

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 55th UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2000, 11 votes meet these criteria.

Section III has five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 11 important votes at the 55th UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the 16 important resolutions adopted by consensus at the 55th 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 (83).

IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 11 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. Israeli Actions in Occupied Territories

A/Res/ES-10/7 October 20 92-6(US)-46

Condemns the violence that took place on September 28, 2000, and the following days at Al-Haram Al-Sharif and other holy places, especially the excessive use of force by Israeli forces against Palestinian civilians; expresses support for the understandings reached at the summit convened at Sharm El-Sheikh, Egypt; reiterates that Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, are illegal and an obstacle to peace; demands that Israel, the occupying power, abide by its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949; strongly supports the establishment of a mechanism of

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

inquiry into the recent events and requests that the Secretary General report to the General Assembly on the progress made in these efforts; and invites Switzerland as depositary of the Fourth Geneva Conventions to consult on the humanitarian situation, in accordance with the statement of the Conference of High Contracting Parties adopted July 15, 1999.

The United States opposed the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly because it would serve only to distract the attention of the parties and would likely damage the prospects for peace. The United States voted against the resolution because it was biased and would only exacerbate the situation on the ground. Also voting against the resolution were Israel, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, and Tuvalu. A significant number of countries (46) abstained. Instead of convening an emergency session, the priority should have been on supporting implementation of the understandings reached by the parties at Sharm El-Sheikh that were endorsed by President Clinton, the UN Secretary General, Egypt, and Jordan. These understandings formed the best basis for progress.

2. U.S. Embargo of Cuba

A/Res/55/20

November 9

167-3(US)-4

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. The U.S. decision to maintain a trade embargo against the Government of Cuba is strictly a matter of bilateral trade policy and not a matter appropriate for consideration in or by the General Assembly. The contention, implicit in the resolution, that the United States forbids others from trading with Cuba is simply wrong. Sovereign states themselves decide with which other states they will trade. Because of the repressive policies and actions of the Cuban Government itself, the United States chooses not to trade with it. The United States imposed and maintains a bilateral economic trade embargo as one element of a policy of promoting democracy in Cuba. While maintaining the embargo, the U.S. Government has moved to expand dramatically people-to-people contacts with the Cuban population, to increase remittances, and to help foster the growth of nongovernmental organizations that are truly independent of the Government of Cuba. In October 2000, the U.S. Government passed a law allowing the sale of food to Cuba. 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, to protect human rights, to help develop a thriving civil society, and to provide for the economic prosperity that the Cuban Government's disastrous economic

III - Important Votes

policies are denying the Cuban people. The focus of the United Nations should be on the continuing human rights crisis in Cuba rather than on bilateral aspects of U.S. efforts to facilitate a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. This resolution served only to distract the attention of the international community and, worse, encourage the Cuban authorities to persist in their misguided policies. (Israel and the Marshall Islands also voted against this resolution; El Salvador, Latvia, Morocco, and Nicaragua abstained.)

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

A/Res/55/33B November 20 88-5(US)-66

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; urges all UN member states to support efforts aimed at stemming the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery; and welcomes the U.S. decision of September 1, 2000, not to authorize deployment of a national missile defense at this time.

The United States again in 2000 opposed this resolution. The new paragraph that was added welcoming President Clinton's decision of September 1 not to deploy a national missile defense at this time made the resolution worse; it essentially ignored the President's decision by failing to make any other changes to the resolution to take into account how the decision had changed the landscape on ABM issues. Moreover, the change did not remedy the basic flaws that caused the United States to oppose this initiative from the beginning. The resolution was still based on the premise that preserving and strengthening the ABM treaty is incompatible with amending it. This was a peculiar view to take of a treaty that specifically provides a mechanism for considering proposals for further increasing the viability of the treaty, including proposals for amendments. The ABM treaty has in fact already been amended. This resolution continues to place the UN General Assembly in the position of taking sides in ongoing discussions between the United States and Russia, and making judgments about substantive issues in the discussions, whereas questions about the treaty are for the treaty parties to resolve. That process will only be hindered by having the General Assembly take sides.

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

A/Res/55/33C November 20 154(US)-3-8

Calls for upholding a moratorium on nuclear explosions pending entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT); agrees that

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

the Conference on Disarmament should negotiate a treaty within five years banning production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; calls on nuclear states to take steps leading to nuclear disarmament to reduce unilaterally their nuclear arsenals, and to show increased transparency in their nuclear-weapon capabilities in fulfillment of their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT); and notes that recommendations regarding legally binding assurances by the five nuclear-weapon states (NWS) to non-nuclear-weapon states should be made by the Preparatory Committee of the 2005 NPT Review Conference.

The United States was able to support the resolution on this subject in 2000, unlike in past years, because it recognized that nuclear disarmament is a step-by-step process that requires pragmatic proposals, not political calls for impossible goals. Incremental steps—negotiation of additional treaties and agreements, unilateral initiatives reflecting national and international security and stability concerns—are the best way to bring about a world free of nuclear weapons. The United States reviewed this resolution in light of the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference in the spring, and was able to give it general support.

5. Reducing Nuclear Danger

A/Res/55/33N

November 20

110-45(US)-14

Calls for a review of nuclear doctrines and, in this context, immediate steps to reduce risks of unintentional use of nuclear weapons; asks the five nuclear-weapon states to take measures to implement the call; and calls on UN member states to take necessary measures to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects and promote nuclear disarmament toward the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

The United States voted against this resolution because it was unrealistic and failed to acknowledge the real progress being made on unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral fronts to reduce nuclear dangers. Unilateral and bilateral efforts over the past decade have reduced the size of nuclear arsenals. There is now less possibility of a nuclear exchange involving the five nuclear-weapon states than at any other time over the past 50 years. This impractical resolution would have done nothing to promote nuclear disarmament. It did not even mention the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which succeeded in adopting substantial, agreed, and practical steps for nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament that will reduce nuclear dangers. This resolution also called for convening an international conference to identify ways to eliminate nuclear dangers. It remained the U.S. view that now is not the time to convene such a conference, and, should one become necessary, it should be convened as a Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, with a balanced agenda and objectives.

III - Important Votes

6. Risk of Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East

A/Res/55/36 November 20 157-3(US)-8

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 the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as a confidence-building measure.

The United States once again voted against the resolution on this subject because it continued the tradition of a one-sided attack on one country in the region and presented an inaccurate picture of the nuclear weapons proliferation problem in the region. Not only was the resolution one-sided, but also it did not address several specific concerns about compliance with NPT treaty obligations in the region. For example, there was no mention of the one country in the region that has been found in non-compliance with the NPT, no mention of steps being taken by some NPT parties in the region to develop the capability to acquire nuclear weapons, and no call on Middle East states to join the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. This resolution was a step backward from the cooperative spirit engendered in the NPT Review Conference in May 2000. It was also a step away from cooperative efforts to address the applications of safeguards in the Middle East at the IAEA General Conference.

7. "Honor Crimes" Against Women

A/Res/55/66 December 4 146(US)-1-26

Expresses concern that women continue to be victims of violence, including crimes committed in the name of honor; welcomes activities of states, UN bodies and programs, and civil society toward elimination of honor crimes against women; calls on states to take measures toward that end.

The United States welcomed this first-ever resolution to eliminate honor crimes, but did not cosponsor it because it omitted some vital language that seriously undermined its effectiveness in stopping honor crimes. It did not mention that many perpetrators of honor crimes go unpunished. It did not call for legislation and policy decisions to ensure that perpetrators are punished. And it did not invite states to report honor crimes to relevant treaty bodies.

8. Promoting and Consolidating Democracy

A/Res/55/96 December 4 157(US)-0-16

Calls on states to promote and consolidate democracy by means including: promoting pluralism and maximizing participation of individuals in decision-making; respecting human rights; strengthening the rule of law; developing a

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

free and fair electoral system providing genuine and periodic elections; improving the wide participation of all members of civil society in promotion and consolidation of democracy; good governance; and promoting sustainable development.

The United States cosponsored and strongly supported this resolution, based on a resolution adopted by the UN Commission on Human Rights in the spring and introduced in the General Assembly by Romania. The resolution grew out of the Warsaw Conference of the Community of Democracies held in Warsaw, Poland.

9. Globalization and Human Rights

A/Res/55/102 December 4 112-46(US)-15

Recognizes that, while globalization may affect human rights, the promotion of human rights is first and foremost the responsibility of the state, that the benefits and costs of globalization are unevenly distributed, and that only efforts at the global level can make it equitable, thus contributing to the full enjoyment of all human rights; realizes that globalization has economic, social, political, environmental, cultural, and legal dimensions that have an impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights; and expresses concern that while globalization offers great opportunities, its benefits are very unevenly shared and its costs are unevenly distributed, which affects the economic, social, and cultural rights of peoples of the developing countries.

The United States believes the globalization process offers many positive impacts on worldwide enjoyment of human rights. However, the United States opposed this resolution introduced by Egypt because it strongly implies that globalization interferes with enjoyment of human rights by people in developing countries. In fact, many developing countries have experienced unprecedented economic growth, reductions in poverty levels, and new participation in their own governments in large part due to opportunities made possible by globalization and seized by those countries. Also, people in countries where human rights are enjoyed least were in similar straits long before globalization was an issue. Their marginalization is generally of long standing and came about due to internal factors, not because of the globalization process.

