	76.4%	33.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Central African Rep. ..	2	4	3	1	80.5%	33.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	4	4	0	82.5%	33.3%
Ethiopia	2	4	4	0	82.1%	33.3%
Guinea	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	4	4	0	81.3%	33.3%
Madagascar	2	4	0	4	79.0%	33.3%
Mali	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Mauritania	2	4	2	2	81.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	2	4	4	0	81.6%	33.3%
Zambia	2	4	1	3	81.3%	33.3%
Angola	2	5	2	1	77.8%	28.6%
Nigeria	2	7	0	1	72.9%	22.2%
Seychelles	1	2	0	7	81.3%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	1	4	0	5	79.3%	20.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	4	3	2	74.7%	20.0%
Gabon	1	4	4	1	78.3%	20.0%
Kenya	1	4	4	1	81.1%	20.0%
UR Tanzania	1	4	5	0	81.1%	20.0%
Ghana	1	5	4	0	78.3%	16.7%
Namibia	1	5	4	0	76.8%	16.7%
Congo	0	0	0	10	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	10	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Rwanda	0	2	0	8	57.4%	0.0%
Burundi	0	3	0	7	79.5%	0.0%
Eritrea	0	4	5	1	79.1%	0.0%
Uganda	0	4	1	5	69.0%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	6	3	1	72.7%	0.0%
Average	2.2	3.8	1.9	2.0	81.4%	37.0%

III - Important Votes

Asian Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Micronesia	6	0	3	1	100.0%	100.0%
Japan	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Mongolia	6	4	0	0	84.5%	60.0%
Marshall Islands	5	0	2	3	100.0%	100.0%
Republic of Korea	5	0	5	0	100.0%	100.0%
Kazakhstan	5	2	2	1	91.6%	71.4%
Samoa	5	3	0	2	87.7%	62.5%
Solomon Islands	5	3	1	1	86.2%	62.5%
Vanuatu	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Kuwait	5	4	0	1	84.2%	55.6%
Uzbekistan	4	0	4	2	100.0%	100.0%
Kyrgyzstan	4	1	4	1	95.2%	80.0%
Cyprus	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Bahrain	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Maldives	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Tajikistan	4	4	1	1	80.6%	50.0%
Thailand	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Indonesia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Iran	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Malaysia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Saudi Arabia	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	2	2	85.7%	50.0%
Afghanistan	3	4	1	2	78.5%	42.9%
Bangladesh	3	4	2	1	82.9%	42.9%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	4	3	0	83.0%	42.9%
Oman	3	4	1	2	82.4%	42.9%
Singapore	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
United Arab Emirates	3	4	2	1	82.4%	42.9%
Pakistan	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Philippines	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Qatar	3	5	0	2	79.1%	37.5%
Bhutan	2	3	5	0	83.0%	40.0%
Fiji	2	4	2	2	80.3%	33.3%
Jordan	2	4	3	1	81.6%	33.3%
Lebanon	2	5	2	1	76.5%	28.6%
Sri Lanka	2	5	3	0	79.2%	28.6%
Nepal	1	2	6	1	89.9%	33.3%
China	1	4	5	0	80.5%	20.0%
Yemen	1	4	1	4	80.1%	20.0%
Syria	1	5	3	1	75.1%	16.7%
India	1	6	3	0	75.0%	14.3%
Cambodia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	10	*	*
Palau	0	0	0	10	*	*
Turkmenistan	0	3	0	7	71.9%	0.0%
Laos	0	4	5	1	77.1%	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

Asian Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
DPR of Korea	0	5	2	3	71.3%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	5	3	2	73.8%	0.0%
Average	3.0	3.4	2.0	1.7	84.0%	46.8%

