

III - GENERAL ASSEMBLY—IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101-246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected important United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” For the 54th UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 1999, 13 votes meet these criteria.

Section III has five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 13 important votes at the 54th UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the 16 important consensus resolutions adopted at the 54th 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 groups and other important groups; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section II. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts 3 and 4 above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 16 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 (97).

IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 13 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 numerical order.

1. U.S. Embargo of Cuba

A/Res/54/21 November 9 155-2(US)-8

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.

The United States once again opposed this ill-advised, Cuba-sponsored resolution, which serves only to distract the attention of the international com-

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

munity and to encourage the Cuban authorities to persist in their misguided policies. The decision of the United States to maintain a trade embargo against the government of Cuba is a matter of bilateral trade policy, not a matter appropriate for consideration by the UN General Assembly. The contention, implicit in the resolution, that the United States forbids others from trading with Cuba is wrong. Each state itself decides with which states to trade. The United States chooses not to trade with the Cuban government because of the repressive policies and actions of that government. The United States imposed and maintains a bilateral economic trade embargo as one element in a policy of promoting democracy in Cuba. While maintaining the embargo, the United States has moved to dramatically expand people-to-people contacts with the Cuban people, increase remittances, and allow the sale of food and agricultural inputs to private entities. The American people have been extremely generous in providing humanitarian assistance to Cuba. The goal of this policy is to foster a transition to a democratic form of government, protect human rights, permit a civil society to thrive, and provide the economic prosperity the Cuban government's economic policies are denying the Cuban people. It is the U.S. view, based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that human rights violations in any state are of concern to the entire international community. The focus of the international community through the United Nations should be on the human rights crisis in Cuba rather than on the bilateral trade aspects of U.S. efforts to facilitate a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. (Israel also voted against this resolution.)

2. IAEA Report

A/Res/54/26

November 15

122(US)-1-6

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 on 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 on North Korea and Iraq to comply with their obligations regarding peaceful use of nuclear energy.

III - Important Votes

3. Compliance with the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty

A/Res/54/54A December 1 80-4(US)-68

Recognizes the historical role of the treaty between the United States and Russia on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Systems of May 26, 1972, as a cornerstone for maintaining global peace and security; calls for continued efforts to strengthen the ABM treaty; calls on the parties to comply fully, to limit the deployment of ABM systems, and to refrain from deployment of ABM systems for defense of their countries; and urges all UN member states to support efforts aimed at stemming the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

The United States lobbied heavily against this resolution, introduced by Russia, because it sought to engage international opinion in resisting any change to the ABM treaty. The resolution was fundamentally unacceptable because it sought to have the international community influence, in Russia's favor, a bilateral discussion between the United States and the Russian Federation. It could thereby make U.S.-Russian agreement on the substance less likely, not more. The intercept flight test conducted by the United States in October—permissible under, and in compliance with, the treaty—heightened the profile of this issue at the UNGA. While the resolution was adopted, its impact was significantly undercut by the large number of abstentions, which almost equaled the number of supporting votes. The United States has reaffirmed its commitment to the ABM treaty, but stressed that it may need to be amended through negotiations between the parties most directly concerned as technologies and threats change, requiring the United States and others to adapt their defenses. This 30-year-old treaty can be updated accordingly without undermining it.

4. Ultimate Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

A/Res/54/54D December 1 153(US)-0-12

Reaffirms the importance of achieving the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), calls on states not parties to the NPT to accede to it, and urges NPT parties to fulfill their obligations; calls for the determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon states of systematic efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons, and by all states of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control; stresses that, in order to advance toward the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, it is necessary to pursue: (a) early signature and ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), and cessation of nuclear tests pending its entry into force, (b) intensive negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on early conclusion of a

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, (c) multi-lateral discussions on future steps on nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, (d) early entry into force of the Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) and early commencement of negotiations for START III by the Russian Federation and the United States of America, and (e) further efforts by the five nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals; welcomes the efforts in dismantlement of nuclear weapons; calls on all states to redouble their efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; urges all states that have not done so to conclude an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency for ensuring nuclear non-proliferation; and underlines the vital importance of the 2000 Review Conference of parties to the NPT.

The United States supported this resolution because it offered a more realistic vision of nuclear disarmament than other resolutions introduced in the General Assembly, both in terms of what had been accomplished to date, and in terms of the difficult tasks that lay ahead. The United States is firmly committed to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, but remains convinced that this can be accomplished only through an orderly process. The next agreed step was a cut-off in the production of fissionable material; in the U.S. view, no further delays in getting this negotiation under way should be tolerated. Regarding bilateral steps, the United States is focused on getting the START III talks under way and headed in the right direction. Nevertheless, the United States has reservations about provisions in the resolution regarding the NPT. While in full agreement that the NPT is of vital importance, and while working for a successful review conference, the United States believed it inappropriate for the General Assembly to detail actions the review conference should take or to specify results of the review because this prejudices what the conference would do.

5. New Agenda for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World

A/Res/54/54G

December 1

111-13(US)-39

Calls on nuclear-weapon states (NWS) 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; calls on NWS to integrate all five nuclear-weapon states seamlessly into the process, and to reduce nuclear weapons, to de-alert their nuclear weapons, and to remove nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles; calls on the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate a treaty banning production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, and pending entry of a treaty into force, urges states to observe a moratorium on such production; and considers that an international conference on nuclear disarmament could consolidate a new agenda for a nuclear-weapon-free world.

III - Important Votes

The U.S. Government opposed this resolution because of the false premise that a new agenda for nuclear disarmament is needed. A broad multilateral arms control agenda already exists. While the pace of progress toward nuclear disarmament has been frustrating, dramatic progress in nuclear arms reductions has been made. Disarmament is best achieved through practical, incremental steps, each building on its predecessors, and each taking into account the realities of the international security environment. While this is painstaking, difficult work, it produces results. The United States did not believe that the international conference called for in the resolution would be useful. Enough forums already exist, and adding another layer of international discussion would not speed progress toward nuclear disarmament. Rather than a new agenda, the international community should take concrete, practical steps such as negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a cut-off of production of fissile material.

6. Small Arms

A/Res/54/54V December 15 119(US)-0-2

Decides to convene an international conference on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in June-July 2001; decides to establish a preparatory committee, open to participation by all states, that will meet in the first of three sessions in February 2000 and will decide on the date and venue of the conference; invites member states to communicate views on the agenda to the Secretary General, and calls on them to implement the recommendations in the Secretary General's report to the General Assembly on small arms; and asks the Secretary General to carry out a study relating to small arms as a background document for the conference.

The United States strongly supports efforts to address the problems posed for international peace and security by the uncontrolled spread of small arms and light weapons, and supported this resolution introduced by Japan. While always wary of international conferences because of the costs involved, the United States was able to support this conference because sufficient funding was already programmed in the UN budget.

7. Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East

A/Res/54/57 December 1 149-3(US)-9

Calls on Israel, which remains the only state in the Middle East that has not yet become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to accede to that treaty, not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons, and to place all unsafeguarded nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards as a confidence-building measure.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

The United States has routinely voted against resolutions on this subject because they have been unbalanced and excessively discriminatory. They ignore other proliferation threats in the region, and they cannot help the peace process. In 1999, the United States was also deeply concerned about the impact this divisive resolution could have on the upcoming NPT review conference. The United States worked to reduce support for this resolution out of a desire to encourage greater moderation on this issue. (Israel and Micronesia also voted against this resolution.)

8. Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism

A/Res/54/110 December 9 149(US)-0-2

Strongly condemns all acts of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomever committed; reiterates that such acts are unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other nature that may be invoked to justify them; urges all states to become parties to relevant conventions and protocols, including the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings; takes note of the establishment of the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Center for International Crime Prevention in Vienna, Austria; and decides that the ad hoc committee established by General Assembly Resolution 51/210 shall continue to elaborate a draft international convention for the suppression of nuclear terrorism, consider the elaboration of a comprehensive convention on international terrorism, and address the question of convening a high-level UN conference to formulate a joint international response to terrorism.

The United States strongly supported this resolution. Its overwhelming adoption was a ringing reaffirmation of the view that no cause could justify acts of terrorism.

9. Human Rights in Iran

A/Res/54/177 December 17 61(US)-47-51

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 and ensure that capital punishment will be imposed only for the most serious crimes; and calls on Iran to cooperate with 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. Although there had been some positive developments in Iran, the situation of human rights remained extremely fragile. Systematic abuses included extrajudicial

III - Important Votes

killings and summary executions, disappearances, widespread use of torture and other degrading treatment, harsh prison conditions, arbitrary arrest and detention, lack of due process, and restrictions on freedom of speech, press, assembly, association, religion, and movement. Elements of the government had used violent tactics to oppose widespread public interest in promoting greater attention to the rule of law and the development of civil society. The trend toward greater freedom of expression was under attack through arbitrary arrests, the closure of reform-oriented publications, and the murders of several dissident writers. The government continued to discriminate against ethnic and religious minorities, particularly the Baha'is, who came under increasing repression by conservative elements in the judiciary and security establishment. A number of Iranian Jews remained in detention on charges of espionage for Israel and the United States, and were not given access to defense counsel. While women were able to participate actively in the society, they were being denied basic rights and equality under the law. They faced legal and social discrimination. Vigilante groups enforced their interpretation of appropriate social behavior through intimidation and violence. Iran had not acted in good faith in its relationship with the United Nations. It continued to deny entry to the UN special representative.

10. Human Rights in Iraq

A/Res/54/178

December 17

100(US)-3-53

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 for certain offenses; and calls on Iraq to abide by international human rights treaties, to bring the actions of its military into conformity with international law, to cooperate with UN human rights mechanisms, to restore the independence of the judiciary, to cease repressive practices aimed at Iraqi Kurds in the north, to cooperate with international aid agencies to provide humanitarian assistance, and to ensure equitable distribution of humanitarian supplies purchased with the proceeds of oil sales in implementation of Security Council resolutions.

The United States supported this resolution, introduced by the European Union, to highlight and condemn the alarming human rights situation in Iraq. Citizens were denied freedom of speech, assembly, and religion. They had no right to change their government. Relatives and close friends from Saddam Hussein's hometown held most key positions. A 1991 law outlawed opposition parties, and the national assembly had no power. The rule of law was nonexistent. State control was maintained by the extensive use of intimidation through arrest, torture, and summary execution. People had been executed merely because of their association with an opposition group or as part of an effort to reduce prison populations. The Shi'ite Muslim majority faced severe persecution. Human rights monitors and others were restricted from investigating

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

abuses. The special rapporteur for human rights had been denied entry into Iraq for seven years. And the government and security forces had harassed and intimidated international relief personnel.