10. Human Rights in Iran

A/Res/55/114 December 4 67(US)-54-46

Expresses concern about continuing violations of human rights in Iran, in particular freedom of the press, executions, torture, and discrimination against members of religious minorities, particularly the Baha'is, and against women; calls on Iran to invite the Special Representative of the UN Commission on Human Rights to visit Iran and to cooperate with him; calls on Iran to abide by

III - Important Votes

human rights instruments and ensure that capital punishment will be imposed only for the most serious crimes; and calls on Iran to eliminate discrimination on religious grounds or against members of minorities, to end torture and genocide, and to promote equal human rights for women.

The United States cosponsored this fair and balanced resolution, introduced by the European Union, to highlight once again the egregious violations of human rights in Iran. Although there had been some positive developments in Iran, the situation of human rights remained extremely fragile, particularly in the volatile Iranian political environment, where attacks have accelerated on freedom of the press and freedom of expression. Religious freedom remains curtailed. Iran's Bahai community is subjected to continued intense repression by Iranian authorities, and Iranian Jews remain in jail, convicted without the benefit of internationally recognized due process rights. While women participate actively in the society, they are denied basic rights and equality under the law. Iran continued to deny entry to the UN special representative on human rights in Iran.

11. Human Rights in Iraq

A/Res/55/115

December 4

102(US)-3-60

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 its obligations under international human rights treaties, to bring the actions of its military into conformity with international law, to cooperate with UN human rights mechanisms, to establish 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 cosponsored this resolution, introduced by the European Union, to highlight and condemn the alarming human rights situation in Iraq.

IMPORTANT CONSENSUS RESOLUTIONS

The 16 important resolutions listed and discussed below were adopted by consensus at the 55th 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.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

1. Scale of Assessments for the Regular UN Budget

A/Res/55/5A-B December 23

Decides that the scale of assessments for the period 2001-2003 shall, inter alia, have a maximum rate of 22 percent for any country's contribution, and shall be based on current economic statistics.

The effect of the reduction in the maximum assessment rate is a reduction in the U.S. assessment from 25 percent, the previous maximum, to 22 percent. It was the first time since 1974 that the ceiling rate for the UN regular budget had been reduced to a lower level. The United States worked vigorously in the UN General Assembly and in UN members' capitals to achieve this outcome. The reduction to 22 percent not only reduced the level of the U.S. assessment, but also addressed a key legislative requirement that would enable payment of U.S. arrears to the United Nations and other international organizations. The successful outcome of this high-priority and difficult issue was a major accomplishment for the United States.

2. Review of HIV/AIDS

A/Res/55/13 November 3

Decides to convene as a matter of urgency a special session of the General Assembly, during June 25-27, 2001, to review and address the problem of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) and secure a global commitment to enhance coordination and intensification of national, regional, and international efforts to combat it in a comprehensive manner.

The United States, believing that HIV/AIDS is one of the greatest threats facing human kind and that it should be a primary focus of all countries, and believing also that present global efforts have not been nearly sufficient, gave strong support to this resolution and to the convening of a special session in order to intensify efforts to combat this pandemic. The U.S. goal at the special session will be to secure a global declaration of political commitment to enhance coordination and intensification of national, regional, and international efforts to combat HIV/AIDS.

3. Role of Diamonds in Fueling Conflict

A/Res/55/56 December 1

Calls on all states to implement Security Council measures targeting the link between the trade in conflict diamonds and the supply to rebel movements of weapons, fuel, or other prohibited materiel; urges all states to support efforts of the diamond producing, processing, exporting, and importing countries and the diamond industry to find ways to break the link between conflict diamonds

III - Important Votes

and armed conflict; welcomes the offer of the Government of Namibia to convene a workshop of the world's leading diamond exporting, processing, and importing countries, continuing the momentum of the Kimberley Process to consider technical aspects pertaining to the envisaged international certification scheme for rough diamonds; recognizes that the vast majority of rough diamonds come from legitimate sources and that legitimate trade in diamonds makes a critical contribution to the economies of several countries; and encourages the countries participating in the Kimberley Process to consider expanding the membership of the Process in order to allow all key states with a significant interest in the world diamond industry to participate in meetings to develop the envisaged international certification scheme for rough diamonds.

The United States, wishing to break the deadly link between diamonds and conflict in Africa, while avoiding damage to the legitimate production of diamonds, co-sponsored and strongly supported this resolution drafted by South Africa. The United States pressed for the global certification system envisaged in the resolution as well as expansion of the Kimberley Process

4. Combating the Criminal Misuse of Information Technologies (Cyber Crime)

A/Res/55/63

December 4

Invites states to take note of the following measures in their efforts to combat the criminal misuse of information technologies: (a) ensure that laws and practice eliminate safe havens for those who criminally misuse information technologies, (b) cooperate and coordinate with concerned states in the investigation and prosecution of international cases, (c) exchange information with states regarding the problems they face in combating criminal misuse of information technologies, (d) train and equip law enforcement personnel to address such criminal misuse, (e) provide legal protection for the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data, (f) permit the preservation and quick access to data pertaining to criminal investigations, (g) ensure that mutual assistance regimes provide for the timely gathering and exchange of evidence in such cases, (h) inform the public of the need to prevent criminal misuse of information technology, (i) design information technology to help prevent and detect criminal misuse, and (j) take into account the need to protect individual freedoms and privacy.

The United States, because of its concern that technological advancements have created new possibilities for criminal activity, in particular the criminal misuse of information technologies, introduced this resolution, with 58 cosponsors, with a view to combating computer-related crimes.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

5. Human Rights in Myanmar (Burma)

A/Res/55/112 December 4

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 increasingly systematic policy of the Government to persecute the democratic opposition; urges the Government of Myanmar to cease all activities aimed at preventing free exercise of internationally recognized human rights, including freedom of association, assembly, movement, and speech, and in particular to remove all restrictions on the freedom of movement of Aung San Suu Kyi and other members of the National League for Democracy; urges the Government to release detained political leaders and all political prisoners; expresses grave concern about 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 to seek new ways to promote national reconciliation and restore democracy, in accordance with the will of the people as expressed in the democratic elections held in 1990, and, to that end, to engage in a substantive dialogue with political leaders, including Aung San Suu Kyi; and representatives of ethnic groups; urges the Government to eradicate forced labor; deplores continued violations of human rights of women and of persons belonging to ethnic and religious minorities; and urges the Government to end 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. The United States has for several years supported a resolution on human rights in Burma, considering it one of the primary vehicles by which the international community can voice its disapproval of the Burmese regime's dismal human rights record and its refusal to enter into a dialogue with the democratically elected opposition.

6. Human Rights in Parts of South-Eastern Europe

A/Res/55/113 December 4

Reiterates the call for the full implementation of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in the region; stresses the crucial role of human rights in the successful implementation of the Peace Agreement; condemns the growing problem of trafficking in women in the region; urges all parties to cooperate

III - Important Votes

with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia; notes that varying degrees of progress have been made on human rights in the area, but that substantial efforts remain to be made; reiterates the call on all parties to ensure that promotion and protection of human rights and effective, functioning democratic institutions will be central elements in developing civilian structures; notes the progress made with regard to refugee returns in Bosnia and Herzegovina (B/H), while calling on all authorities to support the return process; condemns the recurrent instances of religious discrimination and press manipulation in B/H; welcomes the political change following the recent elections in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY), which shows the clear decision of the people to choose democracy, respect for human rights, and integration into the international community; welcomes the commitment of the FRY to investigate past abuses of human rights, including in Kosovo; calls on the FRY authorities to cooperate fully with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia; and underlines the obligation of the FRY authorities to abide by the terms of Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) on the political solution to the Kosovo crisis.

The United States again in 2000 introduced a resolution on human rights in south-eastern Europe. This resolution, which reflects the dramatic changes following the elections in the FRY, is one aspect of the continuing, long-term effort by the United States 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.

7. Review of Peacekeeping Operations

A/Res/55/135 December 8

Welcomes the report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Brahimi Report); endorses the proposals, recommendations, and conclusions of the report; urges member states, the Secretariat, and relevant UN organs to implement these proposals, recommendations, and conclusions; and decides that the Special Committee shall continue its efforts for a comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations, review the implementation of its previous proposals, and consider any new proposals so as to enhance the capacity of the United Nations to fulfill its responsibilities in this field. This resolution was adopted following a special session of a Special Committee dedicated to review of the Brahimi Report. The Special Committee report endorsed many of the Brahimi recommendations, including the need for an emergency increase in resources (95 new positions, in Resolution 238) to back-stop peacekeeping.

