

IV - GENERAL ASSEMBLY - IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101-246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” An important basis for identifying issues is their consistency with the State Department’s Strategic Goals. For the 63rd UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2008, 13 votes and 7 consensus resolutions were identified for inclusion in this section.

Section IV contains five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 13 important votes at the 63rd UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the seven important consensus resolutions at the 63rd UNGA; (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important actions that were adopted by 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 III. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts three and four above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 11 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 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 number 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. For each vote, a summary of the resolution or decision is provided (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), followed by background on the resolution and an explanation of the U.S. position. The resolutions/decisions are listed in order by the date adopted. Full texts of all 2008 General Assembly resolutions can be found at: <http://www.un.org/ga/63/resolutions.shtml>.

1. U.S. Embargo of Cuba

A/Res/63/7

October 29

185-3(US)-2

Calls upon all states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures such as the “Helms-Burton Act,” whose extra-territorial consequences allegedly affect the sovereignty of other states and the legitimate interests of those under their jurisdictions and the freedom of trade and navigation; urges states to repeal such laws.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Background and U.S. Position: In 1960, the United States imposed a trade and financial transaction embargo on Cuba because of Castro's repressive policies and expropriation of U.S. property without compensation. The United States strengthened the embargo in 1962, 1992, and 1996. The General Assembly has adopted a resolution condemning this embargo every year since 1992.

The United States again voted against this resolution, pointing out that the embargo is a bilateral issue concerning U.S. efforts to break the absolute control that the Cuban regime holds over the resources that its people need, and therefore highly inappropriate for the Assembly to consider.

The United States is one of Cuba's largest suppliers of food and one of Cuba's largest trading partners. In fact, the American people are the largest providers of humanitarian aid to the Cuban people in the entire world. Israel and Palau also voted no; Marshall Islands and Micronesia abstained.

2. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

A/Res/63/26

November 26

107-8(US)-57

Requests the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian people to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and to support the Middle East peace process.

Background and U.S. Position: The General Assembly established the Committee in 1975 by Resolution 3376; it renews its support for the Committee annually.

The United States believes that this Committee perpetuates and institutionalizes the perception of inherent UN bias against Israel. By its very nature, it fails properly to demand actions from both sides; instead it focuses only on Israel, thus serving more to undermine than to advance ongoing negotiations. It also undermines the credibility of the United Nations, which, as a member of the Quartet (with the United States, the European Union, and Russia), must be seen by both sides as an honest broker in facilitating a resolution of the Middle East conflict.

This Committee makes no positive contribution to achieving what the Quartet believes would be a just and durable resolution of the conflict: two democratic states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security. The United States believes it should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Committee's mandate.

3. Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat

A/Res/63/27

November 26

106-8(US)-57

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Requests the Secretary General to continue to provide the Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat with the necessary resources, and to ensure that it continues to carry out its program of work as detailed in other relevant earlier resolutions.

Background and U.S. Position: The General Assembly established the Division for Palestinian Rights by Resolution 32/40B in 1977. It renews its support annually.

The United States believes that the continuation of the Division, which embodies institutional discrimination against Israel, is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet (the United States, the United Nations, Russia, and the European Union) to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace.

The activities of this Division continue to promulgate actively a one-sided view of Israeli-Palestinian issues and do not contribute constructively to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this Division should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Division's mandate.

4. Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

A/Res/63/95

December 5

94-8(US)-73

Demands that Israel, the occupying power, cooperate with the Special Committee in implementing its mandate; deplores the policies of Israel violating the human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the occupied territories; expresses grave concern about the critical situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, and requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate Israeli practices.

Background and U.S. Position: The General Assembly established the Special Committee by Resolution 2443 in 1968. The United States believes that this committee embodies institutional discrimination against Israel, and that its continuation is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet (United States, United Nations, Russia, and the European Union) to achieve a just and durable solution of democratic Israeli and Palestinian states living in peace.

The committee's activities continue to promulgate a one-sided view of Israeli-Palestinian issues and are not constructive to efforts to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The United States believes this committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

withdraw their support for the annual resolution that renews the Committee's mandate.