11. Human Rights in Kosovo

A/Res/54/183 December 17 108(US)-4-45

Reaffirms that the human rights and humanitarian crisis in Kosovo shall be addressed in the framework of a political solution based on the principles set out in Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) and welcomes establishment of the UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK); calls on all parties to cooperate with UNMIK in ensuring full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms and to facilitate the return of internally displaced persons to their homes; expresses concern about the forced division of any part of Kosovo into ethnic cantons; demands that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (FRY) provide an updated list of all persons detained or transferred from Kosovo and calls on them to provide information on the high number of missing persons from Kosovo; condemns any effort to create parallel institutions for Kosovar Serbs and Albanians; and asks the Human Rights Commission Special Rapporteur to continue to monitor closely the human rights situation in Kosovo.

The United States drafted and introduced this resolution. It includes areas of particular U.S. concern, including education, adequate winter accommodations for refugees, condemning parallel institutions (de facto splitting up of Kosovo), and trafficking in women and children. It condemns acts of terrorism, kidnappings, and evictions of any resident of Kosovo, whatever the victim's ethnic background, i.e., retaliation against the Serb residents of Kosovo.

12. Human Rights in Bosnia/Herzegovina, Croatia, and Yugoslavia (S/M)

A/Res/54/184 December 17 123(US)-2-34

Calls for the full implementation of the General Framework Agreement for Peace; stresses the crucial role of human rights in the successful implementation of the Peace Agreement; calls on all parties to ensure that protection of human rights will be central elements in the new civilian structures; calls on all states to cooperate with the International Tribunal; and notes the varying degrees of progress that have been made in Bosnia, Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (FRY).

The United States again in 1999 introduced this resolution on human rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and the FRY. This resolution is one aspect of the continuing, long-term effort to help these countries emerge from their violent past and develop democratic and tolerant civil societies with full respect for international standards of human rights. Progress had been made in

III - Important Votes

Bosnia and Herzegovina, but much remained to be done. Freedoms of speech and the press were limited by political influence. Political parties often dominated the press, and the government applied slander laws selectively. Religious discrimination and violence also persisted. While violence against returning refugees had decreased, harassment continued. Police protection had improved, but concerns remained about professionalism, political influence, and excessive force. Judicial reform had made advances, but the rights of the accused were still not sufficiently protected. In Croatia, respect for due process, rule of law, treatment of ethnic minorities, and press freedoms still fell short of standards. The judicial process suffered from delays and manipulation. Progress had not been made on election and media laws. The government continued to maintain tight control over access to broadcast media, and little progress had been made in media reform. Courts and administrative bodies had been used to obstruct media critical of the government. Croatia had not cooperated fully with the War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague. Harassment and physical attacks against ethnic Serbs increased during the year. In the FRY, the human rights situation was dominated by the horrific violence in Kosovo during the first part of 1999. The regime used brutal police force and armed forces against the civilian population of Kosovo, along with a systematic effort to ethnically cleanse the province of its entire Albanian community, thereby creating nearly one million refugees. The FRY was still holding thousands of detainees removed to Serbia from Kosovo. Indictees had not been surrendered to the War Crimes Tribunal for Yugoslavia. Within the FRY, the government had not permitted freedom of assembly, media, thought, and expression. Independent media were stifled. Intensifying state control of university faculties continued to stifle academic freedom.

13. Toward a Stable International Financial System

A/Res/54/197

December 22

155-1(US)-0

Emphasizes the need for improved capabilities to deal with the spread of financial crises while protecting the most vulnerable countries; stresses the importance of coordinated policies for world economic growth and international financial stability, particularly by the major industrialized countries; calls on development partners to increase official development assistance, strengthen debt relief, and improve market access of the least developed countries; stresses the need for continued dialogue among developed and developing countries, and between the Economic and Social Council and the Bretton Woods institutions; emphasizes roles for international, regional, and sub-regional financial institutions; calls for greater private sector involvement in prevention of financial crisis; and asks the Secretary General to identify measures toward a more stable international financial system responsive to development challenges, in particular of developing countries.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

The United States voted against this resolution because it embodied discussions and recommendations that surpassed the mandate of the General Assembly and interfered in the normal course of business of the international financial institutions. The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Financial Stability Forum are the competent forums for discussions of continuing reforms in the international financial system. All countries should support the work of these institutions, where a global consensus on strengthening the international financial system is emerging and is being implemented at a rapid pace. The resolution also underplayed the extent to which individual nations' actions determine their future, placing an undue burden on the role of the international community.

IMPORTANT CONSENSUS RESOLUTIONS

The 16 important resolutions listed and discussed below were adopted by consensus at the 54th 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. Implementing Outcome of World Summit for Social Development

A/Res/54/23 November 11

Reaffirms the commitments adopted by heads of state and government at the World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen, and their pledge to give the highest priority to national, regional, and international policies and actions for the promotion of social progress, social justice, betterment of the human condition, and social integration, based on full participation by all; emphasizes the urgency of placing the goals of social development, as contained in the Copenhagen Declaration and Program of Action, at the center of economic policy-making, including policies influencing domestic and global market forces and the global economy; also emphasizes the need for revitalized economic and social development everywhere within a framework that places people at the center of development and aims to meet human needs rapidly and more effectively by enhancing positive interaction between economic and social policies and stresses the need to invest in people and their well-being; reiterates its invitation to member states to participate in a special session of the General Assembly in 2000 to review implementation of the outcome of the summit and to consider further actions; and reaffirms the need for effective cooperation between governments, international organizations, relevant actors of civil society, including the private sector, social partners, and

III - Important Votes

nongovernmental organizations in implementing the Declaration and Program of Action and in the preparatory process of the special session.

The United States, which was one of the principal supporters of the social summit in Copenhagen, cosponsored this resolution. The United States especially supported the emphasis on investment in people, placing people at the center of development, and inclusion of relevant actors of civil society in the process of development.

2. Review of Cooperation on Oceans and Seas

A/Res/54/33 November 24

Decides to establish an open-ended informal consultative process in order to facilitate the annual review by the General Assembly of developments in ocean affairs, with an emphasis on identifying areas where coordination and cooperation should be enhanced; decides that the meetings within the framework of the consultative process shall be open to all UN members, all parties to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and intergovernmental organizations with competence in ocean affairs; decides that the meeting will take place for one week each year, starting May 30-June 3, 2000; decides to review the effectiveness and utility of this consultative process at the 57th session (2002) of the General Assembly; and asks the Secretary General to ensure more effective collaboration and coordination between parts of the UN Secretariat and the UN system as a whole on ocean affairs and the law of the sea.

The United States cosponsored this resolution, and it welcomed the call for an improvement in coordination and cooperation on matters relating to oceans and seas. The United States urged the involvement of the appropriate intergovernmental organizations, viewing their participation as necessary to identify how improvements can be made.

3. Convention on Suppressing Financing of Terrorism

A/Res/54/109 December 9

Adopts the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism annexed to this resolution, and asks the Secretary General to open it for signature at UN headquarters in New York from January 10, 2000, to December 31, 2001; and urges all states to sign and ratify the Convention.

The United States was an active participant in and strong supporter of the elaboration of this convention, which was initiated by France, and signed the convention on January 10, the opening day. This convention fills an important gap in international law by expanding the legal framework for international cooperation in the investigation, prosecution, and extradition of persons who engage in terrorist financing. It serves to combat terrorism at one of its most critical points—raising and spending the money needed to finance terrorist

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

activities. The United States strongly supported this and all 11 preceding counter-terrorism conventions, including the U.S.-initiated convention on the suppression of terrorist bombings.

4. Global Implications of the Year 2000 (Y2K) Problem of Computers

A/Res/54/114 December 15

Asks member states to continue their efforts to solve the year 2000 problem before the roll-over date of December 31, 1999; urges member states to take measures such as virus scanning against the additional potential risk of malicious software; urges all states to emphasize the importance of contingency planning to address the potential for possible large-scale failures in the public and private sectors; appeals to states to forge global cooperation to ensure a timely and effective response to the year 2000 challenge; calls on governments, public and private sector organizations, and civil society generally to share information about their experiences in addressing the year 2000 problem; asks the Secretary General to ensure that the UN system closely monitors sources of funding to support the efforts of developing countries to address the year 2000 problem; and urges the Office of the Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs to be ready to respond to any humanitarian emergencies that could be caused by serious year 2000 failures.

The United States, which was a prime mover in efforts to solve the year 2000 problem of computers through effective remediation efforts, contingency planning, and cooperation among all who could be affected, strongly supported this resolution.

5. UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime

A/Res/54/126 December 17

Takes note of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Elaboration of a Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, and expresses appreciation of the results achieved in development of a convention and protocols thereto, which address trafficking in women and children, combating illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, and illegal trafficking in and transporting of migrants; asks the Ad Hoc Committee to complete its work in 2000; decides that the Ad Hoc Committee shall submit the final text of the Convention and protocols to the General Assembly for adoption prior to a high-level signing conference; and notes with appreciation the offer by the Government of Italy to host a high-level signing conference in Palermo.

The U.S. Government has supported UN efforts in crime prevention. This resolution, and the convention to which it refers, constitute further steps in a U.S. initiative, personally put forward by President Clinton at the UN General

III - Important Votes

Assembly in 1995, to address the problem of transnational organized crime in its myriad aspects.

6. Human Rights in Myanmar (Burma)

A/Res/54/186 December 17

Deplores the continuing violations of human rights in Myanmar, including extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions, enforced disappearances, rape, torture, inhuman treatment, mass arrests, forced labor, including the use of children, forced relocation, and denial of freedom of assembly, association, expression, and movement; expresses grave concern about the increased repression of any form of public political activity, the arbitrary detention and arrest of those exercising their rights to freedom of thought, expression, assembly, and association, as well as the harassment of their families; urges the Government of Myanmar to release detained political leaders and all political prisoners; expresses grave concern about the escalation in the persecution of the democratic opposition, in particular members and supporters of the National League for Democracy; expresses concern that the composition and working procedures of the National Convention do not permit either members of Parliament-elect or representatives of the ethnic minorities to express their views freely; urges the Government of Myanmar to take all necessary steps toward restoration of democracy in accordance with the will of the people as expressed in the democratic elections held in 1990 and, to this end, to engage in a substantive dialogue with political leaders, including Aung San Suu Kyi; deplores the continued violations of human rights of women and of persons belonging to ethnic and religious minorities; and urges the Government of Myanmar to end the enforced displacement of persons and other causes of refugee flows to neighboring countries and to create conditions conducive to their voluntary return and full reintegration.