The United States strongly supported these resolutions implementing the Brahimi recommendations, believing that the Brahimi Report correctly identified many of the reasons why peacekeeping operations had proven difficult, and offered some excellent suggestions for improving them. It has been a long-standing policy of the United States to improve these operations, pressing

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

especially for practical measures to enhance peacekeeping capabilities, to improve the capacity to assess conflict situations effectively, to plan and manage operations more efficiently, and to respond quickly and effectively to Security Council mandates. The United States also believed that the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations was understaffed to perform its functions properly, and that the 95 posts approved were needed to fill critical gaps.

8. International Trade and Development

A/Res/55/182 December 20

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, which contributes to the economic and social advancement of all countries by promoting the liberalization and expansion of trade, employment, and stability; reiterates the importance of continued trade liberalization; stresses the need to facilitate the integration of the countries of Africa into the world economy; and recognizes the importance of regional economic integration.

The United States was able to join consensus on this resolution because, in line with U.S. views, it emphasizes the importance of trade as an engine of development, the necessity of maintaining an open and rule-based international trading system, the need for trade liberalization, and the responsibility of each country for its own economic policies for sustainable development.

9. External Debt Problem of Developing Countries

A/Res/55/184 December 20

Recognizes that effective 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 sustained economic growth and sustainable development; calls for the full and effective implementation of the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative; calls on the HIPC countries to take the policy measures necessary to become eligible for the initiative; calls for concerted national and international action to address debt problems of middle-income developing countries; stresses that debt relief should contribute to development; notes that debt relief alone will not lead to poverty reduction and economic growth and, in this regard, emphasizes the need for sound economic management as well as an efficient, transparent, and accountable public service; and stresses the importance for developing countries to promote a favorable environment for attracting foreign investment, thereby promoting economic growth and sustainable development so as to favor their exit from debt and debt-service problems.

III - Important Votes

The U.S. Government was able again in 2000 to join consensus on the resolution on this subject because 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. Because unsustainable debt can halt progress, drag down growth, and drain resources needed to meet basic human needs, the United States endorsed debt relief via the HIPC initiative. It is the U.S. view that the purpose of debt relief is to free up capital for development. This idea is incorporated in the resolution. 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.

10. Financing for Development

A/Res/55/186 December 20

Notes that the planned high-level international intergovernmental event on financing for development will provide a unique opportunity to consider all sources of financing for development; underlines the utmost importance of implementing the resolve to create an environment that is conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty through good governance within each country as well as transparency in the financial, monetary, and trading systems; also underlines the importance of open, equitable, rule-based, predictable, and nondiscriminatory multilateral trading and financial systems; also stresses the special importance of creating an enabling domestic environment through the rule of law, capacity-building, and implementation of appropriate economic and social policies; recognizes that stability of the international financial system is an important global public good; stresses the importance of strong domestic institutions to promote financial stability; welcomes the progress made in developing early warning capacities to address the threat of financial crisis; calls on the international community to support the promotion of long-term private financial flows, especially foreign direct investment; and reaffirms the need to consider appropriate frameworks for involvement of the private sector in the prevention and resolution of financial crisis.

While believing that the strengthening of the international financial system and its stability are primarily the province of the international financial institutions instead of the United Nations, the United States was able to join consensus on this resolution, which helps to carry forward the dialogue on this subject. The United States welcomed inclusion of an emphasis in the resolution on the need for countries to devote domestic financial resources to development instead of relying excessively on official development assistance from abroad. The mention of the need for good national economic policies was also welcome.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

11. World Summit on Sustainable Development (Rio + 10)

A/Res/55/199 December 20

Decides to organize a 10-year review of progress achieved in implementation of the outcome of the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 2002 at the summit level to reinvigorate the global commitment to sustainable development, to call the review the World Summit on Sustainable Development; and to accept the offer of the Government of South Africa to host the summit.

While supporting the concept of a 10-year review, the United States dissociated from consensus on holding the event as a global conference and explained that it would be unable to pay its share of UN funding if current legislation were to be renewed and, as a result, U.S. policy would be not to support the convening of new global conferences in the UN system.

12. Globalization and Interdependence

A/Res/55/212 December 20

Calls for effective addressing of globalization, including by making the decision-making process of international economic and financial policy more participatory; stresses the importance, at the national level, of maintaining sound economic policies and developing effective institutional and regulatory frameworks and human resources so as to realize development; encourages developing countries to pursue appropriate policies to promote economic development and poverty eradication; urges the international community to support foreign direct investment, enhanced official development assistance, the search for a durable solution to the external debt problem, market access, and the dissemination of knowledge and technology in order to achieve the sustainable development of Africa and the participation of all African countries in the global economy; reaffirms the resolve to give greater opportunities to the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and civil society to contribute to UN programs, and thereby offset the negative economic and social consequences of globalization; and asks the Secretary General to report on the effect of increasing linkages and interdependencies among trade, finance, knowledge, technology, and investment on growth and development in the context of globalization, containing action-oriented recommendations.

The United States was able to join consensus on this resolution because it did not try to stop the process of globalization nor interfere with the fundamental processes of market discipline that keep production efficient and growing. The resolution also stressed the need for developing countries to maintain sound economic policies and good governance, in accord with the U.S. view that the benefits accruing to any country from globalization depend to a great extent on that country's economic, political, and legal environment.

13. Results-Based Budgeting

A/Res/55/231 December 23

Approves the Secretary General's proposal to implement results-based budgeting throughout the United Nations, beginning with the budget for 2002-2003, and notes that the measures are intended to provide a management tool that should enhance responsibility and accountability in the implementation of programs and budgets. Also decides that the implementation should be accomplished in a gradual and incremental manner and in compliance with existing rules and regulations for planning, programming, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluation. Furthermore, emphasizes the need for the UN Secretariat to continue improving its program evaluation capacity by strengthening standard evaluation methodologies. In addition, stresses that the evaluation of program delivery, with a focus on expected accomplishments, should be implemented in a way that is flexible and complementary to the existing evaluation system.

The United States backed results-based budgeting since it was presented in part of the 1997 package of reforms proposed by the Secretary General. Its approval by the General Assembly is a significant advancement in the drive to create a UN culture in which results are measured regularly and both program managers and member states are better able to determine how the organization's resources are used.

14. Scale of Assessments for UN Peacekeeping Operations

A/Res/55/235 December 23

Decides to establish an official scale of assessments for UN peacekeeping operations, with effect from July 1, 2001. The new scale is composed of 10 assessment levels, which take into account economic factors in determining members' eligibility for discounts on their respective assessments for peacekeeping. The Permanent Members of the Security Council would continue to be assessed a premium to reflect their special responsibility for UN peacekeeping activities.

The United States worked vigorously to place this item on the agenda of the General Assembly and to reach agreement on this significant reform of the peacekeeping scale. The debate in the General Assembly was contentious, reflecting the divergent views of the UN membership on how the costs of UN peacekeeping operations should be assessed. Agreement on the new scale was reached only after extensive negotiation and the willingness of many members to be flexible on aspects of their negotiating positions. As approved, the new scale will result in a significant reduction in the assessment rate for the United States—from 30.28 percent in year 2000 to 28.134 percent by the end of year 2001. The U.S. rate will decline further in 2002 and 2003 to an expected level of just over 27 percent. Although the new rate falls somewhat short of the U.S.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

goal of 25 percent, the reduction represents a major achievement for the United States. Moreover, the United Nations now has an official scale of assessments for peacekeeping that is based on defined economic criteria.

15. UN Budget for 2000-2001

A/Res/55/238-239 December 23

Affirms that for the 2000-2001 biennium, the budget amount of \$2,535,689,200 appropriated in December 1999 shall be reduced to a revised total of \$2,533,125,400.

The United States joined consensus on these budget resolutions for the current 2000-2001 biennium because spending increases in a number of areas were more than offset by decreases resulting from savings in other parts of the UN budget. As revised, the UN budget is below the initial level approved for the biennium in 1999 and is consistent with the U.S. objective of ensuring budget discipline in the United Nations.

16. Proposed Program Budget Outline for 2002-2003

Decision December 22

Approves the preliminary estimate of resources needed for proposed program activities in the amount of \$2.515 billion for the biennium 2002-2003. The estimate provides guidance to the Secretary General in his preparation of the detailed budget request for the next biennium.

This estimate was in keeping with U.S. policy requiring strict budget discipline. It is below the current UN budget of \$2.533 billion and includes provision for the funding of special political missions—a priority activity for the United States. However, because of current uncertainties regarding costs, the preliminary estimate does not include provision for the full implementation of the Brahimi panel recommendations on peacekeeping and the Secretary General's proposals regarding the safety and security of UN personnel. It is expected that the cost estimates will be clarified later and will be included in the Secretary General's budget request for the biennium 2002-2003.

COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member performance at the 55th UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 11 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 11 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 15 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the end of the second paragraph in this section.)

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.