5. Report of the Human Rights Council

A/Res/63/160

December 18

121-7(US)-58

Takes note of the Human Rights Council Report (A/63/53) and acknowledges the recommendations contained in its 90 resolutions, 31 decisions, and four presidential statements. Resolution topics included: protecting cultural rights and property in armed conflict; human rights and international solidarity; unilateral coercive measures; arbitrary detention; adequate housing as a part of the right to an adequate standard of living; the right to food; and the right of everyone to enjoy the highest standard of physical and mental health. Topics of decisions included: prevention of genocide; Alliance of Civilizations; mandate of the Special Rapporteur for human rights in the Sudan; and outcomes of universal periodic review for 32 countries. Presidential statements included: the human rights situation in Haiti and the 20th anniversary of the entry into force of the UN convention against torture.

Background and U.S. Position: The Human Rights Council Report covered the Council's activities from September 10, 2007, to September 24, 2008, including three regular sessions and three special sessions. The draft resolution in Third Committee was sponsored by Cuba, whose representative amended it orally to have the General Assembly acknowledge but not endorse the Council's recommendations, because member states should maintain the right to examine those recommendations individually.

The Human Rights Council was intended to be the world's leading human rights protection mechanism. The United States, however, has been deeply disappointed by its performance so far, and voted against this resolution both in committee and plenary sessions.

6. Moratorium on the Use of the Death Penalty

A/Res/63/168

December 18

106-46(US)-34

Welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of Resolution 62/149 (which called on all states with the death penalty to: respect international safeguards guaranteeing protection of the rights of those facing the death penalty; provide information on capital punishment and the safeguards protecting the rights of the condemned; progressively restrict the use of the death penalty and reduce the number of offenses for which it may be imposed; establish a moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty; and called on states which have abolished the death penalty not to reintroduce it), and its conclusions and recommendations; decides to continue consideration of the matter at its 65th session.

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Background and U.S. Position: International law does not prohibit capital punishment. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights permits countries to impose the death penalty for the most serious crimes, carried out pursuant to a final judgment rendered by a competent court and in accordance with appropriate safeguards and observance of due process.

The United States urges all governments that employ the death penalty to do so in conformity with their international human rights obligations and to ensure that it is not applied in an extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary manner. The United States voted against this resolution, and urged its supporters to focus any future death penalty resolutions on actual human rights violations.

7. Situation of Human Rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)

A/Res/63/190

December 18

94(US)-22-63

Expresses its very serious concern at: the persistence of continuing reports of systematic, widespread and grave violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights in the DPRK; and the continued refusal of its government to recognize the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on human rights in the DPRK or to extend cooperation to him, despite the renewal of the mandate by the Human Rights Council in its Resolution 7/15.

Reiterates its very serious concern at unresolved questions of international concern relating to the abduction of foreigners in the form of enforced disappearance, which violates the human rights of the nationals of other sovereign countries;

Expresses its very deep concern, while noting the willingness to seek humanitarian assistance, at the precarious humanitarian situation in the country, in particular the prevalence of maternal malnutrition and of infant malnutrition; and strongly urges the DPRK government to respect fully all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Background and U.S. Position: The human rights situation remains grave in North Korea. The government controls almost all aspects of citizens' lives and refuses to allow international evaluation of human rights conditions. In February 2008, the Special Rapporteur on DPRK human rights detailed the severe treatment meted out to returned migrants. Days later, it was widely reported that 15 people had been publicly executed for attempting to flee the country or for helping others escape.

The United States strongly supported this resolution as demonstrating the international community's concern over the human rights situation in the DPRK, the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights violations, and to improve the situation of human rights in the DPRK.

8. Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

No Action Motion December 18 69-84(US)-25

Draft Resolution III, included in Committee 3 Report A/63/430/Add.3:

Expresses deep concern at the ongoing violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of the Islamic Republic of Iran, including the increasing harassment and persecution of political opponents and human rights defenders;

Calls on Iran to respect its human rights obligations, to uphold due process of law rights and to end impunity for human rights violations, to abolish public executions, and to eliminate all forms of discrimination against women and girls; and

Encourages Iran to cooperate with the United Nations on human rights and justice reform.