The United States cosponsored this resolution, introduced by Sweden on behalf of about 30 cosponsors. The United States urged others to cosponsor and support this resolution, which is one of the primary vehicles by which the international community is able to voice its disapproval of the dismal human rights situation in Burma and the refusal of the Burmese regime to enter into a dialogue with the democratically elected opposition.

7. Establishment of MICAH in Haiti

A/Res/54/193 December 17

Decides, at the request of the President of Haiti, to establish the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti (MICAH) to consolidate the results achieved by the International Civilian Mission in Haiti (MICIVIH) and previous UN missions; decides that the initial mandate of MICAH will begin at the closing of the UN Civilian Police Mission in Haiti (MIPONUH) and continue

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

until February 6, 2001, and that the mandate of MICIVIH will continue until commencement of MICAH; also decides that the personnel and goods of MICIVIH and MIPONUH will be transferred to MICAH; decides that MICAH shall: (a) assist with development of democratic institutions, (b) assist in reform and strengthening of the system of justice, including penal institutions, and promote the office of the ombudsman, (c) support efforts to professionalize the police force, (d) support observance of human rights, and (e) provide technical assistance for the organization of democratic elections; and decides that the Representative of the Secretary General and Head of MICAH will have overall authority over all UN activities in Haiti.

The United States strongly supported the resolution to create MICAH, believing that the successful work of UN missions in Haiti is key to the future success of democracy, strong institutions, and prosperity in that country. The U.S. Government supported UN funding at the same level as for previous missions in Haiti, and announced sizable U.S. voluntary contributions.

8. Financing for Development

A/Res/54/196 December 22

Decides to convene in 2001 a high-level intergovernmental event of political decision makers, at least at the ministerial level, on financing for development; decides that the event in 2001 will address national, international, and systemic issues relating to financing for development in a holistic manner in the context of globalization and interdependence, and, in this context, will address the mobilization of financial resources; decides to establish an intergovernmental Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) for the event; decides that the PrepCom should consider innovative ways to facilitate the involvement of all stakeholders in the preparatory process and the event; decides that the first organizational session of the PrepCom shall be held no later than the end of January 2000 and meet in resumed session by March 2000; decides that the resumed organizational session will consider (a) the form of the event, (b) its venue, (c) its timing and format, (d) its agenda, (e) modalities for participation of stakeholders, notably the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the UN Conference on Trade and Development, (f) modalities for participation of other stakeholders, notably nongovernmental organizations and the private sector, and (g) the program of work of the PrepCom; and decides that the first substantive session of the PrepCom should be held in May 2000.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which helps to carry the dialogue on this subject further. It was noteworthy that member states recognized in the resolution that the IMF and World Bank are key stakeholders in development finance issues. The United States remained concerned about the form and agenda of the final event, and emphasized that developing countries would be best served if the outcome is not a political document, but,

III - Important Votes

rather, practical guidelines on the effective mobilization, prioritization, and utilization of resources in support of national efforts to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development. The United States was also concerned that the final event not soak up funds that could be put to more directly beneficial uses. The U.S. delegation will raise these concerns again at the PrepCom sessions, and will stress also that the agenda should focus on ways in which the United Nations can encourage member states' own development efforts.

9. International Trade and Development

A/Res/54/198 December 22

Recognizes the importance of expansion of international trade as an engine of growth and development and, in this context, the need for integration of developing countries and countries with economies in transition into the international trading system, in full cognizance of the opportunities and challenges of globalization and liberalization; renews the commitment to uphold and strengthen an open, rule-based, equitable, secure, non-discriminatory, transparent, and predictable multilateral trade system, which contributes to the economic and social advancement of all countries by promoting the liberalization and expansion of trade, employment, and stability, and by providing a framework for the conduct of international trade relations; recognizes that improvement of market access for exports from developing countries, through reduction of tariffs and non-tariff barriers, should be a high priority for trade negotiations; deplores attempts to bypass agreed procedures on the conduct of international trade; reiterates the importance of continued trade liberalization; reiterates the need to arrest and reverse the marginalization of the least developed countries; stresses the need to facilitate the integration of the countries of Africa into the world economy; stresses the need to meet the special development needs and problems of small-island developing states and of landlocked developing countries; stresses the need for improved measures to address the volatility of short-term capital flows as well as the effects of financial crisis on the international trading system and the development prospects of developing countries, emphasizing that keeping all markets open is a key element in overcoming such a crisis, and rejects the use of protectionist measures; and recognizes the importance of regional economic integration and affirms that regional trade agreements should be outward-oriented and supportive of the multilateral trading system.

In line with U.S. views, this resolution emphasizes the importance of trade as an engine of development, the need for trade liberalization, and each country's responsibility for its own economic policies for sustainable development.

10. External Debt Crisis of Developing Countries

A/Res/54/202 December 22

Recognizes that effective, equitable, development-oriented, and durable solutions to external debt and debt-service burdens of developing countries can contribute substantially to the strengthening of the global economy and to the efforts of developing countries to achieve sustainable development; stresses the urgency of providing additional resources for the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Debt Initiative; welcomes the decision of those countries that have cancelled bilateral official debt and urges creditor countries that have not done so to consider full cancellation of bilateral official debts of HIPC countries; notes that multilateral debt-relief funds can assist governments in increasing expenditures on priority social sectors; stresses the principle that funding of any debt relief should not compromise the financing made available through concessional windows; expresses appreciation that certain developed countries have reached or even gone beyond the agreed target of official development assistance of 0.7 percent of their gross national product, while calling on other countries to fulfill this target as soon as possible; encourages the international creditor community to consider measures for countries with a very high level of debt overhang; calls for concerted national and international action to address debt problems of highly indebted middle-income developing countries; encourages private creditors and, in particular, commercial banks to continue to address the commercial debt problems of middle-income developing countries, in particular those affected by the financial crisis; stresses that debt relief should contribute to development objectives, including poverty reduction, and urges countries to direct resources freed through debt relief toward these objectives; notes the adverse impact of the volatility of short-term capital flows on exchange and interest rates and the debt situation of developing countries, and stresses the need for liberalization of capital accounts in an orderly, gradual, and well-sequenced manner to keep pace with the ability of countries to mitigate the adverse impact of such volatility; emphasizes the need for an enabling environment as well as for an efficient, transparent, and accountable public service and administration; stresses the need to strengthen the institutional capacity of developing countries in debt management, and calls on the international community to support efforts toward this end; stresses the need for new financial flows to debtor developing countries from all sources, in addition to debt-relief measures; stresses the importance of trade to development, and emphasizes that multilateral trade negotiations should deliver early and substantial benefits to developing countries as well as improve market access and further reduce barriers to trade; stresses the importance for developing countries of continuing their efforts to promote a favorable environment for attracting foreign investment; and stresses the need for the international community to promote a conducive external environment through improved market access, stabilization of

III - Important Votes

exchange rates, effective stewardship of international interest rates, increased resource flows, access to international financial markets, and improved access to technology for developing countries.

The U.S. Government was able again in 1999 to join consensus on the resolution on this subject because it was balanced. It acknowledged the concerns of heavily indebted countries and noted their responsibilities, and it respected the rights of donors and the prerogatives of lending institutions. Over the years, the United States has voiced its opposition to the target of 0.7 percent of gross national product for official development assistance (ODA) in numerous forums. While not reserving on the ODA passages, U.S. delegations have made interpretive statements. Because unsustainable debt can halt progress, drag down growth, and drain resources needed to meet basic human conditions, the United States, along with its Group of 7 partners, endorsed further debt relief via improvements in the HIPC initiative. It is the U.S. view that the purpose of debt relief is to free up resources for development. The United States announced plans to write off up to 100 percent of the debt owed by HIPC countries, and urged middle-income countries experiencing difficulties with their external debt load to maintain good working relationships with all creditors to ensure continued access to international capital markets. Rescheduling of debt should take place in the context of an economic reform program. Economic reforms must continue so that more countries will not become enmeshed in the cycle of debt that is so destructive of development. The resolution noted that sound economic policies, a favorable investment climate, and accessible markets are necessary for sustainable development.

11. Business and Development

A/Res/54/204 December 22

Recognizes that business and industry, including corporations engaged in international business, can contribute substantially to a country's economic development; encourages governments to create an environment that enables businesses to conduct their activities in a humane, stable, and socially responsible way; urges all governments to create an enabling environment for business and investment, including through sound macroeconomic, fiscal, and development policies, the rule of law, anti-corruption and anti-bribery efforts, and transparent business practices that promote efficiency, fairness, and competitiveness in international commerce; urges the private sector to conduct orderly and fair business practices, while adhering to the principles of honesty, transparency, and accountability; emphasizes the importance of a supportive international economic environment for promotion of entrepreneurship and privatization; stresses the need for adequate resources and transfer of technology on concessional and preferential terms to developing countries to develop appropriate infrastructure and services to promote entrepreneurship; values the promotion of entrepreneurship through micro-enterprises and small and

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

medium-sized enterprises and industries by various actors throughout civil society, and of privatization, demonopolization, and simplification of administrative procedures; stresses the importance of encouraging investment in human resource programs devoted to health, education, and job training; and calls on UN organs, funds, and programs to support promotion of entrepreneurship.

The United States, which has urged movement toward private sector activity and entrepreneurship in General Assembly resolutions since 1988, introduced this resolution. It seeks to focus the attention of the Secretary General and the international community on the link between business development and prosperity, economic growth, and, ultimately, development. The seven cosponsors of the resolution represented a mix of developed and developing countries with good geographic distribution, a marked improvement from two years previously when the United States had last introduced a resolution on this subject. The U.S. delegation urged developing countries to promote business as the primary engine of development by strengthening the rule of law, implementing strict anti-corruption measures, and enacting strong labor standards. It worked to ensure that this resolution made clear that individual countries and governments, not international financial institutions, are responsible for creating an enabling domestic environment supportive of entrepreneurship and facilitative of privatization.