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

All Countries (Alphabetical)

COUNTRY					VOTING COINCIDENCE	
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	2	2	0	7	80.7%	50.0%
Albania	8	2	1	0	89.8%	80.0%
Algeria	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Andorra	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Angola	4	5	1	1	77.0%	44.4%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	3	5	3	0	78.1%	37.5%
Argentina	4	3	4	0	87.0%	57.1%
Armenia	3	5	3	0	78.8%	37.5%
Australia	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Austria	7	3	1	0	88.4%	70.0%
Azerbaijan	3	7	1	0	71.8%	30.0%
Bahamas	4	4	2	1	83.1%	50.0%
Bahrain	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Bangladesh	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Barbados	5	5	1	0	80.6%	50.0%
Belarus	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Belgium	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Belize	5	6	0	0	76.4%	45.5%
Benin	3	6	2	0	74.2%	33.3%
Bhutan	2	6	2	1	72.3%	25.0%
Bolivia	5	5	1	0	80.8%	50.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	5	2	1	3	87.7%	71.4%
Botswana	4	6	1	0	76.2%	40.0%
Brazil	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	3	0	70.8%	12.5%
Bulgaria	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Burkina Faso	3	6	2	0	75.6%	33.3%
Burundi	3	5	2	1	77.9%	37.5%
Cambodia	3	5	1	2	78.5%	37.5%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	79.5%	33.3%
Canada	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Cape Verde	3	6	2	0	74.6%	33.3%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	11	*	*
Chad	2	3	1	5	78.1%	40.0%
Chile	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
China	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Colombia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Comoros	2	4	1	4	74.7%	33.3%
Congo	2	3	1	5	65.4%	40.0%
Costa Rica	5	3	3	0	86.8%	62.5%
Cote d'Ivoire	5	6	0	0	75.7%	45.5%
Croatia	5	3	3	0	87.5%	62.5%
Cuba	2	7	2	0	71.3%	22.2%
Cyprus	6	4	1	0	84.6%	60.0%
Czech Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	3	2	5	58.8%	25.0%
DPR of Korea	0	7	1	3	62.3%	0.0%
Denmark	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Djibouti	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Dominica	4	2	0	5	78.9%	66.7%

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Dominican Republic ...	3	4	4	0	82.5%	42.9%
Ecuador	5	6	0	0	77.8%	45.5%
Egypt	2	7	2	0	71.8%	22.2%
El Salvador	5	3	2	1	86.6%	62.5%
Equatorial Guinea	1	4	0	6	65.9%	20.0%
Eritrea	3	4	3	1	81.7%	42.9%
Estonia	7	1	2	1	95.7%	87.5%
Ethiopia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Fiji	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Finland	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
France	6	4	1	0	84.0%	60.0%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	76.5%	28.6%
Gambia	3	6	1	1	70.3%	33.3%
Georgia	5	2	3	1	91.1%	71.4%
Germany	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Ghana	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Greece	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Grenada	5	5	1	0	80.3%	50.0%
Guatemala	5	3	3	0	87.1%	62.5%
Guinea	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	11	*	*
Guyana	4	7	0	0	73.9%	36.4%
Haiti	4	5	2	0	78.7%	44.4%
Honduras	4	4	1	2	82.6%	50.0%
Hungary	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Iceland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
India	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Indonesia	3	7	1	0	72.9%	30.0%
Iran	2	7	1	1	71.1%	22.2%
Iraq	0	0	0	11	*	*
Ireland	7	4	0	0	85.2%	63.6%
Israel	9	1	1	0	96.2%	90.0%
Italy	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Jamaica	4	6	1	0	75.5%	40.0%
Japan	6	2	3	0	91.7%	75.0%
Jordan	2	6	2	1	74.6%	25.0%
Kazakhstan	4	5	2	0	78.5%	44.4%
Kenya	2	5	4	0	78.1%	28.6%
Kiribati	0	1	0	10	16.2%	0.0%
Kuwait	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	4	0	77.1%	28.6%
Laos	2	7	2	0	68.9%	22.2%
Latvia	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Lebanon	2	7	1	1	70.6%	22.2%
Lesotho	3	5	2	1	72.6%	37.5%
Liberia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Libya	1	8	2	0	68.0%	11.1%
Liechtenstein	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Lithuania	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Luxembourg	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Madagascar	3	6	1	1	74.8%	33.3%
Malawi	4	5	1	1	74.2%	44.4%
Malaysia	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Maldives	2	6	2	1	74.4%	25.0%
Mali	3	6	1	1	74.6%	33.3%
Malta	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Marshall Islands	8	1	2	0	95.9%	88.9%
Mauritania	1	2	0	8	81.3%	33.3%
Mauritius	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Mexico	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
Micronesia	9	0	1	1	100.0%	100.0%
Monaco	6	4	1	0	83.9%	60.0%
Mongolia	5	6	0	0	77.3%	45.5%
Morocco	2	5	2	2	76.7%	28.6%
Mozambique	3	6	2	0	75.0%	33.3%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	7	3	0	70.6%	12.5%
Namibia	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Nauru	6	4	1	0	83.9%	60.0%
Nepal	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Netherlands	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
New Zealand	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Nicaragua	4	3	4	0	86.3%	57.1%
Niger	0	0	0	11	*	*
Nigeria	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Norway	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Oman	1	7	2	1	69.1%	12.5%
Pakistan	0	8	2	1	65.3%	0.0%
Palau	5	0	0	6	100.0%	100.0%
Panama	4	5	1	1	79.8%	44.4%
Papua New Guinea	5	5	0	1	80.0%	50.0%
Paraguay	4	3	4	0	87.0%	57.1%
Peru	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Philippines	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Poland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Portugal	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Qatar	1	6	3	1	73.7%	14.3%
Republic of Korea	4	3	4	0	86.5%	57.1%
Republic of Moldova	6	3	1	1	87.6%	66.7%
Romania	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Russia	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Rwanda	2	2	2	5	73.2%	50.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	4	0	5	69.5%	33.3%
St. Lucia	3	5	2	1	78.5%	37.5%
St. Vincent/Gren.	4	5	1	1	72.0%	44.4%
Samoa	5	4	2	0	83.2%	55.6%
San Marino	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Sao Tome and Principe	4	2	0	5	78.4%	66.7%
Saudi Arabia	2	6	2	1	73.7%	25.0%
Senegal	4	7	0	0	74.1%	36.4%
Seychelles	0	0	0	11	*	*

III - Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sierra Leone	2	5	3	1	76.5%	28.6%
Singapore	3	4	4	0	82.6%	42.9%
Slovak Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Slovenia	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Solomon Islands	5	3	1	2	86.3%	62.5%
Somalia	0	0	0	11	*	*
South Africa	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
Spain	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Sri Lanka	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Sudan	2	8	1	0	68.0%	20.0%
Suriname	5	6	0	0	71.5%	45.5%
Swaziland	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Sweden	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Syria	1	7	2	1	68.8%	12.5%
Tajikistan	3	4	2	2	76.2%	42.9%
Thailand	3	5	3	0	79.2%	37.5%
TFYR Macedonia	6	2	3	0	91.7%	75.0%
Togo	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Tonga	1	3	2	5	81.0%	25.0%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	5	3	2	1	84.8%	62.5%
Tunisia	3	6	1	1	75.6%	33.3%
Turkey	5	4	1	1	83.6%	55.6%
Turkmenistan	1	5	0	5	57.6%	16.7%
Tuvalu	1	0	0	10	100.0%	100.0%
Uganda	3	5	2	1	78.8%	37.5%
Ukraine	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
United Arab Emirates .	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
United Kingdom	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
UR Tanzania	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Uruguay	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Uzbekistan	2	1	3	5	90.8%	66.7%
Vanuatu	5	5	0	1	78.0%	50.0%
Venezuela	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Vietnam	2	7	2	0	69.1%	22.2%
Yemen	3	6	0	2	73.3%	33.3%
Yugoslavia	3	1	0	7	90.7%	75.0%
Zambia	3	6	0	2	75.2%	33.3%
Zimbabwe	3	7	0	1	71.4%	30.0%
Average	3.8	4.2	1.6	1.3	80.7%	47.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Micronesia	9	0	1	1	100.0%	100.0%
Israel	9	1	1	0	96.2%	90.0%
Marshall Islands	8	1	2	0	95.9%	88.9%
Albania	8	2	1	0	89.8%	80.0%
Australia	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Canada	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Estonia	7	1	2	1	95.7%	87.5%
Latvia	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Bulgaria	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Czech Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Denmark	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Germany	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Hungary	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Iceland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Italy	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Liechtenstein	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Lithuania	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Netherlands	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
New Zealand	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Norway	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Poland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Romania	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
San Marino	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Slovak Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Slovenia	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Sweden	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
United Kingdom	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Andorra	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Austria	7	3	1	0	88.4%	70.0%
Belgium	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Malta	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Ireland	7	4	0	0	85.2%	63.6%
Japan	6	2	3	0	91.7%	75.0%
TFYR Macedonia	6	2	3	0	91.7%	75.0%
Republic of Moldova ..	6	3	1	1	87.6%	66.7%
Cyprus	6	4	1	0	84.6%	60.0%
France	6	4	1	0	84.0%	60.0%
Monaco	6	4	1	0	83.9%	60.0%
Nauru	6	4	1	0	83.9%	60.0%
Palau	5	0	0	6	100.0%	100.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	5	2	1	3	87.7%	71.4%
Georgia	5	2	3	1	91.1%	71.4%
Costa Rica	5	3	3	0	86.8%	62.5%
Croatia	5	3	3	0	87.5%	62.5%
El Salvador	5	3	2	1	86.6%	62.5%

III - Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Guatemala	5	3	3	0	87.1%	62.5%
Solomon Islands	5	3	1	2	86.3%	62.5%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	5	3	2	1	84.8%	62.5%
Chile	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
Samoa	5	4	2	0	83.2%	55.6%
Turkey	5	4	1	1	83.6%	55.6%
Ukraine	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
Barbados	5	5	1	0	80.6%	50.0%
Bolivia	5	5	1	0	80.8%	50.0%
Grenada	5	5	1	0	80.3%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	5	5	0	1	80.0%	50.0%
Vanuatu	5	5	0	1	78.0%	50.0%
Belize	5	6	0	0	76.4%	45.5%
Cote d'Ivoire	5	6	0	0	75.7%	45.5%
Ecuador	5	6	0	0	77.8%	45.5%
Mongolia	5	6	0	0	77.3%	45.5%
Suriname	5	6	0	0	71.5%	45.5%
Dominica	4	2	0	5	78.9%	66.7%
Sao Tome and Principe	4	2	0	5	78.4%	66.7%
Argentina	4	3	4	0	87.0%	57.1%
Nicaragua	4	3	4	0	86.3%	57.1%
Paraguay	4	3	4	0	87.0%	57.1%
Republic of Korea	4	3	4	0	86.5%	57.1%
Bahamas	4	4	2	1	83.1%	50.0%
Brazil	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Honduras	4	4	1	2	82.6%	50.0%
Peru	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Uruguay	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Angola	4	5	1	1	77.0%	44.4%
Colombia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Ethiopia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Fiji	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Haiti	4	5	2	0	78.7%	44.4%
Kazakhstan	4	5	2	0	78.5%	44.4%
Malawi	4	5	1	1	74.2%	44.4%
Mauritius	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Panama	4	5	1	1	79.8%	44.4%
St. Vincent/Gren.	4	5	1	1	72.0%	44.4%
Botswana	4	6	1	0	76.2%	40.0%
Jamaica	4	6	1	0	75.5%	40.0%
Mexico	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
South Africa	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
Guyana	4	7	0	0	73.9%	36.4%
Senegal	4	7	0	0	74.1%	36.4%
Yugoslavia	3	1	0	7	90.7%	75.0%
Dominican Republic ...	3	4	4	0	82.5%	42.9%
Eritrea	3	4	3	1	81.7%	42.9%
Singapore	3	4	4	0	82.6%	42.9%
Tajikistan	3	4	2	2	76.2%	42.9%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	3	5	3	0	78.1%	37.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Armenia	3	5	3	0	78.8%	37.5%
Burundi	3	5	2	1	77.9%	37.5%
Cambodia	3	5	1	2	78.5%	37.5%
Lesotho	3	5	2	1	72.6%	37.5%
St. Lucia	3	5	2	1	78.5%	37.5%
Thailand	3	5	3	0	79.2%	37.5%
Uganda	3	5	2	1	78.8%	37.5%
Belarus	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Benin	3	6	2	0	74.2%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	3	6	2	0	75.6%	33.3%
Cape Verde	3	6	2	0	74.6%	33.3%
Gambia	3	6	1	1	70.3%	33.3%
Ghana	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Guinea	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Kuwait	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Madagascar	3	6	1	1	74.8%	33.3%
Mali	3	6	1	1	74.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	3	6	2	0	75.0%	33.3%
Namibia	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Nepal	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Philippines	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Swaziland	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Tunisia	3	6	1	1	75.6%	33.3%
Venezuela	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Yemen	3	6	0	2	73.3%	33.3%
Zambia	3	6	0	2	75.2%	33.3%
Azerbaijan	3	7	1	0	71.8%	30.0%
Bangladesh	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Indonesia	3	7	1	0	72.9%	30.0%
Sri Lanka	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Togo	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
UR Tanzania	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Zimbabwe	3	7	0	1	71.4%	30.0%
Uzbekistan	2	1	3	5	90.8%	66.7%
Afghanistan	2	2	0	7	80.7%	50.0%
Rwanda	2	2	2	5	73.2%	50.0%
Chad	2	3	1	5	78.1%	40.0%
Congo	2	3	1	5	65.4%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	79.5%	33.3%
Comoros	2	4	1	4	74.7%	33.3%
Nigeria	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	4	0	5	69.5%	33.3%
United Arab Emirates	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	76.5%	28.6%
Kenya	2	5	4	0	78.1%	28.6%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	4	0	77.1%	28.6%
Morocco	2	5	2	2	76.7%	28.6%
Sierra Leone	2	5	3	1	76.5%	28.6%
Bhutan	2	6	2	1	72.3%	25.0%
Djibouti	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%

III - Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Jordan	2	6	2	1	74.6%	25.0%
Maldives	2	6	2	1	74.4%	25.0%
Russia	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	6	2	1	73.7%	25.0%
Algeria	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Cuba	2	7	2	0	71.3%	22.2% ²
Egypt	2	7	2	0	71.8%	22.2%
India	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Iran	2	7	1	1	71.1%	22.2%
Laos	2	7	2	0	68.9%	22.2%
Lebanon	2	7	1	1	70.6%	22.2%
Malaysia	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Vietnam	2	7	2	0	69.1%	22.2%
Sudan	2	8	1	0	68.0%	20.0%
Tuvalu	1	0	0	10	100.0%	100.0%
Mauritania	1	2	0	8	81.3%	33.3%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	3	2	5	58.8%	25.0%
Tonga	1	3	2	5	81.0%	25.0%
Equatorial Guinea	1	4	0	6	65.9%	20.0%
Turkmenistan	1	5	0	5	57.6%	16.7%
Bahrain	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
China	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Qatar	1	6	3	1	73.7%	14.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	3	0	70.8%	12.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	7	3	0	70.6%	12.5%
Oman	1	7	2	1	69.1%	12.5%
Syria	1	7	2	1	68.8%	12.5%
Libya	1	8	2	0	68.0%	11.1%
Central African Rep. ...	0	0	0	11	*	*
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	11	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	11	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	11	*	*
Seychelles	0	0	0	11	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Kiribati	0	1	0	10	16.2%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	7	1	3	62.3%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	8	2	1	65.3%	0.0%
Average	3.8	4.2	1.6	1.3	80.7%	47.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 11 important votes. They list countries by UN regional groups.

African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Cote d'Ivoire	5	6	0	0	75.7%	45.5%
Sao Tome and Principe	4	2	0	5	78.4%	66.7%
Angola	4	5	1	1	77.0%	44.4%
Ethiopia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Malawi	4	5	1	1	74.2%	44.4%
Mauritius	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Botswana	4	6	1	0	76.2%	40.0%
Saudi Arabia	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
Senegal	4	7	0	0	74.1%	36.4%
Eritrea	3	4	3	1	81.7%	42.9%
Burundi	3	5	2	1	77.9%	37.5%
Lesotho	3	5	2	1	72.6%	37.5%
Uganda	3	5	2	1	78.8%	37.5%
Benin	3	6	2	0	74.2%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	3	6	2	0	75.6%	33.3%
Cape Verde	3	6	2	0	74.6%	33.3%
Gambia	3	6	1	1	70.3%	33.3%
Ghana	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Guinea	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Madagascar	3	6	1	1	74.8%	33.3%
Mali	3	6	1	1	74.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	3	6	2	0	75.0%	33.3%
Namibia	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Swaziland	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Tunisia	3	6	1	1	75.6%	33.3%
Zambia	3	6	0	2	75.2%	33.3%
Togo	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
UR Tanzania	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Zimbabwe	3	7	0	1	71.4%	30.0%
Rwanda	2	2	2	5	73.2%	50.0%
Chad	2	3	1	5	78.1%	40.0%
Congo	2	3	1	5	65.4%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	79.5%	33.3%
Comoros	2	4	1	4	74.7%	33.3%
Nigeria	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	76.5%	28.6%
Kenya	2	5	4	0	78.1%	28.6%
Morocco	2	5	2	2	76.7%	28.6%
Sierra Leone	2	5	3	1	76.5%	28.6%
Djibouti	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Algeria	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Egypt	2	7	2	0	71.8%	22.2%
Sudan	2	8	1	0	68.0%	20.0%

III - Important Votes

African Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritania	1	2	0	8	81.3%	33.3%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	3	2	5	58.8%	25.0%
Equatorial Guinea	1	4	0	6	65.9%	20.0%
Libya	1	8	2	0	68.0%	11.1%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	11	*	*
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	11	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	11	*	*
Seychelles	0	0	0	11	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Average	2.4	4.7	1.4	2.5	75.1%	34.0%