Background and U.S. Position: The human rights situation continues to deteriorate in Iran. Since March 2007 the government has tightened restrictions on independent media, continues to detain and torture dissidents, and holds scores of prisoners of conscience. The Secretary-General's recent report notes cases of amputation, flogging and suspicious deaths while in custody, as well as executions without due process of law.

Women were restricted from marking International Women's Day in 2008, and are subject to severe repression. Members of Arab, Kurd, Baluch, Azeri-Turk and other minority communities face systematic human rights violations. The regime also continues to harass and persecute non-Shi'a religious groups – most significantly among the Baha'is – but also Sufi and Sunni Muslims, some Christian groups, and members of the Jewish community.

The representative of Iran called for the motion of no action on the draft resolution (subsequently Resolution 63/191, below) criticizing human rights violations in the Republic of Iran. The United States joined in defeating this motion.

9. Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

A/Res/63/191 December 18 69(US)-54-57

Expresses its deep concern at serious human rights violations in the Islamic Republic of Iran;

Calls upon the Iranian government to address the substantive concerns highlighted in the report of the Secretary-General and the specific

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

calls to action found in previous resolutions of the General Assembly, and to respect fully its human rights obligations, in law and in practice;

Notes the positive although limited gains, developments and steps discussed in the report of the Secretary-General, but remains concerned that many such steps have yet to be implemented in law or in practice;

Further calls upon the Iranian government to redress its inadequate record of cooperation with international human rights mechanisms, and encourages it to continue exploring cooperation on human rights and justice reform with the United Nations, including the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights;

Requests an update from the Secretary-General on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, including its cooperation with international human rights mechanisms, at its 64th session; and decides to continue its examination of Iran's human rights situation at that session.

Background and U.S. Position: The human rights situation continued to deteriorate in Iran. Since March 2007 the Iranian government tightened restrictions on independent media, continues to detain and torture dissidents, and held scores of prisoners of conscience. The Secretary-General's recent report noted cases of amputation, flogging and suspicious deaths while in custody, as well as executions without due process of law.

Women were restricted from marking International Women's Day in 2008, and were subject to severe repression. Members of Arab, Kurd, Baluch, Azeri-Turk and other minority communities faced systematic human rights violations. The regime also continued to harass and persecute non-Shi'a religious groups - most significantly among the Baha'is - but also Sufi and Sunni Muslims, some Christian groups, and members of the Jewish community.

The United States cosponsored this resolution and lobbied other delegations to vote in favor of the text. The resolution demonstrated the international community's concern over the human rights situation in Iran and the desire to hold the government accountable for its human rights violations and to improve the situation of human rights in Iran.

10. Combating Defamation of Religions

A/Res/63/171

December 18

86-53(US)-42

Expresses concern at the negative stereotyping of religions; deplores all acts of violence on the basis of religion or belief;

Expresses concern that Islam is frequently and wrongly associated with human rights violations and terrorism; and emphasizes that everyone has the right to hold opinions and to freedom of expression, the exercise of which

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

carries special responsibilities and may be subject to limitations as provided by law.

Background and U.S. Position: Over the past decade, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), an inter-governmental organization comprised of 57 Muslim states and headquartered in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, has been working through the UN system to introduce the problematic concept of “defamation of religions” into UN resolutions and reports.

Originally phrased in 1999 as “defamation of Islam,” the OIC broadened the title to appear to encompass respect for all religions, but Islam remains the only specifically mentioned faith in the numerous resolutions passed on this topic at the UN Human Rights Council and General Assembly. States have cited the concept to justify actions that selectively curtail civil dissent, halt criticism of political structures, and restrict the religious speech of minority faith communities, dissenting members of the majority faith, and persons of no faith.

The United States opposes efforts that would prohibit so-called “defamation of religions,” and voted against this resolution. Such efforts have been used to declare legitimate expression – such as commentary on government interpretations of religion – as illegal and punishable by imprisonment or, in some cases, death.

It is the free flow of information, expression, and opinions, and the protection of religious freedom, which create great societies and encourage speech that promotes understanding and tolerance. The United States looks forward to continued dialogue on these important issues.