12. Renewal of Dialogue on Cooperation for Development

A/Res/54/213 December 22

Reaffirms the importance of continued constructive dialogue and genuine partnership to further promote international economic cooperation for development; decides that the theme of the second high-level dialogue on strengthening international economic cooperation for development through partnership will be “Responding to Globalization: Facilitating the Integration of Developing Countries into the World Economy”; asks the President of the General Assembly to begin consultations with member states so as to arrive at an early decision on the date, modalities, nature of the outcome, and focus of the discussions of the second high-level dialogue; and asks the Secretary General to make initial preparations for the dialogue.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which affirms the need to cooperate in development on the basis of mutual interests and benefits, genuine interdependence, shared responsibility, and partnership, while avoiding the North-South polemics of earlier discussions. The resolution also moves forward the concrete discussions necessary for effective promotion of development.

13. Development of Small-Island Developing States

A/Res/54/224 December 22

Reiterates the significance of implementation of the Declaration and review document adopted at the 22nd special session of the General Assembly on the special challenges and vulnerabilities of small-island developing states (SIDS), both of an environmental and economic nature; urges the various organs of the UN system and the regional commissions to take the necessary actions for further implementation and follow-up; calls on governments and intergovernmental organizations to support the efforts of SIDS; calls on stakeholders, in particular local communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector, to take necessary actions for implementation and follow-up of the program of action for SIDS; and urges relevant organizations to develop a vulnerability index to assist in defining the vulnerability of the SIDS.

The United States was an active participant in the meeting in Barbados five years ago that established a program of action for SIDS, and supported this resolution. The United States urged the SIDS to work to gain benefits from globalization—through good governance and adequate levels of investment and savings. The United States has also worked to achieve sustainable marine fisheries, on which the SIDS are dependent, and has been active in the task of protecting coral reefs, on which many SIDS depend for tourism, fisheries, and protection against coastal erosion and flooding.

14. Globalization and Interdependence

A/Res/54/231 December 22

Reaffirms that the United Nations has a central role to play in promoting international cooperation for development and in promoting greater policy coherence on global development issues, including in the context of globalization and interdependence; stresses that the United Nations, the Bretton Woods institutions, and the World Trade Organization should intensify their collaboration in promoting coordination at the global level to optimize the benefits and minimize the negative consequences of globalization, trade liberalization, and interdependence; calls for cooperation to address the challenges of globalization through the enhanced participation of developing countries in the international economic policy decision-making process and continuation of reforms of the international financial system; stresses the importance, at the national level, of maintaining sound macroeconomic policies and developing effective institutional and regulatory frameworks; urges the international community to promote equity in finance, trade, and transfer of technology and address the problems of developing countries in the areas of external debt and transfer of resources, financial vulnerability, declining terms of trade, and market access; underlines the importance of an enabling environment for investment, in par-

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

ticular foreign direct investment, and of market access, governance responsive to the needs of the people with efficient, participatory, transparent, and accountable public service, policy-making processes and administration, and an increase in the volume and effectiveness of official development assistance; emphasizes the technology-led dimension of globalization and the importance of facilitating access to and transfer of information and communication technology to developing countries on favorable terms, taking into account the need to protect intellectual property rights, to enable developing countries to benefit from globalization through integration into the emerging global information network; emphasizes the need for UN programs to assist developing countries in the area of information and communication technology; and asks the Secretary General to convene a panel of experts to make recommendations on the UN role in enhancing the integration of developing countries in the emerging global information network, facilitating access to information and communication technology, and promoting participation by developing countries in knowledge-intensive sectors of the world economy.

The United States joined consensus on this resolution because it represents, on balance, a step forward in a number of areas. Part of the way forward is to strengthen support for developing countries so they can develop the skills and institutions to manage change effectively and to seize the benefits of globalization. Just as important is the need for governments to effectively manage their own development. This resolution recognizes that governance should be responsive to the needs of the people, based on an efficient and accountable public service, with transparent policy making processes. Such good governance is essential to sustainable development. While the concept of good governance needs to be further developed in the context of the General Assembly, it has become a central pillar of economic growth and poverty alleviation.

15. Internal Oversight

A/Res/54/244 December 23

Recognizes the importance of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in continuing to assist the Secretary General in fulfilling its internal oversight responsibilities; emphasizes the importance of coordination among oversight bodies, and welcomes periodic meetings of OIOS with the external oversight bodies (Board of Auditors and Joint Inspection Unit); stresses that the Secretary General shall provide procedures to protect individual rights of OIOS staff, including those who make reports to the Investigation Section; and emphasizes the operational independence of OIOS.

The United States considered this resolution a significant accomplishment because it reaffirmed the legislation that created OIOS and preserved its independence and operating procedures. The General Assembly decided in 1993 to establish an independent entity to enhance oversight functions. The United States, believing that the oversight mechanisms at that time were ineffective in

III - Important Votes

dealing with the expanding scope and complexity of the United Nations, introduced a proposal to establish an independent oversight authority to ensure that UN programs would accomplish their intent and properly utilize resources. It was a major step toward improving management of UN activities. During the past five years, the OIOS has demonstrated that the decision to create an independent internal oversight mechanism was a wise one. In fact, it was the single most important UN reform measure passed by the General Assembly during the past five years. The OIOS has helped improve the functioning of the United Nations, saving millions of dollars, improving operations, identifying fraud, and correcting instances of noncompliance. The implementation rate of its audit recommendations has steadily increased, indicating that managers take the work of OIOS seriously and see the value in the auditors' recommendations. The work of OIOS resulted in savings of \$70 million over the past five years. Moreover, OIOS has served as a trend-setting model for internal oversight in the separately administered funds and programs and in the UN specialized agencies.

16. Proposed Program Budget for 2000-2001

A/Res/54/250 December 23

Approves appropriations totalling \$2,535,689,200 for the biennium 2000-2001.

The United States was unable to associate itself with the consensus on this budget resolution because it was not in keeping with U.S. policy requiring strict budget discipline. The U.S. policy of zero nominal growth (ZNG) in the budget required that it not exceed \$2.533 billion. It was the U.S. view also that the budget contained an over-emphasis on inputs and it retained deficiencies in program evaluation, as opposed to the more results-oriented focus the United States has endeavored to instill in the planning and budget process.

COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member performance at the 54th UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 13 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 13 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 16 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.