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Argentina	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Brazil	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Chile	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Costa Rica	6	3	1	0	86.8%	66.7%
Dominican Republic ...	6	3	0	1	85.3%	66.7%
Ecuador	6	3	1	0	88.3%	66.7%
Paraguay	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
El Salvador	5	2	2	1	91.0%	71.4%
Honduras	5	2	1	2	89.4%	71.4%
Nicaragua	5	2	2	1	91.1%	71.4%
Bahamas	5	3	0	2	87.6%	62.5%
Barbados	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Bolivia	5	3	1	1	87.6%	62.5%
Guatemala	5	3	0	2	87.0%	62.5%
Haiti	5	3	0	2	87.1%	62.5%
Peru	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Uruguay	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Mexico	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
Panama	4	3	2	1	87.4%	57.1%
Guyana	4	4	2	0	83.5%	50.0%
Jamaica	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Suriname	4	4	2	0	83.7%	50.0%
Venezuela	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	3	2	2	3	87.3%	60.0%
Belize	3	3	1	3	85.5%	50.0%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	3	3	3	1	86.3%	50.0%
Colombia	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
St. Lucia	2	3	4	1	86.0%	40.0%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
St. Vincent/Gren.	1	2	0	7	82.0%	33.3%
Cuba	1	5	4	0	76.3%	16.7%
Dominica	0	1	0	9	17.2%	0.0%
Grenada	0	3	1	6	82.0%	0.0%
Average	4.1	3.0	1.5	1.4	86.5%	57.4%

III - Important Votes

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
France	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
Monaco	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
United Kingdom	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Andorra	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Australia	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Belgium	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Canada	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Denmark	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Finland	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Germany	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Greece	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Italy	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Luxembourg	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Netherlands	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Norway	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Portugal	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Spain	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Austria	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Ireland	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Liechtenstein	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
New Zealand	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
San Marino	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Sweden	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Malta	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Iceland	5	1	3	1	95.6%	83.3%
Turkey	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Average	6.0	1.4	2.5	0.1	94.3%	81.3%

Eastern European Group (EE)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Estonia	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Latvia	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Lithuania	7	0	3	0	100.0%	100.0%
Bulgaria	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Czech Republic	7	1	1	1	96.0%	87.5%
Hungary	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Poland	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Romania	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Slovak Republic	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Slovenia	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Republic of Moldova ..	5	1	4	0	95.6%	83.3%
Croatia	5	2	2	1	91.4%	71.4%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	4	0	3	3	100.0%	100.0%
Georgia	4	1	3	2	95.3%	80.0%
TFYR Macedonia	4	1	5	0	95.4%	80.0%
Ukraine	4	2	4	0	91.3%	66.7%
Azerbaijan	4	3	0	3	86.7%	57.1%
Russia	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Armenia	3	2	3	2	90.6%	60.0%
Belarus	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	0	0	0	10	*	*
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	10	*	*
Average	5.0	1.3	2.3	1.5	94.5%	79.6%

OTHER GROUPINGS

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with U.S. votes for other major groups, in rank order by identical votes.

Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Kuwait	5	4	0	1	84.2%	55.6%
Algeria	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Bahrain	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Egypt	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Djibouti	4	5	1	0	80.5%	44.4%
Saudi Arabia	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Morocco	3	4	3	0	82.9%	42.9%
Oman	3	4	1	2	82.4%	42.9%
United Arab Emirates .	3	4	2	1	82.4%	42.9%
Qatar	3	5	0	2	79.1%	37.5%
Tunisia	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Libya	3	6	1	0	76.0%	33.3%
Sudan	3	6	1	0	76.4%	33.3%
Jordan	2	4	3	1	81.6%	33.3%
Mauritania	2	4	2	2	81.6%	33.3%
Lebanon	2	5	2	1	76.5%	28.6%
Yemen	1	4	1	4	80.1%	20.0%
Syria	1	5	3	1	75.1%	16.7%
Iraq	0	0	0	10	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Average	2.7	4.1	1.4	1.9	81.0%	40.0%

III - Important Votes

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Indonesia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Malaysia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	4	3	0	83.0%	42.9%
Singapore	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
Philippines	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Laos	0	4	5	1	77.1%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	5	3	2	73.8%	0.0%
Average	2.8	4.6	2.3	0.3	80.9%	37.9%