Asian Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Micronesia	9	0	1	1	100.0%	100.0%
Marshall Islands	8	1	2	0	95.9%	88.9%
Japan	6	2	3	0	91.7%	75.0%
Cyprus	6	4	1	0	84.6%	60.0%
Nauru	6	4	1	0	83.9%	60.0%
Palau	5	0	0	6	100.0%	100.0%
Solomon Islands	5	3	1	2	86.3%	62.5%
Samoa	5	4	2	0	83.2%	55.6%
Papua New Guinea	5	5	0	1	80.0%	50.0%
Vanuatu	5	5	0	1	78.0%	50.0%
Mongolia	5	6	0	0	77.3%	45.5%
Republic of Korea	4	3	4	0	86.5%	57.1%
Fiji	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Kazakhstan	4	5	2	0	78.5%	44.4%
Singapore	3	4	4	0	82.6%	42.9%
Tajikistan	3	4	2	2	76.2%	42.9%
Cambodia	3	5	1	2	78.5%	37.5%
Thailand	3	5	3	0	79.2%	37.5%
Kuwait	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Nepal	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Philippines	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Yemen	3	6	0	2	73.3%	33.3%
Bangladesh	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Indonesia	3	7	1	0	72.9%	30.0%
Sri Lanka	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Uzbekistan	2	1	3	5	90.8%	66.7%
Afghanistan	2	2	0	7	80.7%	50.0%
United Arab Emirates ..	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	4	0	77.1%	28.6%
Bhutan	2	6	2	1	72.3%	25.0%
Jordan	2	6	2	1	74.6%	25.0%
Maldives	2	6	2	1	74.4%	25.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

Asian Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Saudi Arabia	2	6	2	1	73.7%	25.0%
India	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Iran	2	7	1	1	71.1%	22.2%
Laos	2	7	2	0	68.9%	22.2%
Lebanon	2	7	1	1	70.6%	22.2%
Malaysia	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Vietnam	2	7	2	0	69.1%	22.2%
Tuvalu	1	0	0	10	100.0%	100.0%
Tonga	1	3	2	5	81.0%	25.0%
Turkmenistan	1	5	0	5	57.6%	16.7%
Bahrain	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
China	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Qatar	1	6	3	1	73.7%	14.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	3	0	70.8%	12.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	7	3	0	70.6%	12.5%
Oman	1	7	2	1	69.1%	12.5%
Syria	1	7	2	1	68.8%	12.5%
Iraq	0	0	0	11	*	*
Kiribati	0	1	0	10	16.2%	0.0%
DPR of Korea	0	7	1	3	62.3%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	8	2	1	65.3%	0.0%
Average	2.8	4.9	1.7	1.6	76.8%	36.5%

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Costa Rica	5	3	3	0	86.8%	62.5%
El Salvador	5	3	2	1	86.6%	62.5%
Guatemala	5	3	3	0	87.1%	62.5%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	5	3	2	1	84.8%	62.5%
Chile	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
Barbados	5	5	1	0	80.6%	50.0%
Bolivia	5	5	1	0	80.8%	50.0%
Grenada	5	5	1	0	80.3%	50.0%
Belize	5	6	0	0	76.4%	45.5%
Ecuador	5	6	0	0	77.8%	45.5%
Suriname	5	6	0	0	71.5%	45.5%
Dominica	4	2	0	5	78.9%	66.7%
Argentina	4	3	4	0	87.0%	57.1%
Nicaragua	4	3	4	0	86.3%	57.1%
Paraguay	4	3	4	0	87.0%	57.1%
Bahamas	4	4	2	1	83.1%	50.0%
Brazil	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Honduras	4	4	1	2	82.6%	50.0%
Peru	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Uruguay	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Colombia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%

III - Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Haiti	4	5	2	0	78.7%	44.4%
Panama	4	5	1	1	79.8%	44.4%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	5	1	1	72.0%	44.4%
Jamaica	4	6	1	0	75.5%	40.0%
Mexico	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
Guyana	4	7	0	0	73.9%	36.4%
Dominican Republic ...	3	4	4	0	82.5%	42.9%
Antigua and Barbuda ..	3	5	3	0	78.1%	37.5%
St. Lucia	3	5	2	1	78.5%	37.5%
Venezuela	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	4	0	5	69.5%	33.3%
Cuba	2	7	2	0	71.3%	22.2%
Average	4.1	4.5	1.8	0.5	80.3%	47.4%

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Australia	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Canada	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Denmark	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Germany	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Iceland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8% ⁷
Italy	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Liechtenstein	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Netherlands	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
New Zealand	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Norway	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
San Marino	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Sweden	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
United Kingdom	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Andorra	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Austria	7	3	1	0	88.4%	70.0%
Belgium	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Malta	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Ireland	7	4	0	0	85.2%	63.6%
France	6	4	1	0	84.0%	60.0%
Monaco	6	4	1	0	83.9%	60.0%
Turkey	5	4	1	1	83.6%	55.6%
Average	6.8	2.6	1.5	0.0	89.8%	72.7

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

Eastern European Group (EE)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	8	2	1	0	89.8%	80.0%
Estonia	7	1	2	1	95.7%	87.5%
Latvia	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Bulgaria	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Czech Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Hungary	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Lithuania	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Poland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Romania	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Slovak Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Slovenia	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
TFYR Macedonia	6	2	3	0	91.7%	75.0%
Republic of Moldova ..	6	3	1	1	87.6%	66.7%
Bosnia/Herzegovina ...	5	2	1	3	87.7%	71.4%
Georgia	5	2	3	1	91.1%	71.4%
Croatia	5	3	3	0	87.5%	62.5%
Ukraine	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
Yugoslavia	3	1	0	7	90.7%	75.0%
Armenia	3	5	3	0	78.8%	37.5%
Belarus	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Azerbaijan	3	7	1	0	71.8%	30.0%
Russia	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Average	5.6	2.8	2.0	0.6	88.0%	67.0%

III - Important Votes

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
Kuwait	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Tunisia	3	6	1	1	75.6%	33.3%
Yemen	3	6	0	2	73.3%	33.3%
United Arab Emirates .	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Morocco	2	5	2	2	76.7%	28.6%
Djibouti	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Jordan	2	6	2	1	74.6%	25.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	6	2	1	73.7%	25.0%
Algeria	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Egypt	2	7	2	0	71.8%	22.2%
Lebanon	2	7	1	1	70.6%	22.2%
Sudan	2	8	1	0	68.0%	20.0%
Mauritania	1	2	0	8	81.3%	33.3%
Bahrain	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Qatar	1	6	3	1	73.7%	14.3%
Oman	1	7	2	1	69.1%	12.5%
Syria	1	7	2	1	68.8%	12.5%
Libya	1	8	2	0	68.0%	11.1%
Iraq	0	0	0	11	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Average	1.7	5.5	1.7	2.2	73.2%	23.1%

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Singapore	3	4	4	0	82.6%	42.9%
Cambodia	3	5	1	2	78.5%	37.5%
Thailand	3	5	3	0	79.2%	37.5%
Philippines	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Indonesia	3	7	1	0	72.9%	30.0%
Laos	2	7	2	0	68.9%	22.2%
Malaysia	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Vietnam	2	7	2	0	69.1%	22.2%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	3	0	70.8%	12.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	7	3	0	70.6%	12.5%
Average	2.3	6.2	2.3	0.2	74.0%	27.1%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

European Union (EU)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Germany	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Italy	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Netherlands	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Sweden	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
United Kingdom	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Austria	7	3	1	0	88.4%	70.0%
Belgium	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Finland	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Ireland	7	4	0	0	85.2%	63.6%
France	6	4	1	0	84.0%	60.0%
Average	6.9	2.7	1.3	0.0	89.3%	71.7%

Islamic Conference (OIC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	8	2	1	0	89.8%	80.0%
Turkey	5	4	1	1	83.6%	55.6%
Suriname	5	6	0	0	71.5%	45.5%
Kazakhstan	4	5	2	0	78.5%	44.4%
Senegal	4	7	0	0	74.1%	36.4%
Tajikistan	3	4	2	2	76.2%	42.9%
Uganda	3	5	2	1	78.8%	37.5%
Benin	3	6	2	0	74.2%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	3	6	2	0	75.6%	33.3%
Gambia	3	6	1	1	70.3%	33.3%
Guinea	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Kuwait	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Mali	3	6	1	1	74.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	3	6	2	0	75.0%	33.3%
Tunisia	3	6	1	1	75.6%	33.3%
Yemen	3	6	0	2	73.3%	33.3%
Azerbaijan	3	7	1	0	71.8%	30.0%
Bangladesh	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Indonesia	3	7	1	0	72.9%	30.0%
Togo	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Afghanistan	2	2	0	7	80.7%	50.0%
Chad	2	3	1	5	78.1%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	79.5%	33.3%
Comoros	2	4	1	4	74.7%	33.3%
United Arab Emirates ..	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	76.5%	28.6%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	4	0	77.1%	28.6%

III - Important Votes

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Morocco	2	5	2	2	76.7%	28.6%
Sierra Leone	2	5	3	1	76.5%	28.6%
Djibouti	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Jordan	2	6	2	1	74.6%	25.0%
Maldives	2	6	2	1	74.4%	25.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	6	2	1	73.7%	25.0%
Algeria	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Egypt	2	7	2	0	71.8%	22.2%
Iran	2	7	1	1	71.1%	22.2%
Lebanon	2	7	1	1	70.6%	22.2%
Malaysia	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Sudan	2	8	1	0	68.0%	20.0%
Mauritania	1	2	0	8	81.3%	33.3%
Turkmenistan	1	5	0	5	57.6%	16.7%
Bahrain	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Qatar	1	6	3	1	73.7%	14.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	3	0	70.8%	12.5%
Oman	1	7	2	1	69.1%	12.5%
Syria	1	7	2	1	68.8%	12.5%
Libya	1	8	2	0	68.0%	11.1%
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	11	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	11	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	11	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Pakistan	0	8	2	1	65.3%	0.0%
Average	2.3	5.3	1.5	1.9	74.1%	29.8%