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	2	3	1	7	73.8%	40.0%
Albania	6	1	2	4	94.8%	85.7%
Algeria	5	5	3	0	80.8%	50.0%
Andorra	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Angola	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	5	5	2	1	80.1%	50.0%
Argentina	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Armenia	5	5	1	2	79.0%	50.0%
Australia	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Austria	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Azerbaijan	5	4	1	3	82.1%	55.6%
Bahamas	6	4	1	2	83.9%	60.0%
Bahrain	6	5	2	0	81.1%	54.5%
Bangladesh	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Barbados	7	4	1	1	84.0%	63.6%
Belarus	4	8	0	1	71.1%	33.3%
Belgium	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Belize	5	5	1	2	78.7%	50.0%
Benin	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Bhutan	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Bolivia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	5	1	2	5	94.1%	83.3%
Botswana	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Brazil	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Bulgaria	8	3	1	1	88.6%	72.7%
Burkina Faso	4	6	3	0	76.5%	40.0%
Burundi	0	0	0	13	*	*
Cambodia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
Cameroon	3	3	5	2	85.5%	50.0%
Canada	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Cape Verde	5	5	2	1	80.0%	50.0%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	13	*	*
Chad	1	6	3	3	70.8%	14.3%
Chile	7	4	1	1	84.2%	63.6%
China	3	5	5	0	78.4%	37.5%
Colombia	7	6	0	0	79.3%	53.8%
Comoros	2	2	0	9	76.8%	50.0%
Congo	3	4	4	2	80.8%	42.9%
Costa Rica	8	4	1	0	84.8%	66.7%
Cote d'Ivoire	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Croatia	6	4	2	1	84.3%	60.0%
Cuba	3	6	4	0	75.5%	33.3%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	82.1%	58.3%
Czech Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	2	2	8	71.3%	33.3%
DPR of Korea	0	6	4	3	66.1%	0.0%
Denmark	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Djibouti	4	5	2	2	79.6%	44.4%
Dominica	4	4	1	4	81.8%	50.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Dominican Republic ...	5	4	1	3	80.2%	55.6%
Ecuador	8	5	0	0	82.6%	61.5%
Egypt	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
El Salvador	8	2	0	3	91.7%	80.0%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	0	6	74.9%	42.9%
Eritrea	3	4	5	1	82.1%	42.9%
Estonia	9	2	2	0	92.5%	81.8%
Ethiopia	5	4	3	1	83.7%	55.6%
Fiji	2	5	3	3	75.4%	28.6%
Finland	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
France	8	4	1	0	85.5%	66.7%
Gabon	1	3	4	5	77.1%	25.0%
Gambia	1	1	0	11	81.1%	50.0%
Georgia	7	2	4	0	91.9%	77.8%
Germany	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Ghana	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
Greece	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Grenada	5	5	1	2	80.1%	50.0%
Guatemala	8	4	1	0	85.2%	66.7%
Guinea	3	4	5	1	81.1%	42.9%
Guinea-Bissau	4	4	2	3	79.4%	50.0%
Guyana	6	5	1	1	80.9%	54.5%
Haiti	7	5	0	1	81.3%	58.3%
Honduras	4	4	0	5	78.6%	50.0%
Hungary	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Iceland	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
India	4	5	4	0	79.6%	44.4%
Indonesia	6	6	1	0	78.3%	50.0%
Iran	5	8	0	0	71.8%	38.5%
Iraq	0	0	0	13	*	*
Ireland	8	5	0	0	82.8%	61.5%
Israel	10	1	1	1	96.2%	90.9%
Italy	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Jamaica	5	5	2	1	80.3%	50.0%
Japan	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Jordan	5	5	2	1	79.6%	50.0%
Kazakhstan	7	3	1	2	87.2%	70.0%
Kenya	3	4	5	1	82.0%	42.9%
Kiribati	0	0	0	13	*	*
Kuwait	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Kyrgyzstan	0	0	0	13	*	*
Laos	3	5	5	0	77.1%	37.5%
Latvia	7	2	3	1	91.8%	77.8%
Lebanon	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Lesotho	1	2	0	10	47.7%	33.3%
Liberia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Libya	5	7	1	0	74.9%	41.7%
Liechtenstein	8	4	1	0	85.6%	66.7%
Lithuania	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Luxembourg	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Madagascar	4	5	0	4	74.9%	44.4%
Malawi	4	2	1	6	82.5%	66.7%
Malaysia	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Maldives	6	5	0	2	81.0%	54.5%
Mali	3	4	4	2	81.6%	42.9%
Malta	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Marshall Islands	5	2	2	4	90.6%	71.4%
Mauritania	0	0	0	13	*	*
Mauritius	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Mexico	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Micronesia	7	0	2	4	100.0%	100.0%
Monaco	9	4	0	0	85.5%	69.2%
Mongolia	5	5	0	3	79.6%	50.0%
Morocco	6	4	3	0	84.0%	60.0%
Mozambique	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Namibia	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Nauru	0	0	0	13	*	*
Nepal	4	6	2	1	76.6%	40.0%
Netherlands	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
New Zealand	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Nicaragua	5	1	2	5	94.7%	83.3%
Niger	0	0	0	13	*	*
Nigeria	6	4	3	0	84.4%	60.0%
Norway	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Oman	6	4	0	3	83.7%	60.0%
Pakistan	6	5	2	0	81.4%	54.5%
Palau	0	0	0	13	*	*
Panama	4	4	2	3	82.2%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	5	2	3	77.8%	37.5%
Paraguay	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Peru	6	4	3	0	84.5%	60.0%
Philippines	5	5	1	2	80.5%	50.0%
Poland	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Portugal	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Qatar	6	5	0	2	80.8%	54.5%
Republic of Korea	7	3	3	0	88.2%	70.0%
Republic of Moldova ..	7	3	3	0	88.3%	70.0%
Romania	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Russia	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Rwanda	0	1	0	12	64.5%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	4	0	8	61.7%	20.0%
St. Lucia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
St. Vincent/Gren.	2	4	0	7	74.8%	33.3%
Samoa	6	4	1	2	83.8%	60.0%
San Marino	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	13	*	*
Saudi Arabia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Senegal	7	5	1	0	82.0%	58.3%
Seychelles	2	4	0	7	71.9%	33.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sierra Leone	5	3	2	3	86.6%	62.5%
Singapore	4	4	5	0	83.2%	50.0%
Slovak Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Slovenia	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Solomon Islands	7	4	1	1	84.9%	63.6%
Somalia	0	0	0	13	*	*
South Africa	7	5	1	0	81.4%	58.3%
Spain	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Sri Lanka	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Sudan	6	7	0	0	75.3%	46.2%
Suriname	2	5	4	2	76.8%	28.6%
Swaziland	4	5	3	1	79.6%	44.4%
Sweden	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Syria	2	6	3	2	72.8%	25.0%
Tajikistan	5	6	2	0	76.2%	45.5%
Thailand	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	4	0	87.8%	66.7%
Togo	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Tonga	0	0	0	13	*	*
Trinidad and Tobago ..	6	3	3	1	87.7%	66.7%
Tunisia	6	5	1	1	81.3%	54.5%
Turkey	7	3	2	1	87.8%	70.0%
Turkmenistan	3	5	0	5	67.2%	37.5%
Uganda	2	5	3	3	69.8%	28.6%
Ukraine	6	3	4	0	87.9%	66.7%
United Arab Emirates .	6	4	2	1	84.1%	60.0%
United Kingdom	9	3	1	0	89.2%	75.0%
UR Tanzania	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Uruguay	5	4	2	2	83.6%	55.6%
Uzbekistan	6	1	3	3	94.3%	85.7%
Vanuatu	0	0	0	13	*	*
Venezuela	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Vietnam	2	6	3	2	71.7%	25.0%
Yemen	4	4	0	5	81.6%	50.0%
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	13	*	*
Zambia	6	5	1	1	80.8%	54.5%
Zimbabwe	4	5	1	3	78.7%	44.4%
Average	5.1	3.8	1.8	2.4	82.8%	57.2%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	10	1	1	1	96.2%	90.9%
Estonia	9	2	2	0	92.5%	81.8%
Hungary	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Poland	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Romania	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
United Kingdom	9	3	1	0	89.2%	75.0%
Monaco	9	4	0	0	85.5%	69.2%
Canada	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
El Salvador	8	2	0	3	91.7%	80.0%
Norway	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Andorra	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Australia	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Belgium	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Bulgaria	8	3	1	1	88.6%	72.7%
Czech Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Denmark	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Finland	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Germany	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Greece	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Iceland	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Italy	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Japan	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Lithuania	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Luxembourg	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Netherlands	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Portugal	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Slovak Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Slovenia	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Spain	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Austria	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Brazil	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Costa Rica	8	4	1	0	84.8%	66.7%
France	8	4	1	0	85.5%	66.7%
Guatemala	8	4	1	0	85.2%	66.7%
Liechtenstein	8	4	1	0	85.6%	66.7%
Malta	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
New Zealand	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Paraguay	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
San Marino	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Ecuador	8	5	0	0	82.6%	61.5%
Ireland	8	5	0	0	82.8%	61.5%
Micronesia	7	0	2	4	100.0%	100.0%
Georgia	7	2	4	0	91.9%	77.8%
Latvia	7	2	3	1	91.8%	77.8%
Argentina	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Kazakhstan	7	3	1	2	87.2%	70.0%
Mauritius	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Republic of Korea	7	3	3	0	88.2%	70.0%
Republic of Moldova ..	7	3	3	0	88.3%	70.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Turkey	7	3	2	1	87.8%	70.0%
Barbados	7	4	1	1	84.0%	63.6%
Bolivia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Chile	7	4	1	1	84.2%	63.6%
Saudi Arabia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Solomon Islands	7	4	1	1	84.9%	63.6%
Botswana	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	82.1%	58.3%
Haiti	7	5	0	1	81.3%	58.3%
Kuwait	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Senegal	7	5	1	0	82.0%	58.3%
South Africa	7	5	1	0	81.4%	58.3%
Colombia	7	6	0	0	79.3%	53.8%
Albania	6	1	2	4	94.8%	85.7%
Uzbekistan	6	1	3	3	94.3%	85.7%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	4	0	87.8%	66.7%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	6	3	3	1	87.7%	66.7%
Ukraine	6	3	4	0	87.9%	66.7%
Bahamas	6	4	1	2	83.9%	60.0%
Croatia	6	4	2	1	84.3%	60.0%
Morocco	6	4	3	0	84.0%	60.0%
Nigeria	6	4	3	0	84.4%	60.0%
Oman	6	4	0	3	83.7%	60.0%
Peru	6	4	3	0	84.5%	60.0%
Samoa	6	4	1	2	83.8%	60.0%
United Arab Emirates .	6	4	2	1	84.1%	60.0%
Bahrain	6	5	2	0	81.1%	54.5%
Guyana	6	5	1	1	80.9%	54.5%
Maldives	6	5	0	2	81.0%	54.5%
Mexico	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Pakistan	6	5	2	0	81.4%	54.5%
Qatar	6	5	0	2	80.8%	54.5%
Thailand	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Tunisia	6	5	1	1	81.3%	54.5%
Zambia	6	5	1	1	80.8%	54.5%
Bangladesh	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Egypt	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Indonesia	6	6	1	0	78.3%	50.0%
Malaysia	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Sri Lanka	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Sudan	6	7	0	0	75.3%	46.2%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	5	1	2	5	94.1%	83.3%
Nicaragua	5	1	2	5	94.7%	83.3%
Marshall Islands	5	2	2	4	90.6%	71.4%
Sierra Leone	5	3	2	3	86.6%	62.5%
Azerbaijan	5	4	1	3	82.1%	55.6%
Dominican Republic ...	5	4	1	3	80.2%	55.6%
Ethiopia	5	4	3	1	83.7%	55.6%
Uruguay	5	4	2	2	83.6%	55.6%

III - Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Algeria	5	5	3	0	80.8%	50.0%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	5	5	2	1	80.1%	50.0%
Armenia	5	5	1	2	79.0%	50.0%
Belize	5	5	1	2	78.7%	50.0%
Bhutan	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Cape Verde	5	5	2	1	80.0%	50.0%
Grenada	5	5	1	2	80.1%	50.0%
Jamaica	5	5	2	1	80.3%	50.0%
Jordan	5	5	2	1	79.6%	50.0%
Mongolia	5	5	0	3	79.6%	50.0%
Mozambique	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Philippines	5	5	1	2	80.5%	50.0%
Venezuela	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Tajikistan	5	6	2	0	76.2%	45.5%
Libya	5	7	1	0	74.9%	41.7%
Iran	5	8	0	0	71.8%	38.5%
Malawi	4	2	1	6	82.5%	66.7%
Dominica	4	4	1	4	81.8%	50.0%
Guinea-Bissau	4	4	2	3	79.4%	50.0%
Honduras	4	4	0	5	78.6%	50.0%
Panama	4	4	2	3	82.2%	50.0%
Singapore	4	4	5	0	83.2%	50.0%
Yemen	4	4	0	5	81.6%	50.0%
Angola	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
Djibouti	4	5	2	2	79.6%	44.4%
Ghana	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
India	4	5	4	0	79.6%	44.4%
Madagascar	4	5	0	4	74.9%	44.4%
Namibia	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Swaziland	4	5	3	1	79.6%	44.4%
Togo	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Zimbabwe	4	5	1	3	78.7%	44.4%
Burkina Faso	4	6	3	0	76.5%	40.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Nepal	4	6	2	1	76.6%	40.0%
Russia	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Belarus	4	8	0	1	71.1%	33.3%
Cameroon	3	3	5	2	85.5%	50.0%
Congo	3	4	4	2	80.8%	42.9%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	0	6	74.9%	42.9%
Eritrea	3	4	5	1	82.1%	42.9%
Guinea	3	4	5	1	81.1%	42.9%
Kenya	3	4	5	1	82.0%	42.9%
Mali	3	4	4	2	81.6%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Cambodia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
China	3	5	5	0	78.4%	37.5%
Laos	3	5	5	0	77.1%	37.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Papua New Guinea	3	5	2	3	77.8%	37.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
St. Lucia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
Turkmenistan	3	5	0	5	67.2%	37.5%
Cuba	3	6	4	0	75.5%	33.3%
Comoros	2	2	0	9	76.8%	50.0%
Afghanistan	2	3	1	7	73.8%	40.0%
Seychelles	2	4	0	7	71.9%	33.3%
St. Vincent/Gren.	2	4	0	7	74.8%	33.3%
Fiji	2	5	3	3	75.4%	28.6%
Suriname	2	5	4	2	76.8%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	3	3	69.8%	28.6%
Lebanon	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Syria	2	6	3	2	72.8%	25.0%
UR Tanzania	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Vietnam	2	6	3	2	71.7%	25.0%
Gambia	1	1	0	11	81.1%	50.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	2	2	8	71.3%	33.3%
Lesotho	1	2	0	10	47.7%	33.3%
Gabon	1	3	4	5	77.1%	25.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	4	0	8	61.7%	20.0%
Chad	1	6	3	3	70.8%	14.3%
Burundi	0	0	0	13	*	*
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	13	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	13	*	*
Kiribati	0	0	0	13	*	*
Kyrgyzstan	0	0	0	13	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Mauritania	0	0	0	13	*	*
Nauru	0	0	0	13	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	13	*	*
Palau	0	0	0	13	*	*
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	13	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Tonga	0	0	0	13	*	*
Vanuatu	0	0	0	13	*	*
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	13	*	*
Rwanda	0	1	0	12	64.5%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	6	4	3	66.1%	0.0%
Average	5.1	3.8	1.8	2.4	82.8%	57.2%

III - Important Votes

UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 13 important votes. They list countries by UN regional groups.