European Union (EU)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
France	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
United Kingdom	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Belgium	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Denmark	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Finland	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Germany	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Greece	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Italy	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Luxembourg	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Netherlands	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Portugal	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Spain	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Austria	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Ireland	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Sweden	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Average	6.1	1.2	2.7	0.0	95.1%	83.6%

Islamic Conference (OIC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Kazakhstan	5	2	2	1	91.6%	71.4%
Senegal	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Turkey	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Kuwait	5	4	0	1	84.2%	55.6%
Albania	4	0	3	3	100.0%	100.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENSES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Kyrgyzstan	4	1	4	1	95.2%	80.0%
Algeria	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Azerbaijan	4	3	0	3	86.7%	57.1%
Bahrain	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Chad	4	4	2	0	83.0%	50.0%
Comoros	4	4	0	2	78.9%	50.0%
Egypt	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Maldives	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Suriname	4	4	2	0	83.7%	50.0%
Tajikistan	4	4	1	1	80.6%	50.0%
Togo	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Djibouti	4	5	1	0	80.5%	44.4%
Indonesia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Iran	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Malaysia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Saudi Arabia	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Afghanistan	3	4	1	2	78.5%	42.9%
Bangladesh	3	4	2	1	82.9%	42.9%
Gambia	3	4	0	3	82.3%	42.9%
Morocco	3	4	3	0	82.9%	42.9%
Oman	3	4	1	2	82.4%	42.9%
United Arab Emirates	3	4	2	1	82.4%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	1	1	79.8%	37.5%
Niger	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Pakistan	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Qatar	3	5	0	2	79.1%	37.5%
Sierra Leone	3	5	1	1	79.1%	37.5%
Tunisia	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Libya	3	6	1	0	76.0%	33.3%
Sudan	3	6	1	0	76.4%	33.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Guinea	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	4	4	0	81.3%	33.3%
Jordan	2	4	3	1	81.6%	33.3%
Mali	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Mauritania	2	4	2	2	81.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	2	4	4	0	81.6%	33.3%
Lebanon	2	5	2	1	76.5%	28.6%
Burkina Faso	1	4	0	5	79.3%	20.0%
Gabon	1	4	4	1	78.3%	20.0%
Yemen	1	4	1	4	80.1%	20.0%
Syria	1	5	3	1	75.1%	16.7%
Iraq	0	0	0	10	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Turkmenistan	0	3	0	7	71.9%	0.0%
Uganda	0	4	1	5	69.0%	0.0%
Average	3.0	3.9	1.6	1.5	82.2%	43.0%