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE	
					INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Malta	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Cyprus	6	4	1	0	84.6%	60.0%
Guatemala	5	3	3	0	87.1%	62.5%
Trinidad and Tobago ..	5	3	2	1	84.8%	62.5%
Chile	5	4	2	0	84.0%	55.6%
Barbados	5	5	1	0	80.6%	50.0%
Bolivia	5	5	1	0	80.8%	50.0%
Grenada	5	5	1	0	80.3%	50.0%
Papua New Guinea	5	5	0	1	80.0%	50.0%
Vanuatu	5	5	0	1	78.0%	50.0%
Belize	5	6	0	0	76.4%	45.5%
Cote d'Ivoire	5	6	0	0	75.7%	45.5%
Ecuador	5	6	0	0	77.8%	45.5%
Mongolia	5	6	0	0	77.3%	45.5%
Suriname	5	6	0	0	71.5%	45.5%
Sao Tome and Principe	4	2	0	5	78.4%	66.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Nicaragua	4	3	4	0	86.3%	57.1%
Bahamas	4	4	2	1	83.1%	50.0%
Honduras	4	4	1	2	82.6%	50.0%
Peru	4	4	3	0	83.3%	50.0%
Angola	4	5	1	1	77.0%	44.4%
Colombia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Ethiopia	4	5	2	0	80.0%	44.4%
Malawi	4	5	1	1	74.2%	44.4%
Mauritius	4	5	2	0	79.7%	44.4%
Panama	4	5	1	1	79.8%	44.4%
Botswana	4	6	1	0	76.2%	40.0%
Jamaica	4	6	1	0	75.5%	40.0%
South Africa	4	6	1	0	76.9%	40.0%
Guyana	4	7	0	0	73.9%	36.4%
Senegal	4	7	0	0	74.1%	36.4%
Yugoslavia	3	1	0	7	90.7%	75.0%
Dominican Republic ...	3	4	4	0	82.5%	42.9%
Eritrea	3	4	3	1	81.7%	42.9%
Singapore	3	4	4	0	82.6%	42.9%
Burundi	3	5	2	1	77.9%	37.5%
Cambodia	3	5	1	2	78.5%	37.5%
Lesotho	3	5	2	1	72.6%	37.5%
St. Lucia	3	5	2	1	78.5%	37.5%
Thailand	3	5	3	0	79.2%	37.5%
Uganda	3	5	2	1	78.8%	37.5%
Belarus	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Benin	3	6	2	0	74.2%	33.3%
Burkina Faso	3	6	2	0	75.6%	33.3%
Cape Verde	3	6	2	0	74.6%	33.3%
Gambia	3	6	1	1	70.3%	33.3%
Ghana	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Guinea	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Kuwait	3	6	1	1	75.4%	33.3%
Madagascar	3	6	1	1	74.8%	33.3%
Mali	3	6	1	1	74.6%	33.3%
Mozambique	3	6	2	0	75.0%	33.3%
Namibia	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Nepal	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Philippines	3	6	2	0	75.8%	33.3%
Swaziland	3	6	2	0	75.2%	33.3%
Tunisia	3	6	1	1	75.6%	33.3%
Venezuela	3	6	2	0	76.0%	33.3%
Yemen	3	6	0	2	73.3%	33.3%
Zambia	3	6	0	2	75.2%	33.3%
Bangladesh	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Indonesia	3	7	1	0	72.9%	30.0%
Sri Lanka	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Togo	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
UR Tanzania	3	7	1	0	73.1%	30.0%
Zimbabwe	3	7	0	1	71.4%	30.0%

III - Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Uzbekistan	2	1	3	5	90.8%	66.7%
Afghanistan	2	2	0	7	80.7%	50.0%
Rwanda	2	2	2	5	73.2%	50.0%
Chad	2	3	1	5	78.1%	40.0%
Congo	2	3	1	5	65.4%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	79.5%	33.3%
Comoros	2	4	1	4	74.7%	33.3%
Nigeria	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
United Arab Emirates ..	2	4	4	1	81.3%	33.3%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	76.5%	28.6%
Kenya	2	5	4	0	78.1%	28.6%
Morocco	2	5	2	2	76.7%	28.6%
Sierra Leone	2	5	3	1	76.5%	28.6%
Bhutan	2	6	2	1	72.3%	25.0%
Djibouti	2	6	3	0	74.8%	25.0%
Jordan	2	6	2	1	74.6%	25.0%
Maldives	2	6	2	1	74.4%	25.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	6	2	1	73.7%	25.0%
Algeria	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Cuba	2	7	2	0	71.3%	22.2%
Egypt	2	7	2	0	71.8%	22.2%
India	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Iran	2	7	1	1	71.1%	22.2%
Laos	2	7	2	0	68.9%	22.2%
Lebanon	2	7	1	1	70.6%	22.2%
Malaysia	2	7	2	0	72.0%	22.2%
Vietnam	2	7	2	0	69.1%	22.2%
Sudan	2	8	1	0	68.0%	20.0%
Mauritania	1	2	0	8	81.3%	33.3%
Dem. Rep. of Congo ...	1	3	2	5	58.8%	25.0%
Equatorial Guinea	1	4	0	6	65.9%	20.0%
Turkmenistan	1	5	0	5	57.6%	16.7%
Bahrain	1	6	4	0	73.7%	14.3%
Qatar	1	6	3	1	73.7%	14.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	3	0	70.8%	12.5%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	7	3	0	70.6%	12.5%
Oman	1	7	2	1	69.1%	12.5%
Syria	1	7	2	1	68.8%	12.5%
Libya	1	8	2	0	68.0%	11.1%
Central African Rep. ..	0	0	0	11	*	*
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	11	*	*
Iraq	0	0	0	11	*	*
Liberia	0	0	0	11	*	*
Niger	0	0	0	11	*	*
Seychelles	0	0	0	11	*	*
Somalia	0	0	0	11	*	*
DPR of Korea	0	7	1	3	62.3%	0.0%
Pakistan	0	8	2	1	65.3%	0.0%
Average	2.8	5.0	1.5	1.7	75.9%	35.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

Nordic Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Iceland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Norway	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Sweden	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Finland	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Average	7.0	2.2	1.8	0.0	91.3%	76.1%

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Canada	7	1	3	0	95.8%	87.5%
Czech Republic	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Denmark	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Germany	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Hungary	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Iceland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Italy	7	2	2	0	91.9%	77.8%
Netherlands	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Norway	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Poland	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
United Kingdom	7	2	2	0	92.0%	77.8%
Belgium	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Greece	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Luxembourg	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Portugal	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
Spain	7	3	1	0	88.5%	70.0%
France	6	4	1	0	84.0%	60.0%
Turkey	5	4	1	1	83.6%	55.6%
Average	6.8	2.4	1.7	0.1	90.3%	73.7%

III - Important Votes

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2000 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	2	50.0%	7	20	25.9%
Albania	8	2	80.0%	29	5	85.3%
Algeria	2	7	22.2%	14	41	25.5%
Andorra	7	3	70.0%	33	21	61.1%
Angola	4	5	44.4%	23	25	47.9%
Antigua and Barbuda	3	5	37.5%	20	36	35.7%
Argentina	4	3	57.1%	23	29	44.2%
Armenia	3	5	37.5%	23	30	43.4%
Australia	7	1	87.5%	33	19	63.5%
Austria	7	3	70.0%	32	21	60.4%
Azerbaijan	3	7	30.0%	21	32	39.6%
Bahamas	4	4	50.0%	23	36	39.0%
Bahrain	1	6	14.3%	14	39	26.4%
Bangladesh	3	7	30.0%	21	41	33.9%
Barbados	5	5	50.0%	24	39	38.1%
Belarus	3	6	33.3%	21	40	34.4%
Belgium	7	3	70.0%	34	20	63.0%
Belize	5	6	45.5%	24	34	41.4%
Benin	3	6	33.3%	21	34	38.2%
Bhutan	2	6	25.0%	14	34	29.2%
Bolivia	5	5	50.0%	24	39	38.1%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	5	2	71.4%	24	10	70.6%
Botswana	4	6	40.0%	19	40	32.2%
Brazil	4	4	50.0%	23	35	39.7%
Brunei Darussalam	1	7	12.5%	19	40	32.2%
Bulgaria	7	2	77.8%	33	21	61.1%
Burkina Faso	3	6	33.3%	20	40	33.3%
Burundi	3	5	37.5%	18	37	32.7%
Cambodia	3	5	37.5%	21	38	35.6%
Cameroon	2	4	33.3%	20	30	40.0%
Canada	7	1	87.5%	35	18	66.0%
Cape Verde	3	6	33.3%	19	36	34.5%
Central African Rep.	0	0	*	0	0	*
Chad	2	3	40.0%	5	31	13.9%
Chile	5	4	55.6%	26	36	41.9%
China	1	6	14.3%	13	39	25.0%
Colombia	4	5	44.4%	23	38	37.7%
Comoros	2	4	33.3%	5	33	13.2%
Congo	2	3	40.0%	4	9	30.8%
Costa Rica	5	3	62.5%	24	30	44.4%
Cote d'Ivoire	5	6	45.5%	22	32	40.7%
Croatia	5	3	62.5%	30	19	61.2%
Cuba	2	7	22.2%	11	41	21.2%
Cyprus	6	4	60.0%	28	27	50.9%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