African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritius	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Botswana	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Senegal	7	5	1	0	82.0%	58.3%
South Africa	7	5	1	0	81.4%	58.3%
Morocco	6	4	3	0	84.0%	60.0%
Nigeria	6	4	3	0	84.4%	60.0%
Tunisia	6	5	1	1	81.3%	54.5%
Zambia	6	5	1	1	80.8%	54.5%
Egypt	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Sudan	6	7	0	0	75.3%	46.2%
Sierra Leone	5	3	2	3	86.6%	62.5%
Ethiopia	5	4	3	1	83.7%	55.6%
Algeria	5	5	3	0	80.8%	50.0%
Cape Verde	5	5	2	1	80.0%	50.0%
Mozambique	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Libya	5	7	1	0	74.9%	41.7%
Malawi	4	2	1	6	82.5%	66.7%
Guinea-Bissau	4	4	2	3	79.4%	50.0%
Angola	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
Djibouti	4	5	2	2	79.6%	44.4%
Ghana	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
Madagascar	4	5	0	4	74.9%	44.4%
Namibia	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Swaziland	4	5	3	1	79.6%	44.4%
Togo	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Zimbabwe	4	5	1	3	78.7%	44.4%
Burkina Faso	4	6	3	0	76.5%	40.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Cameroon	3	3	5	2	85.5%	50.0%
Congo	3	4	4	2	80.8%	42.9%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	0	6	74.9%	42.9%
Eritrea	3	4	5	1	82.1%	42.9%
Guinea	3	4	5	1	81.1%	42.9%
Kenya	3	4	5	1	82.0%	42.9%
Mali	3	4	4	2	81.6%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Comoros	2	2	0	9	76.8%	50.0%
Seychelles	2	4	0	7	71.9%	33.3%
Uganda	2	5	3	3	69.8%	28.6%
UR Tanzania	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Gambia	1	1	0	11	81.1%	50.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	2	2	8	71.3%	33.3%
Lesotho	1	2	0	10	47.7%	33.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

African Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Gabon	1	3	4	5	77.1%	25.0%
Chad	1	6	3	3	70.8%	14.3%
Burundi	0	0	0	13	*	*
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	13	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Mauritania	0	0	0	13	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	13	*	*
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	13	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Rwanda	0	1	0	12	64.5%	0.0%
Average	3.4	3.8	2.0	3.8	79.5%	47.2%

Asian Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Japan	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Micronesia	7	0	2	4	100.0%	100.0%
Kazakhstan	7	3	1	2	87.2%	70.0%
Republic of Korea	7	3	3	0	88.2%	70.0%
Saudi Arabia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Solomon Islands	7	4	1	1	84.9%	63.6%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	82.1%	58.3%
Kuwait	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Uzbekistan	6	1	3	3	94.3%	85.7%
Oman	6	4	0	3	83.7%	60.0%
Samoa	6	4	1	2	83.8%	60.0%
United Arab Emirates .	6	4	2	1	84.1%	60.0%
Bahrain	6	5	2	0	81.1%	54.5%
Maldives	6	5	0	2	81.0%	54.5%
Pakistan	6	5	2	0	81.4%	54.5%
Qatar	6	5	0	2	80.8%	54.5%
Thailand	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Bangladesh	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Indonesia	6	6	1	0	78.3%	50.0%
Malaysia	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Sri Lanka	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Marshall Islands	5	2	2	4	90.6%	71.4%
Bhutan	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Jordan	5	5	2	1	79.6%	50.0%
Mongolia	5	5	0	3	79.6%	50.0%
Philippines	5	5	1	2	80.5%	50.0%
Tajikistan	5	6	2	0	76.2%	45.5%
Iran	5	8	0	0	71.8%	38.5%
Singapore	4	4	5	0	83.2%	50.0%
Yemen	4	4	0	5	81.6%	50.0%
India	4	5	4	0	79.6%	44.4%

III - Important Votes

Asian Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Nepal	4	6	2	1	76.6%	40.0%
Cambodia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
China	3	5	5	0	78.4%	37.5%
Laos	3	5	5	0	77.1%	37.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Papua New Guinea	3	5	2	3	77.8%	37.5%
Turkmenistan	3	5	0	5	67.2%	37.5%
Afghanistan	2	3	1	7	73.8%	40.0%
Fiji	2	5	3	3	75.4%	28.6%
Lebanon	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Syria	2	6	3	2	72.8%	25.0%
Vietnam	2	6	3	2	71.7%	25.0%
Iraq	0	0	0	13	*	*
Kiribati	0	0	0	13	*	*
Kyrgyzstan	0	0	0	13	*	*
Nauru	0	0	0	13	*	*
Palau	0	0	0	13	*	*
Tonga	0	0	0	13	*	*
Vanuatu	0	0	0	13	*	*
DPR of Korea	0	6	4	3	66.1%	0.0%
Average	4.2	4.1	1.7	3.0	80.4%	50.9%

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
El Salvador	8	2	0	3	91.7%	80.0%
Brazil	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Costa Rica	8	4	1	0	84.8%	66.7%
Guatemala	8	4	1	0	85.2%	66.7%
Paraguay	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Ecuador	8	5	0	0	82.6%	61.5%
Argentina	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Barbados	7	4	1	1	84.0%	63.6%
Bolivia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Chile	7	4	1	1	84.2%	63.6%
Haiti	7	5	0	1	81.3%	58.3%
Colombia	7	6	0	0	79.3%	53.8%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	6	3	3	1	87.7%	66.7%
Bahamas	6	4	1	2	83.9%	60.0%
Peru	6	4	3	0	84.5%	60.0%
Guyana	6	5	1	1	80.9%	54.5%
Mexico	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Nicaragua	5	1	2	5	94.7%	83.3%
Dominican Republic ...	5	4	1	3	80.2%	55.6%
Uruguay	5	4	2	2	83.6%	55.6%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	5	5	2	1	80.1%	50.0%
Belize	5	5	1	2	78.7%	50.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Grenada	5	5	1	2	80.1%	50.0%
Jamaica	5	5	2	1	80.3%	50.0%
Venezuela	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Dominica	4	4	1	4	81.8%	50.0%
Honduras	4	4	0	5	78.6%	50.0%
Panama	4	4	2	3	82.2%	50.0%
St. Lucia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
Cuba	3	6	4	0	75.5%	33.3%
St. Vincent/Gren.	2	4	0	7	74.8%	33.3%
Suriname	2	5	4	2	76.8%	28.6%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	4	0	8	61.7%	20.0%
Average	5.5	4.2	1.5	1.8	82.4%	56.7%

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
United Kingdom	9	3	1	0	89.2%	75.0%
Monaco	9	4	0	0	85.5%	69.2%
Canada	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Norway	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Andorra	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Australia	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Belgium	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Denmark	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Finland	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Germany	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Greece	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Iceland	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Italy	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Luxembourg	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Netherlands	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Portugal	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Spain	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Austria	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
France	8	4	1	0	85.5%	66.7%
Liechtenstein	8	4	1	0	85.6%	66.7%
Malta	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
New Zealand	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
San Marino	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Ireland	8	5	0	0	82.8%	61.5%
Turkey	7	3	2	1	87.8%	70.0%
Average	8.0	3.3	1.6	0.0	87.8%	70.8%

III - Important Votes

Eastern European Group (EE)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Estonia	9	2	2	0	92.5%	81.8%
Hungary	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Poland	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Romania	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Bulgaria	8	3	1	1	88.6%	72.7%
Czech Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Lithuania	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Slovak Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Slovenia	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Georgia	7	2	4	0	91.9%	77.8%
Latvia	7	2	3	1	91.8%	77.8%
Republic of Moldova ..	7	3	3	0	88.3%	70.0%
Albania	6	1	2	4	94.8%	85.7%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	4	0	87.8%	66.7%
Ukraine	6	3	4	0	87.9%	66.7%
Croatia	6	4	2	1	84.3%	60.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	5	1	2	5	94.1%	83.3%
Azerbaijan	5	4	1	3	82.1%	55.6%
Armenia	5	5	1	2	79.0%	50.0%
Russia	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Belarus	4	8	0	1	71.1%	33.3%
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	13	*	*
Average	6.5	3.1	2.0	1.4	87.2%	67.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

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	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Saudi Arabia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Kuwait	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Morocco	6	4	3	0	84.0%	60.0%
Oman	6	4	0	3	83.7%	60.0%
United Arab Emirates ..	6	4	2	1	84.1%	60.0%
Bahrain	6	5	2	0	81.1%	54.5%
Qatar	6	5	0	2	80.8%	54.5%
Tunisia	6	5	1	1	81.3%	54.5%
Egypt	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Sudan	6	7	0	0	75.3%	46.2%
Algeria	5	5	3	0	80.8%	50.0%
Jordan	5	5	2	1	79.6%	50.0%
Libya	5	7	1	0	74.9%	41.7%
Yemen	4	4	0	5	81.6%	50.0%
Djibouti	4	5	2	2	79.6%	44.4%
Lebanon	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Syria	2	6	3	2	72.8%	25.0%
Iraq	0	0	0	13	*	*
Mauritania	0	0	0	13	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Average	4.5	4.4	1.3	3.0	79.9%	50.6%