III - Important Votes

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCE S	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Chile	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Ecuador	6	3	1	0	88.3%	66.7%
Malta	6	3	1	0	88.5%	66.7%
Mongolia	6	4	0	0	84.5%	60.0%
Honduras	5	2	1	2	89.4%	71.4%
Mauritius	5	2	2	1	91.2%	71.4%
Nicaragua	5	2	2	1	91.1%	71.4%
Bahamas	5	3	0	2	87.6%	62.5%
Barbados	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Bolivia	5	3	1	1	87.6%	62.5%
Guatemala	5	3	0	2	87.0%	62.5%
Lesotho	5	3	0	2	84.5%	62.5%
Peru	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Senegal	5	3	2	0	88.0%	62.5%
Swaziland	5	3	2	0	87.1%	62.5%
Vanuatu	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Kuwait	5	4	0	1	84.2%	55.6%
South Africa	5	4	1	0	84.6%	55.6%
Uzbekistan	4	0	4	2	100.0%	100.0%
Algeria	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Cyprus	4	3	3	0	87.5%	57.1%
Panama	4	3	2	1	87.4%	57.1%
Bahrain	4	4	1	1	83.6%	50.0%
Chad	4	4	2	0	83.0%	50.0%
Comoros	4	4	0	2	78.9%	50.0%
Egypt	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Guyana	4	4	2	0	83.5%	50.0%
Jamaica	4	4	2	0	83.9%	50.0%
Maldives	4	4	1	1	83.2%	50.0%
Suriname	4	4	2	0	83.7%	50.0%
Thailand	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Togo	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Venezuela	4	4	2	0	84.0%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Djibouti	4	5	1	0	80.5%	44.4%
Indonesia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Iran	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Malaysia	4	5	1	0	80.8%	44.4%
Saudi Arabia	4	5	0	1	80.3%	44.4%
Belize	3	3	1	3	85.5%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	2	2	85.7%	50.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	3	3	3	1	86.3%	50.0%
Afghanistan	3	4	1	2	78.5%	42.9%
Bangladesh	3	4	2	1	82.9%	42.9%
Botswana	3	4	3	0	83.2%	42.9%
Cape Verde	3	4	2	1	82.3%	42.9%
Colombia	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	2	1	82.6%	42.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCE S	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Gambia	3	4	0	3	82.3%	42.9%
Morocco	3	4	3	0	82.9%	42.9%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	4	3	0	83.0%	42.9%
Oman	3	4	1	2	82.4%	42.9%
Singapore	3	4	3	0	83.3%	42.9%
United Arab Emirates .	3	4	2	1	82.4%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	1	1	79.8%	37.5%
Malawi	3	5	0	2	79.5%	37.5%
Niger	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Pakistan	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Philippines	3	5	2	0	80.0%	37.5%
Qatar	3	5	0	2	79.1%	37.5%
Sierra Leone	3	5	1	1	79.1%	37.5%
Tunisia	3	5	2	0	79.8%	37.5%
Libya	3	6	1	0	76.0%	33.3%
Sudan	3	6	1	0	76.4%	33.3%
Bhutan	2	3	5	0	83.0%	40.0%
St. Lucia	2	3	4	1	86.0%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	0	81.4%	33.3%
Central African Rep. ..	2	4	3	1	80.5%	33.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	4	4	0	82.5%	33.3%
Ethiopia	2	4	4	0	82.1%	33.3%
Guinea	2	4	4	0	81.8%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	4	4	0	81.3%	33.3%
Jordan	2	4	3	1	81.6%	33.3%
Madagascar	2	4	0	4	79.0%	33.3%
Mali	2	4	3	1	81.4%	33.3%
Mauritania	2	4	2	2	81.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	2	4	4	0	81.6%	33.3%
Zambia	2	4	1	3	81.3%	33.3%
Angola	2	5	2	1	77.8%	28.6%
Lebanon	2	5	2	1	76.5%	28.6%
Sri Lanka	2	5	3	0	79.2%	28.6%
Nigeria	2	7	0	1	72.9%	22.2%
Nepal	1	2	6	1	89.9%	33.3%
Seychelles	1	2	0	7	81.3%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	1	4	0	5	79.3%	20.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	4	3	2	74.7%	20.0%
Gabon	1	4	4	1	78.3%	20.0%
Kenya	1	4	4	1	81.1%	20.0%
UR Tanzania	1	4	5	0	81.1%	20.0%
Yemen	1	4	1	4	80.1%	20.0%
Cuba	1	5	4	0	76.3%	16.7%
Ghana	1	5	4	0	78.3%	16.7%
Namibia	1	5	4	0	76.8%	16.7%
Syria	1	5	3	1	75.1%	16.7%
India	1	6	3	0	75.0%	14.3%
Cambodia	0	0	0	10	*	*

III - Important Votes

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Congo	0	0	0	10	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	10	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	10	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	10	*	*
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	10	*	*
Rwanda	0	2	0	8	57.4%	0.0%
Burundi	0	3	0	7	79.5%	0.0%
Grenada	0	3	1	6	82.0%	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	3	0	7	71.9%	0.0%
Eritrea	0	4	5	1	79.1%	0.0%
Laos	0	4	5	1	77.1%	0.0%
Uganda	0	4	1	5	69.0%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	5	2	3	71.3%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	5	3	2	73.8%	0.0%
Zimbabwe	0	6	3	1	72.7%	0.0%
Average	2.7	3.7	1.9	1.7	82.4%	42.1%