11. Toward a New International Economic Order

A/Res/63/224

December 19

123-1(US)-52

Recalls the 1974 Declaration on Establishment of a New International Economic Order;

Reaffirms the need to continue working toward a new international economic order based on the principles of equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest, cooperation and solidarity among all states;

Decides to consider in depth the international economic situation and its impact on development during the 64th session of the General Assembly, and in that regard requests the Secretary-General to include in his next report, under the item “Globalization and interdependence,” an overview of the major international economic and policy challenges for equitable and inclusive sustained economic growth and sustainable development, and of the role of the United Nations in addressing these issues in the light of the relevant principles contained in the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Economic Order and the Program of Action for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

Background and U.S. Position: During Second Committee consideration of the draft resolution on October 6, the United States said that the current financial market turmoil could affect economic growth worldwide. The world was facing higher fuel and food prices, with the latter leading to a rise in food insecurity in a number of countries. It would now be necessary to bolster the development efforts of a number of developing countries in order for them to reach their development goals.

In the current interdependent economic environment, any effective solution to global problems required the relevant stakeholders at all levels to do their part. In the multilateral system, efforts should be redoubled to reach an ambitious agreement at the Doha Round. It was also important to ensure a successful Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development that outlined the progress made, identified areas where more effort was needed, and preserved the spirit of the Monterrey Consensus.

At the national level, countries needed to work even harder to create an enabling environment for sustained economic growth. The United States had taken unprecedented steps to stabilize its financial sector, and was also debating the issue of appropriate regulatory reform to ensure long-term stability. The key challenge for many developing countries was to build on the reforms already in place in order to improve their business climates, reduce macroeconomic distortions, and increase investment spending. A commitment to improving good governance was also critical.

Both developed and developing countries needed to act to advance development. Greater cooperation among them was also necessary to improve aid effectiveness, which was crucial to the success of development efforts. The United States valued partnerships with developing countries, as demonstrated by the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, which would provide \$48 billion over five years. Non-state actors also had a role to play in providing development assistance: foundations had become major foreign assistance partners and needed to be better integrated into the global system, while civil society needed to ensure that dissenting and underrepresented voices were heard.

The United States stood alone in opposing this resolution, though 52 others abstained.

12. Global Efforts for the Total Elimination of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance and the Comprehensive Implementation of and Follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Program of Action

A/Res/63/242

December 24

109-13(US)-35

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Expresses profound concern about and unequivocal condemnation of all forms of racism and racial discrimination; reiterates the call made at the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance for universal ratification of the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Background and U.S. Position: The United States has long been a party to the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, and its record of domestic legislation and policies to combat vigorously such activities and attitudes demonstrates U.S. commitment to this important issue. This resolution, however, devoted significant attention and praise to the World Conference on Racism and requested resources to implement its resulting Declaration and Program of Action.

The United States withdrew from the Third World Conference Against Racism, held in Durban in 2001. It publicly objected to declarations that contained hateful language, supported the idea that too much had been made of the Holocaust, and singled out only one country in the world (Israel) for censure and abuse.

Unfortunately, the work to date of the follow-up preparatory committee gave the United States no confidence that the 2009 meeting in Geneva would be any different. A compilation of proposed paragraphs for use in the drafting process of the outcome document contained dozens of unfair, unbalanced, and often flatly untrue statements about a single country – Israel, once again -- with a corresponding lack of emphasis on more serious problems in other countries.

The United States is opposed to racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related intolerance. The United States condemns all forms of racism and is deeply concerned by acts of violence committed on the pretext of racial or ethnic hatred. The United States regretted having to vote against this resolution, particularly since it contained many provisions with which it agreed. However, both the resolution’s significant attention to and praise for the Durban Conference, and its request for resources to implement its resulting Declaration and Program of Action were unacceptable.

Moreover, the United States maintained that some Durban follow-up activities duplicate work done by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Some also duplicate the work of the Human Rights Committee on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and work related to International Labor Organization conventions addressing worker's rights. In a time of limited resources and many great needs, the United States did not support the continuation of such duplicative work.

13. Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar (Burma)

A/Res/63/245

December 24

80(US)-25-45

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Strongly condemns the ongoing systematic violations of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of the people of Myanmar,

Strongly calls upon the Government of Myanmar: to ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to protect the inhabitants of the country; to allow a full, transparent, effective, impartial, and independent investigation into all reports of human rights violations, and to bring those responsible to justice; to reveal the whereabouts of persons who are detained or missing or who have been subjected to enforced disappearance; to release all political prisoners and those who have been arbitrarily arrested and detained; to lift all restraints on the peaceful political activity of all persons; to ensure timely, safe, full and unhindered access to all parts of Myanmar for the United Nations, international humanitarian organizations and their partners; to put an immediate end to the continuing recruitment and use of child soldiers; to take urgent measures to put an end to violations of international human rights and humanitarian law; and to end the systematic forced displacement of large numbers of persons within their country and the violence contributing to refugee flows into neighboring countries, and to respect ceasefire agreements;

Calls upon the Government of Myanmar: to refrain from imposing restrictions on access to and flow of information from the people; to restore the independence of the judiciary and due process of law, and ensure that discipline in prisons does not amount to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and that prison conditions meet international standards; and to engage more actively to eliminate the use of forced labor.

Background and U.S. Position: In Burma, there currently are over 2,000 prisoners of conscience, including Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi and other high-profile leaders like Min Ko Naing and Ko Ko Kyi, who were rearrested in 2007 during the pro-democracy demonstrations. Ethnic minorities face severe discrimination and persecution.

The junta has refused calls to carry out its own promises made in response to statements by the United Nations, the Association of South East Asian Nations, and the international community urging the release of all prisoners of conscience and engagement in a credible and time-bound dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi and other democratic and ethnic minority leaders.

The Burmese regime's political repression, forced relocations, massive human rights violations, military offensives against ethnic minorities, restrictions on international humanitarian organizations, and the use of rape as a tool of political intimidation have resulted in the destabilizing outflow of over a million Burmese to neighboring countries; cross-border trafficking in narcotics and persons; the spread of communicable diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis; and the internal displacement of between 500,000 and 1 million people.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

The United States remains committed to supporting the people of Burma, and believes that the adoption of this resolution keeps world pressure and attention focused on a regime that disregards the basic rights and universal freedoms of its people.

IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The seven important consensus resolutions are listed and described below. For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the document number, and date adopted. A summary of each resolution is provided (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), followed by background on the resolution and an explanation of the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in order by date.

1. Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

A/Res/63/6

October 27

Takes note with appreciation of the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

Takes note of resolutions on measures to strengthen international cooperation in: nuclear, radiation, transport and waste safety and on transport safety; on progress on measures to protect against nuclear and radiological terrorism; on strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities; on strengthening the Agency's activities related to nuclear science, technology and applications, comprising resolutions on nuclear and non-power nuclear applications, on power applications, and on nuclear knowledge; on strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards system and application of the Model Additional Protocol; on the implementation of the Agreement between the Agency and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the application of safeguards in connection with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; on the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East; and decisions on cooperation agreements with intergovernmental organizations, adopted by the General Conference of the Agency at its 52nd regular session; and

Reaffirms its strong support for the indispensable role of the Agency in encouraging and assisting the development and practical application of atomic energy for peaceful uses, in technology transfer to developing countries and in nuclear safety verification and security; and appeals to Member States to continue to support the activities of the Agency.

Background and U.S. Position: For three years previous to last year's General Assembly, similar resolutions on the IAEA required a recorded vote. However, in 2007 and 2008, the resolution was adopted by consensus.

The IAEA serves critical U.S. national security policy goals related to the nonproliferation of nuclear material; the prevention of nuclear terrorism;

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

the promotion of safe and secure use of nuclear energy; the peaceful application of nuclear science and technology in fields of energy, environment, health, and agriculture, among others; and to cooperation in key areas of nuclear science and technology. The United States strongly supports the IAEA and is the Agency's largest contributor with regard to both the IAEA regular budget and voluntary contributions.