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Indonesia	6	6	1	0	78.3%	50.0%
Malaysia	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Philippines	5	5	1	2	80.5%	50.0%
Singapore	4	4	5	0	83.2%	50.0%
Laos	3	5	5	0	77.1%	37.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Vietnam	2	6	3	2	71.7%	25.0%
Average	4.6	5.3	2.7	0.4	78.8%	46.1%

III - Important Votes

European Union (EU)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
United Kingdom	9	3	1	0	89.2%	75.0%
Belgium	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Denmark	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Finland	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Germany	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Greece	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Italy	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Luxembourg	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Netherlands	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Portugal	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Spain	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Austria	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
France	8	4	1	0	85.5%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Ireland	8	5	0	0	82.8%	61.5%
Average	8.1	3.3	1.6	0.0	87.8%	70.8%

Islamic Conference (OIC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Kazakhstan	7	3	1	2	87.2%	70.0%
Turkey	7	3	2	1	87.8%	70.0%
Saudi Arabia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Kuwait	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Senegal	7	5	1	0	82.0%	58.3%
Albania	6	1	2	4	94.8%	85.7%
Morocco	6	4	3	0	84.0%	60.0%
Oman	6	4	0	3	83.7%	60.0%
United Arab Emirates ..	6	4	2	1	84.1%	60.0%
Bahrain	6	5	2	0	81.1%	54.5%
Maldives	6	5	0	2	81.0%	54.5%
Pakistan	6	5	2	0	81.4%	54.5%
Qatar	6	5	0	2	80.8%	54.5%
Tunisia	6	5	1	1	81.3%	54.5%
Bangladesh	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Egypt	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Indonesia	6	6	1	0	78.3%	50.0%
Malaysia	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Sudan	6	7	0	0	75.3%	46.2%
Sierra Leone	5	3	2	3	86.6%	62.5%
Azerbaijan	5	4	1	3	82.1%	55.6%
Algeria	5	5	3	0	80.8%	50.0%
Jordan	5	5	2	1	79.6%	50.0%
Mozambique	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Tajikistan	5	6	2	0	76.2%	45.5%
Libya	5	7	1	0	74.9%	41.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Iran	5	8	0	0	71.8%	38.5%
Guinea-Bissau	4	4	2	3	79.4%	50.0%
Yemen	4	4	0	5	81.6%	50.0%
Djibouti	4	5	2	2	79.6%	44.4%
Togo	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Burkina Faso	4	6	3	0	76.5%	40.0%
Cameroon	3	3	5	2	85.5%	50.0%
Guinea	3	4	5	1	81.1%	42.9%
Mali	3	4	4	2	81.6%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Turkmenistan	3	5	0	5	67.2%	37.5%
Comoros	2	2	0	9	76.8%	50.0%
Afghanistan	2	3	1	7	73.8%	40.0%
Suriname	2	5	4	2	76.8%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	3	3	69.8%	28.6%
Lebanon	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Syria	2	6	3	2	72.8%	25.0%
Gambia	1	1	0	11	81.1%	50.0%
Gabon	1	3	4	5	77.1%	25.0%
Chad	1	6	3	3	70.8%	14.3%
Iraq	0	0	0	13	*	*
Kyrgyzstan	0	0	0	13	*	*
Mauritania	0	0	0	13	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	13	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Average	4.1	4.2	1.7	2.9	79.7%	49.4%

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Guatemala	8	4	1	0	85.2%	66.7%
Malta	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Ecuador	8	5	0	0	82.6%	61.5%
Mauritius	7	3	3	0	88.5%	70.0%
Barbados	7	4	1	1	84.0%	63.6%
Bolivia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Chile	7	4	1	1	84.2%	63.6%
Saudi Arabia	7	4	0	2	84.5%	63.6%
Botswana	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Cyprus	7	5	1	0	82.1%	58.3%
Kuwait	7	5	1	0	81.9%	58.3%
Senegal	7	5	1	0	82.0%	58.3%
South Africa	7	5	1	0	81.4%	58.3%
Colombia	7	6	0	0	79.3%	53.8%
Uzbekistan	6	1	3	3	94.3%	85.7%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	6	3	3	1	87.7%	66.7%

III - Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Bahamas	6	4	1	2	83.9%	60.0%
Morocco	6	4	3	0	84.0%	60.0%
Nigeria	6	4	3	0	84.4%	60.0%
Oman	6	4	0	3	83.7%	60.0%
Peru	6	4	3	0	84.5%	60.0%
United Arab Emirates .	6	4	2	1	84.1%	60.0%
Bahrain	6	5	2	0	81.1%	54.5%
Guyana	6	5	1	1	80.9%	54.5%
Maldives	6	5	0	2	81.0%	54.5%
Pakistan	6	5	2	0	81.4%	54.5%
Qatar	6	5	0	2	80.8%	54.5%
Thailand	6	5	2	0	81.5%	54.5%
Tunisia	6	5	1	1	81.3%	54.5%
Zambia	6	5	1	1	80.8%	54.5%
Bangladesh	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Egypt	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Indonesia	6	6	1	0	78.3%	50.0%
Malaysia	6	6	1	0	78.4%	50.0%
Sri Lanka	6	6	1	0	78.6%	50.0%
Sudan	6	7	0	0	75.3%	46.2%
Nicaragua	5	1	2	5	94.7%	83.3%
Sierra Leone	5	3	2	3	86.6%	62.5%
Dominican Republic ...	5	4	1	3	80.2%	55.6%
Ethiopia	5	4	3	1	83.7%	55.6%
Algeria	5	5	3	0	80.8%	50.0%
Belize	5	5	1	2	78.7%	50.0%
Bhutan	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Cape Verde	5	5	2	1	80.0%	50.0%
Grenada	5	5	1	2	80.1%	50.0%
Jamaica	5	5	2	1	80.3%	50.0%
Jordan	5	5	2	1	79.6%	50.0%
Mongolia	5	5	0	3	79.6%	50.0%
Mozambique	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Philippines	5	5	1	2	80.5%	50.0%
Venezuela	5	5	3	0	80.6%	50.0%
Libya	5	7	1	0	74.9%	41.7%
Iran	5	8	0	0	71.8%	38.5%
Malawi	4	2	1	6	82.5%	66.7%
Guinea-Bissau	4	4	2	3	79.4%	50.0%
Honduras	4	4	0	5	78.6%	50.0%
Panama	4	4	2	3	82.2%	50.0%
Singapore	4	4	5	0	83.2%	50.0%
Yemen	4	4	0	5	81.6%	50.0%
Angola	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
Djibouti	4	5	2	2	79.6%	44.4%
Ghana	4	5	3	1	79.5%	44.4%
India	4	5	4	0	79.6%	44.4%
Madagascar	4	5	0	4	74.9%	44.4%
Namibia	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Swaziland	4	5	3	1	79.6%	44.4%
Togo	4	5	4	0	79.9%	44.4%
Zimbabwe	4	5	1	3	78.7%	44.4%
Burkina Faso	4	6	3	0	76.5%	40.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	4	6	3	0	76.6%	40.0%
Nepal	4	6	2	1	76.6%	40.0%
Belarus	4	8	0	1	71.1%	33.3%
Cameroon	3	3	5	2	85.5%	50.0%
Congo	3	4	4	2	80.8%	42.9%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	0	6	74.9%	42.9%
Eritrea	3	4	5	1	82.1%	42.9%
Guinea	3	4	5	1	81.1%	42.9%
Kenya	3	4	5	1	82.0%	42.9%
Mali	3	4	4	2	81.6%	42.9%
Benin	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Cambodia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
Laos	3	5	5	0	77.1%	37.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	5	5	0	78.9%	37.5%
Papua New Guinea	3	5	2	3	77.8%	37.5%
St. Lucia	3	5	4	1	78.3%	37.5%
Turkmenistan	3	5	0	5	67.2%	37.5%
Cuba	3	6	4	0	75.5%	33.3%
Comoros	2	2	0	9	76.8%	50.0%
Afghanistan	2	3	1	7	73.8%	40.0%
Seychelles	2	4	0	7	71.9%	33.3%
Suriname	2	5	4	2	76.8%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	3	3	69.8%	28.6%
Lebanon	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Syria	2	6	3	2	72.8%	25.0%
UR Tanzania	2	6	4	1	74.3%	25.0%
Vietnam	2	6	3	2	71.7%	25.0%
Gambia	1	1	0	11	81.1%	50.0%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	2	2	8	71.3%	33.3%
Lesotho	1	2	0	10	47.7%	33.3%
Gabon	1	3	4	5	77.1%	25.0%
Chad	1	6	3	3	70.8%	14.3%
Burundi	0	0	0	13	*	*
Central African Rep. ...	0	0	0	13	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	13	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Mauritania	0	0	0	13	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	13	*	*
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	13	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	13	*	*
Vanuatu	0	0	0	13	*	*
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	0	13	*	*
Rwanda	0	1	0	12	64.5%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	6	4	3	66.1%	0.0%
Average	4.1	4.2	1.8	2.8	79.9%	49.3%

III - Important Votes

Nordic Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Norway	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Denmark	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Finland	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Iceland	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Sweden	8	4	1	0	85.7%	66.7%
Average	8.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	88.9%	72.7%

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Hungary	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
Poland	9	3	1	0	89.3%	75.0%
United Kingdom	9	3	1	0	89.2%	75.0%
Canada	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Norway	8	2	3	0	92.3%	80.0%
Belgium	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Czech Republic	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Denmark	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Germany	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Greece	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Iceland	8	3	2	0	88.8%	72.7%
Italy	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Luxembourg	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Netherlands	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Portugal	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
Spain	8	3	2	0	88.9%	72.7%
France	8	4	1	0	85.5%	66.7%
Turkey	7	3	2	1	87.8%	70.0%
Average	8.1	2.9	1.9	0.1	89.1%	73.4%