Nordic Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Finland	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Norway	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Sweden	6	2	2	0	92.0%	75.0%
Iceland	5	1	3	1	95.6%	83.3%
Average	5.8	1.2	2.8	0.2	95.0%	82.9%

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSEN- CES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
France	7	1	2	0	95.9%	87.5%
United Kingdom	7	1	2	0	96.0%	87.5%
Belgium	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Canada	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Denmark	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Germany	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Greece	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Italy	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	<u>VOTING COINCIDENCE</u>	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Luxembourg	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Netherlands	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Norway	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Portugal	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Spain	6	1	3	0	95.8%	85.7%
Iceland	5	1	3	1	95.6%	83.3%
Turkey	5	3	1	1	87.9%	62.5%
Average	6.0	1.1	2.7	0.1	95.3%	84.1%

III - Important Votes

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 1998 for both important votes and all plenary votes, in a side-by-side comparison.

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PER CENT
Afghanistan	3	4	42.9%	18	26	40.9%
Albania	4	0	100.0%	32	16	66.7%
Algeria	4	3	57.1%	17	38	30.9%
Andorra	6	1	85.7%	36	19	65.5%
Angola	2	5	28.6%	18	37	32.7%
Antigua and Barbuda	2	4	33.3%	17	37	31.5%
Argentina	6	2	75.0%	25	25	50.0%
Armenia	3	2	60.0%	21	24	46.7%
Australia	6	1	85.7%	35	19	64.8%
Austria	6	2	75.0%	36	20	64.3%
Azerbaijan	4	3	57.1%	21	28	42.9%
Bahamas	5	3	62.5%	21	35	37.5%
Bahrain	4	4	50.0%	21	39	35.0%
Bangladesh	3	4	42.9%	20	37	35.1%
Barbados	5	3	62.5%	22	35	38.6%
Belarus	3	5	37.5%	21	29	42.0%
Belgium	6	1	85.7%	37	18	67.3%
Belize	3	3	50.0%	17	36	32.1%
Benin	3	5	37.5%	20	40	33.3%
Bhutan	2	3	40.0%	11	25	30.6%
Bolivia	5	3	62.5%	23	36	39.0%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	*	0	0	*
Botswana	3	4	42.9%	22	38	36.7%
Brazil	6	3	66.7%	25	35	41.7%
Brunei Darussalam	4	5	44.4%	21	40	34.4%
Bulgaria	7	1	87.5%	37	18	67.3%
Burkina Faso	1	4	20.0%	18	36	33.3%
Burundi	0	3	0.0%	16	23	41.0%
Cambodia	0	0	*	0	0	*
Cameroon	2	4	33.3%	18	31	36.7%
Canada	6	1	85.7%	37	18	67.3%
Cape Verde	3	4	42.9%	19	35	35.2%
Central African Rep.	2	4	33.3%	16	32	33.3%
Chad	4	4	50.0%	18	37	32.7%
Chile	6	3	66.7%	24	35	40.7%
China	1	4	20.0%	12	32	27.3%
Colombia	3	4	42.9%	19	38	33.3%
Comoros	4	4	50.0%	16	23	41.0%
Congo	0	0	*	0	0	*
Costa Rica	6	3	66.7%	22	25	46.8%
Cote d'Ivoire	2	4	33.3%	20	37	35.1%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE SITE VOTES	PER CENT
Croatia	5	2	71.4%	34	19	64.2%
Cuba	1	5	16.7%	7	37	15.9%
Cyprus	4	3	57.1%	26	25	51.0%
Czech Republic	7	1	87.5%	37	18	67.3%
DPR of Korea	0	5	0.0%	2	38	5.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo	1	4	20.0%	13	22	37.1%
Denmark	6	1	85.7%	36	19	65.5%
Djibouti	4	5	44.4%	20	39	33.9%
Dominica	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Dominican Republic	6	3	66.7%	21	20	51.2%
Ecuador	6	3	66.7%	24	34	41.4%
Egypt	4	4	50.0%	18	39	31.6%
El Salvador	5	2	71.4%	21	34	38.2%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	42.9%	18	36	33.3%
Eritrea	0	4	0.0%	16	36	30.8%
Estonia	7	0	100.0%	36	16	69.2%
Ethiopia	2	4	33.3%	17	36	32.1%
Fiji	2	4	33.3%	19	29	39.6%
Finland	6	1	85.7%	36	18	66.7%
France	7	1	87.5%	39	14	73.6%
Gabon	1	4	20.0%	11	32	25.6%
Gambia	3	4	42.9%	22	35	38.6%
Georgia	4	1	80.0%	23	16	59.0%
Germany	6	1	85.7%	37	18	67.3%
Ghana	1	5	16.7%	19	39	32.8%
Greece	6	1	85.7%	36	19	65.5%
Grenada	0	3	0.0%	15	30	33.3%
Guatemala	5	3	62.5%	24	28	46.2%
Guinea	2	4	33.3%	18	38	32.1%
Guinea-Bissau	2	4	33.3%	17	36	32.1%
Guyana	4	4	50.0%	19	38	33.3%
Haiti	5	3	62.5%	22	36	37.9%
Honduras	5	2	71.4%	22	18	55.0%
Hungary	7	1	87.5%	38	18	67.9%
Iceland	5	1	83.3%	34	19	64.2%
India	1	6	14.3%	10	42	19.2%
Indonesia	4	5	44.4%	19	40	32.2%
Iran	4	5	44.4%	16	40	28.6%
Iraq	0	0	*	0	0	*
Ireland	6	2	75.0%	35	21	62.5%
Israel	8	0	100.0%	48	3	94.1%
Italy	6	1	85.7%	37	19	66.1%
Jamaica	4	4	50.0%	21	36	36.8%
Japan	6	1	85.7%	29	19	60.4%
Jordan	2	4	33.3%	15	38	28.3%
Kazakhstan	5	2	71.4%	25	24	51.0%
Kenya	1	4	20.0%	19	36	34.5%
Kuwait	5	4	55.6%	24	37	39.3%
Kyrgyzstan	4	1	80.0%	22	23	48.9%

III - Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE SITE VOTES	PER CENT
Laos	0	4	0.0%	9	36	20.0%
Latvia	7	0	100.0%	36	17	67.9%
Lebanon	2	5	28.6%	10	38	20.8%
Lesotho	5	3	62.5%	23	20	53.5%
Liberia	0	0	*	0	0	*
Libya	3	6	33.3%	14	43	24.6%
Liechtenstein	6	2	75.0%	34	20	63.0%
Lithuania	7	0	100.0%	36	17	67.9%
Luxembourg	6	1	85.7%	37	18	67.3%
Madagascar	2	4	33.3%	17	32	34.7%
Malawi	3	5	37.5%	22	39	36.1%
Malaysia	4	5	44.4%	21	39	35.0%
Maldives	4	4	50.0%	20	37	35.1%
Mali	2	4	33.3%	16	36	30.8%
Malta	6	3	66.7%	30	27	52.6%
Marshall Islands	5	0	100.0%	31	7	81.6%
Mauritania	2	4	33.3%	19	37	33.9%
Mauritius	5	2	71.4%	18	35	34.0%
Mexico	5	4	55.6%	19	39	32.8%
Micronesia	6	0	100.0%	36	0	100.0%
Monaco	7	1	87.5%	38	14	73.1%
Mongolia	6	4	60.0%	23	34	40.4%
Morocco	3	4	42.9%	20	38	34.5%
Mozambique	2	4	33.3%	19	36	34.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	4	42.9%	15	39	27.8%
Namibia	1	5	16.7%	15	37	28.8%
Nepal	1	2	33.3%	18	37	32.7%
Netherlands	6	1	85.7%	37	18	67.3%
New Zealand	6	2	75.0%	35	21	62.5%
Nicaragua	5	2	71.4%	22	27	44.9%
Niger	3	5	37.5%	20	39	33.9%
Nigeria	2	7	22.2%	20	41	32.8%
Norway	6	1	85.7%	36	18	66.7%
Oman	3	4	42.9%	19	39	32.8%
Pakistan	3	5	37.5%	13	39	25.0%
Palau	0	0	*	0	0	*
Panama	4	3	57.1%	23	37	38.3%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	50.0%	18	33	35.3%
Paraguay	6	3	66.7%	25	33	43.1%
Peru	5	3	62.5%	23	35	39.7%
Philippines	3	5	37.5%	20	40	33.3%
Poland	7	1	87.5%	37	19	66.1%
Portugal	6	1	85.7%	36	19	65.5%
Qatar	3	5	37.5%	19	40	32.2%
Republic of Korea	5	0	100.0%	27	18	60.0%
Republic of Moldova	5	1	83.3%	32	19	62.7%
Romania	7	1	87.5%	37	19	66.1%
Russia	4	4	50.0%	27	22	55.1%
Rwanda	0	2	0.0%	5	6	45.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1998