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
Czech Republic	7	2	77.8%	34	20	63.0%
DPR of Korea	0	7	0.0%	2	41	4.7%
Dem. Rep. of Congo	1	3	25.0%	2	10	16.7%
Denmark	7	2	77.8%	34	20	63.0%
Djibouti	2	6	25.0%	20	39	33.9%
Dominica	4	2	66.7%	8	8	50.0%
Dominican Republic	3	4	42.9%	22	35	38.6%
Ecuador	5	6	45.5%	24	40	37.5%
Egypt	2	7	22.2%	12	45	21.1%
El Salvador	5	3	62.5%	23	33	41.1%
Equatorial Guinea	1	4	20.0%	15	10	60.0%
Eritrea	3	4	42.9%	21	36	36.8%
Estonia	7	1	87.5%	32	17	65.3%
Ethiopia	4	5	44.4%	22	37	37.3%
Fiji	4	5	44.4%	23	33	41.1%
Finland	7	3	70.0%	33	20	62.3%
France	6	4	60.0%	31	17	64.6%
Gabon	2	5	28.6%	18	39	31.6%
Gambia	3	6	33.3%	19	26	42.2%
Georgia	5	2	71.4%	27	17	61.4%
Germany	7	2	77.8%	35	19	64.8%
Ghana	3	6	33.3%	21	39	35.0%
Greece	7	3	70.0%	33	21	61.1%
Grenada	5	5	50.0%	24	37	39.3%
Guatemala	5	3	62.5%	23	31	42.6%
Guinea	3	6	33.3%	20	38	34.5%
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	*	0	0	*
Guyana	4	7	36.4%	23	41	35.9%
Haiti	4	5	44.4%	23	33	41.1%
Honduras	4	4	50.0%	20	37	35.1%
Hungary	7	2	77.8%	34	19	64.2%
Iceland	7	2	77.8%	34	20	63.0%
India	2	7	22.2%	12	43	21.8%
Indonesia	3	7	30.0%	20	41	32.8%
Iran	2	7	22.2%	17	39	30.4%
Iraq	0	0	*	0	0	*
Ireland	7	4	63.6%	31	24	56.4%
Israel	9	1	90.0%	50	2	96.2%
Italy	7	2	77.8%	33	20	62.3%
Jamaica	4	6	40.0%	23	34	40.4%
Japan	6	2	75.0%	30	21	58.8%
Jordan	2	6	25.0%	16	40	28.6%
Kazakhstan	4	5	44.4%	23	19	54.8%
Kenya	2	5	28.6%	21	37	36.2%
Kiribati	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Kuwait	3	6	33.3%	19	39	32.8%
Kyrgyzstan	2	5	28.6%	20	29	40.8%
Laos	2	7	22.2%	11	41	21.2%
Latvia	7	1	87.5%	33	17	66.0%
Lebanon	2	7	22.2%	11	43	20.4%
Lesotho	3	5	37.5%	19	19	50.0%
Liberia	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
Libya	1	8	11.1%	13	42	23.6%
Liechtenstein	7	2	77.8%	32	21	60.4%
Lithuania	7	2	77.8%	33	18	64.7%
Luxembourg	7	3	70.0%	34	20	63.0%
Madagascar	3	6	33.3%	19	39	32.8%
Malawi	4	5	44.4%	20	20	50.0%
Malaysia	2	7	22.2%	20	40	33.3%
Maldives	2	6	25.0%	21	37	36.2%
Mali	3	6	33.3%	19	37	33.9%
Malta	7	3	30.0%	32	27	54.2%
Marshall Islands	8	1	88.9%	34	12	73.9%
Mauritania	1	2	33.3%	4	27	12.9%
Mauritius	4	5	44.4%	22	38	36.7%
Mexico	4	6	40.0%	21	40	34.4%
Micronesia	9	0	100.0%	35	0	100.0%
Monaco	6	4	60.0%	29	19	60.4%
Mongolia	5	6	45.5%	24	37	39.3%
Morocco	2	5	28.6%	15	34	30.6%
Mozambique	3	6	33.3%	19	38	33.3%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	7	12.5%	12	41	22.6%
Namibia	3	6	33.3%	20	38	34.5%
Nauru	6	4	60.0%	24	26	48.0%
Nepal	3	6	33.3%	20	40	33.3%
Netherlands	7	2	77.8%	34	19	64.2%
New Zealand	7	2	77.8%	32	22	59.3%
Nicaragua	4	3	57.1%	22	32	40.7%
Niger	0	0	*	0	0	*
Nigeria	2	4	33.3%	19	38	33.3%
Norway	7	2	77.8%	35	20	63.6%
Oman	1	7	12.5%	14	41	25.5%
Pakistan	0	8	0.0%	8	43	15.7%
Palau	5	0	100.0%	11	0	100.0%
Panama	4	5	44.4%	23	39	37.1%
Papua New Guinea	5	5	50.0%	24	36	40.0%
Paraguay	4	3	57.1%	23	33	41.3%
Peru	4	4	50.0%	23	34	40.4%
Philippines	3	6	33.3%	21	39	35.0%
Poland	7	2	77.8%	34	20	63.0%
Portugal	7	3	70.0%	33	22	60.0%
Qatar	1	6	14.3%	19	40	32.2%
Republic of Korea	4	3	57.1%	24	22	52.2%
Republic of Moldova	6	3	66.7%	32	20	61.5%
Romania	7	2	77.8%	33	20	62.3%
Russia	2	6	25.0%	24	30	44.4%
Rwanda	2	2	50.0%	4	9	30.8%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	4	33.3%	14	15	48.3%
St. Lucia	3	5	37.5%	21	38	35.6%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	5	44.4%	19	16	54.3%
Samoa	5	4	55.6%	24	27	47.1%
San Marino	7	2	77.8%	31	21	59.6%
Sao Tome and Principe	4	2	66.7%	5	8	38.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

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
Saudi Arabia	2	6	25.0%	14	39	26.4%
Senegal	4	7	36.4%	23	40	36.5%
Seychelles	0	0	*	0	0	*
Sierra Leone	2	5	28.6%	20	31	39.2%
Singapore	3	4	42.9%	21	36	36.8%
Slovak Republic	7	2	77.8%	33	20	62.3%
Slovenia	7	2	77.8%	33	20	62.3%
Solomon Islands	5	3	62.5%	21	31	40.4%
Somalia	0	0	*	0	0	*
South Africa	4	6	40.0%	24	36	40.0%
Spain	7	3	70.0%	33	21	61.1%
Sri Lanka	3	7	30.0%	21	41	33.9%
Sudan	2	8	20.0%	14	42	25.0%
Suriname	5	6	45.5%	23	19	54.8%
Swaziland	3	6	33.3%	19	40	32.2%
Sweden	7	2	77.8%	32	21	60.4%
Syria	1	7	12.5%	8	44	15.4%
Tajikistan	3	4	42.9%	19	14	57.6%
Thailand	3	5	37.5%	21	37	36.2%
TFYR Macedonia	6	2	75.0%	31	20	60.8%
Togo	3	7	30.0%	21	41	33.9%
Tonga	1	3	25.0%	18	18	50.0%
Trinidad and Tobago	5	3	62.5%	23	23	50.0%
Tunisia	3	6	33.3%	16	40	28.6%
Turkey	5	4	55.6%	30	27	52.6%
Turkmenistan	1	5	16.7%	9	8	52.9%
Tuvalu	1	0	100.0%	1	0	100.0%
Uganda	3	5	37.5%	22	39	36.1%
Ukraine	5	4	55.6%	28	27	50.9%
United Arab Emirates ...	2	4	33.3%	15	35	30.0%
United Kingdom	7	2	77.8%	38	15	71.7%
UR Tanzania	3	7	30.0%	21	41	33.9%
Uruguay	4	4	50.0%	23	33	41.1%
Uzbekistan	2	1	66.7%	18	4	81.8%
Vanuatu	5	5	50.0%	20	29	40.8%
Venezuela	3	6	33.3%	22	40	35.5%
Vietnam	2	7	22.2%	12	41	22.6%
Yemen	3	6	33.3%	14	40	25.9%
Yugoslavia	3	1	75.0%	8	14	36.4%
Zambia	3	6	33.3%	21	40	34.4%
Zimbabwe	3	7	30.0%	20	38	34.5%
Average	3.8	4.2	47.9%	21.1	27.9	43.0%