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 1999 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	2	3	40.0%	8	23	25.8%
Albania	6	1	85.7%	33	15	68.8%
Algeria	5	5	50.0%	19	49	27.9%
Andorra	8	3	72.7%	43	21	67.2%
Angola	4	5	44.4%	20	50	28.6%
Antigua and Barbuda	5	5	50.0%	21	48	30.4%
Argentina	7	3	70.0%	28	35	44.4%
Armenia	5	5	50.0%	23	26	46.9%
Australia	8	3	72.7%	42	21	66.7%
Austria	8	4	66.7%	42	22	65.6%
Azerbaijan	5	4	55.6%	21	30	41.2%
Bahamas	6	4	60.0%	24	46	34.3%
Bahrain	6	5	54.5%	21	47	30.9%
Bangladesh	6	6	50.0%	23	50	31.5%
Barbados	7	4	63.6%	25	42	37.3%
Belarus	4	8	33.3%	21	43	32.8%
Belgium	8	3	72.7%	45	20	69.2%
Belize	5	5	50.0%	21	44	32.3%
Benin	3	5	37.5%	19	47	28.8%
Bhutan	5	5	50.0%	17	49	25.8%
Bolivia	7	4	63.6%	26	44	37.1%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	1	83.3%	32	10	76.2%
Botswana	7	5	58.3%	25	49	33.8%
Brazil	8	4	66.7%	28	44	38.9%
Brunei Darussalam	6	6	50.0%	22	49	31.0%
Bulgaria	8	3	72.7%	44	20	68.8%
Burkina Faso	4	6	40.0%	20	49	29.0%
Burundi	0	0	*	0	0	*
Cambodia	3	5	37.5%	13	49	21.0%
Cameroon	3	3	50.0%	17	43	28.3%
Canada	8	2	80.0%	45	20	69.2%
Cape Verde	5	5	50.0%	20	49	29.0%
Central African Rep.	0	0	*	0	0	*
Chad	1	6	14.3%	15	45	25.0%
Chile	7	4	63.6%	27	40	40.3%
China	3	5	37.5%	12	45	21.1%
Colombia	7	6	53.8%	26	49	34.7%
Comoros	2	2	50.0%	4	21	16.0%
Congo	3	4	42.9%	17	45	27.4%
Costa Rica	8	4	66.7%	28	38	42.4%
Cote d'Ivoire	4	6	40.0%	20	48	29.4%
Croatia	6	4	60.0%	34	26	56.7%
Cuba	3	6	33.3%	11	51	17.7%
Cyprus	7	5	58.3%	38	28	57.6%

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
Czech Republic	8	3	72.7%	43	21	67.2%
DPR of Korea	0	6	0.0%	2	47	4.1%
Dem. Rep. of Congo	1	2	33.3%	3	15	16.7%
Denmark	8	3	72.7%	46	21	68.7%
Djibouti	4	5	44.4%	22	49	31.0%
Dominica	4	4	50.0%	21	46	31.3%
Dominican Republic	5	4	55.6%	21	32	39.6%
Ecuador	8	5	61.5%	27	49	35.5%
Egypt	6	6	50.0%	20	50	28.6%
El Salvador	8	2	80.0%	27	43	38.6%
Equatorial Guinea	3	4	42.9%	15	25	37.5%
Eritrea	3	4	42.9%	18	47	27.7%
Estonia	9	2	81.8%	45	18	71.4%
Ethiopia	5	4	55.6%	22	47	31.9%
Fiji	2	5	28.6%	16	41	28.1%
Finland	8	3	72.7%	43	21	67.2%
France	8	4	66.7%	47	17	73.4%
Gabon	1	3	25.0%	7	35	16.7%
Gambia	1	1	50.0%	2	13	13.3%
Georgia	7	2	77.8%	35	16	68.6%
Germany	8	3	72.7%	47	20	70.1%
Ghana	4	5	44.4%	21	49	30.0%
Greece	8	3	72.7%	44	21	67.7%
Grenada	5	5	50.0%	24	48	33.3%
Guatemala	8	4	66.7%	27	38	41.5%
Guinea	3	4	42.9%	17	48	26.2%
Guinea-Bissau	4	4	50.0%	19	34	35.8%
Guyana	6	5	54.5%	25	49	33.8%
Haiti	7	5	58.3%	24	47	33.8%
Honduras	4	4	50.0%	18	34	34.6%
Hungary	9	3	75.0%	47	20	70.1%
Iceland	8	3	72.7%	46	21	68.7%
India	4	5	44.4%	14	50	21.9%
Indonesia	6	6	50.0%	21	49	30.0%
Iran	5	8	38.5%	19	51	27.1%
Iraq	0	0	*	0	0	*
Ireland	8	5	61.5%	41	24	63.1%
Israel	10	1	90.9%	54	6	90.0%
Italy	8	3	72.7%	44	21	67.7%
Jamaica	5	5	50.0%	23	47	32.9%
Japan	8	3	72.7%	38	22	63.3%
Jordan	5	5	50.0%	19	45	29.7%
Kazakhstan	7	3	70.0%	26	21	55.3%
Kenya	3	4	42.9%	17	46	27.0%
Kiribati	0	0	*	0	0	*
Kuwait	7	5	58.3%	25	48	34.2%
Kyrgyzstan	0	0	*	0	0	*
Laos	3	5	37.5%	9	47	16.1%
Latvia	7	2	77.8%	39	19	67.2%
Lebanon	2	6	25.0%	15	49	23.4%
Lesotho	1	2	33.3%	1	4	20.0%
Liberia	0	0	*	0	0	*

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 1999

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PER CENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PER CENT
Libya	5	7	41.7%	18	51	26.1%
Liechtenstein	8	4	66.7%	43	22	66.2%
Lithuania	8	3	72.7%	44	20	68.8%
Luxembourg	8	3	72.7%	45	20	69.2%
Madagascar	4	5	44.4%	16	33	32.7%
Malawi	4	2	66.7%	13	14	48.1%
Malaysia	6	6	50.0%	23	48	32.4%
Maldives	6	5	54.5%	26	47	35.6%
Mali	3	4	42.9%	20	47	29.9%
Malta	8	4	66.7%	42	28	60.0%
Marshall Islands	5	2	71.4%	41	14	74.5%
Mauritania	0	0	*	0	0	*
Mauritius	7	3	70.0%	26	47	35.6%
Mexico	6	5	54.5%	21	49	30.0%
Micronesia	7	0	100.0%	33	0	100.0%
Monaco	9	4	69.2%	45	17	72.6%
Mongolia	5	5	50.0%	22	46	32.4%
Morocco	6	4	60.0%	20	45	30.8%
Mozambique	5	5	50.0%	21	48	30.4%
Myanmar (Burma)	3	5	37.5%	13	49	21.0%
Namibia	4	5	44.4%	20	49	29.0%
Nauru	0	0	*	0	0	*
Nepal	4	6	40.0%	21	49	30.0%
Netherlands	8	3	72.7%	46	20	69.7%
New Zealand	8	4	66.7%	41	25	62.1%
Nicaragua	5	1	83.3%	23	37	38.3%
Niger	0	0	*	0	0	*
Nigeria	6	4	60.0%	25	46	35.2%
Norway	8	2	80.0%	44	20	68.8%
Oman	6	4	60.0%	21	47	30.9%
Pakistan	6	5	54.5%	16	48	25.0%
Palau	0	0	*	0	0	*
Panama	4	4	50.0%	22	46	32.4%
Papua New Guinea	3	5	37.5%	18	49	26.9%
Paraguay	8	4	66.7%	28	43	39.4%
Peru	6	4	60.0%	25	45	35.7%
Philippines	5	5	50.0%	23	49	31.9%
Poland	9	3	75.0%	45	21	68.2%
Portugal	8	3	72.7%	44	21	67.7%
Qatar	6	5	54.5%	22	48	31.4%
Republic of Korea	7	3	70.0%	35	22	61.4%
Republic of Moldova	7	3	70.0%	41	21	66.1%
Romania	9	3	75.0%	45	21	68.2%
Russia	4	6	40.0%	29	34	46.0%
Rwanda	0	1	0.0%	1	9	10.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	1	4	20.0%	10	14	41.7%
St. Lucia	3	5	37.5%	17	49	25.8%
St. Vincent/Gren.	2	4	33.3%	12	30	28.6%
Samoa	6	4	60.0%	26	38	40.6%
San Marino	8	4	66.7%	40	26	60.6%
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	*	0	0	*

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
Saudi Arabia	7	4	63.6%	21	47	30.9%
Senegal	7	5	58.3%	26	48	35.1%
Seychelles	2	4	33.3%	11	30	26.8%
Sierra Leone	5	3	62.5%	22	44	33.3%
Singapore	4	4	50.0%	20	43	31.7%
Slovak Republic	8	3	72.7%	44	21	67.7%
Slovenia	8	3	72.7%	44	21	67.7%
Solomon Islands	7	4	63.6%	26	42	38.2%
Somalia	0	0	*	0	0	*
South Africa	7	5	58.3%	25	38	39.7%
Spain	8	3	72.7%	44	21	67.7%
Sri Lanka	6	6	50.0%	24	50	32.4%
Sudan	6	7	46.2%	19	52	26.8%
Suriname	2	5	28.6%	16	48	25.0%
Swaziland	4	5	44.4%	20	45	30.8%
Sweden	8	4	66.7%	43	23	65.2%
Syria	2	6	25.0%	12	47	20.3%
Tajikistan	5	6	45.5%	21	34	38.2%
Thailand	6	5	54.5%	24	47	33.8%
TFYR Macedonia	6	3	66.7%	34	27	55.7%
Togo	4	5	44.4%	20	47	29.9%
Tonga	0	0	*	0	0	*
Trinidad and Tobago	6	3	66.7%	25	47	34.7%
Tunisia	6	5	54.5%	22	49	31.0%
Turkey	7	3	70.0%	37	29	56.1%
Turkmenistan	3	5	37.5%	13	16	44.8%
Uganda	2	5	28.6%	14	26	35.0%
Ukraine	6	3	66.7%	30	30	50.0%
United Arab Emirates ...	6	4	60.0%	23	47	32.9%
United Kingdom	9	3	75.0%	50	16	75.8%
UR Tanzania	2	6	25.0%	15	50	23.1%
Uruguay	5	4	55.6%	24	42	36.4%
Uzbekistan	6	1	85.7%	21	5	80.8%
Vanuatu	0	0	*	0	0	*
Venezuela	5	5	50.0%	23	48	32.4%
Vietnam	2	6	25.0%	9	50	15.3%
Yemen	4	4	50.0%	15	47	24.2%
Yugoslavia (S/M)	0	0	*	0	0	*
Zambia	6	5	54.5%	23	47	32.9%
Zimbabwe	4	5	44.4%	20	50	28.6%
Average	5.1	3.8	57.2%	23.7	33.0	41.8%