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE SITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE SITE VOTES	PER CENT
St. Kitts and Nevis	3	2	60.0%	14	25	35.9%
St. Lucia	2	3	40.0%	17	38	30.9%
St. Vincent/Gren.	1	2	33.3%	14	14	50.0%
Samoa	5	3	62.5%	23	31	42.6%
San Marino	6	2	75.0%	30	21	58.8%
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	*	0	0	*
Saudi Arabia	4	5	44.4%	18	40	31.0%
Senegal	5	3	62.5%	23	37	38.3%
Seychelles	1	2	33.3%	11	17	39.3%
Sierra Leone	3	5	37.5%	20	36	35.7%
Singapore	3	4	42.9%	20	34	37.0%
Slovak Republic	7	1	87.5%	37	19	66.1%
Slovenia	6	1	85.7%	36	19	65.5%
Solomon Islands	5	3	62.5%	22	24	47.8%
Somalia	0	0	*	0	0	*
South Africa	5	4	55.6%	23	35	39.7%
Spain	6	1	85.7%	36	19	65.5%
Sri Lanka	2	5	28.6%	18	39	31.6%
Sudan	3	6	33.3%	17	43	28.3%
Suriname	4	4	50.0%	22	38	36.7%
Swaziland	5	3	62.5%	21	32	39.6%
Sweden	6	2	75.0%	36	21	63.2%
Syria	1	5	16.7%	8	38	17.4%
Tajikistan	4	4	50.0%	20	17	54.1%
Thailand	4	4	50.0%	22	37	37.3%
TFYR Macedonia	4	1	80.0%	32	19	62.7%
Togo	4	4	50.0%	20	38	34.5%
Trinidad and Tobago ...	3	3	50.0%	19	34	35.8%
Tunisia	3	5	37.5%	20	39	33.9%
Turkey	5	3	62.5%	34	26	56.7%
Turkmenistan	0	3	0.0%	15	7	68.2%
Uganda	0	4	0.0%	14	17	45.2%
Ukraine	4	2	66.7%	26	23	53.1%
United Arab Emirates ...	3	4	42.9%	18	38	32.1%
United Kingdom	7	1	87.5%	41	14	74.5%
UR Tanzania	1	4	20.0%	16	37	30.2%
Uruguay	5	3	62.5%	23	35	39.7%
Uzbekistan	4	0	100.0%	20	2	90.9%
Vanuatu	5	3	62.5%	23	34	40.4%
Venezuela	4	4	50.0%	22	38	36.7%
Vietnam	0	5	0.0%	9	39	18.8%
Yemen	1	4	20.0%	16	37	30.2%
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	*	0	0	*
Zambia	2	4	33.3%	21	29	42.0%
Zimbabwe	0	6	0.0%	18	39	31.6%
Average	3.7	2.9	55.8%	21.8	27.5	44.2%