2. Protection of Global Climate for Present and Future Generations of Mankind

A/Res/63/32

November 26

Taking note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC):

Stresses the seriousness of climate change, and calls upon states to work cooperatively toward achieving the ultimate objective of the UNFCCC through the urgent implementation of its provisions;

Urges parties to the Convention, and invites parties to the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC, to continue to make use of the information contained in the fourth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in their work;

Notes that states that have ratified the Kyoto Protocol welcome the entry into force of the Protocol on February 16, 2005, and strongly urge states that have not yet done so to ratify it in a timely manner;

Reaffirms that efforts to address climate change in a manner that enhances the sustainable development and sustained economic growth of the developing countries and the eradication of poverty should be carried out through promoting the integration of the three components of sustainable development, namely, economic development, social development, and environmental protection, as interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars, in an integrated, coordinated and balanced manner;

Recognizes the need to provide financial and technical resources, as well as capacity-building and access to and transfer of technology, to assist those developing countries adversely affected by climate change;

Calls upon the international community to fulfill the commitments made during the fourth replenishment of the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund; and

Notes the ongoing work of the liaison group of the secretariats and offices of the relevant subsidiary bodies of the Framework Convention, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, and the Convention on Biological Diversity, and encourages cooperation to

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

promote complementarities among the three secretariats while respecting their independent legal status.

Background and U.S. Position: The climate change resolution and its language on budgetary support have been recurrent in previous General Assembly sessions. The UNFCCC entered into force on March 21, 1994, to determine ways to reduce global warming and to cope with any temperature increases. It has been ratified by 192 countries, including the United States. The Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement to reduce greenhouse gases emissions, entered into force on February 16, 2005.

At a UNFCCC Conference of the Parties in Bali in December 2007, all UNFCCC parties at the conference agreed to a Roadmap which established a negotiating process with a clear end date, secures a commitment from developing and developed countries to consider meaningful actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It also established elements for a future international agreement to replace the Kyoto Protocol, which expires in 2012.

The United States recognizes the long-term challenge of global climate change and is committed to taking action on climate change at home and abroad. The United States is a party to the UNFCCC, but not to its Kyoto Protocol. The Roadmap achieved most key U.S. objectives noted in the background section above.

3. The Rule of Law at the National and International Levels

A/Res/63/128 December 11

Reaffirms the role of the General Assembly in encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification, and reaffirms further that states shall abide by all their obligations under international law;

Stresses the importance of adherence to the rule of law at the national level, and the need to strengthen support to member states, upon their request, in the domestic implementation of their respective international obligations through enhanced technical assistance and capacity-building, based on greater coordination and coherence within the UN system and among donors, and calls for greater evaluation of the effectiveness of such activities;

Calls upon the UN system systematically to address, as appropriate, aspects of the rule of law in relevant activities, recognizing the importance of the rule of law to virtually all areas of UN engagement; encourages the Secretary-General and the UN system to accord high priority to rule of law activities;

Invites the International Court of Justice, the UN Commission on International Trade Law, and the International Law Commission to continue to comment, in their respective reports to the General Assembly, on their current roles in promoting the rule of law; invites the Rule of Law Coordination and

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Resource Group and the Rule of Law Unit to interact with member states, in particular in informal briefings; and

Stresses the need to consider without delay the report of the Secretary-General on the resource requirements of the Unit, and urges the Secretary-General and member states to continue to support the functioning of the Unit during the interim phase.

Background and U.S. Position: This agenda item was first included in the agenda of the General Assembly during its 61st session, at the suggestion of Liechtenstein and Mexico. These states characterized their proposal as a follow-up to the 2005 World Summit Outcome document, which noted the need for “universal adherence to and implementation of the rule of law at both the national and international levels.” They stressed the importance of the United Nations in the international legal system and, as a prerequisite for improving the United Nations’ effectiveness, of the need to establish a systematic inventory of rule-of-law programs of UN bodies.

At the 63rd session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General submitted a report that contained an inventory on the rule of law activities of the United Nations (A/63/64) and a report on ways and means to strengthen and coordinate UN rule of law activities (A/63/226).

The United States believes in the value and importance of international law and welcomed the discussion on the rule of law in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. The United States joined consensus on this resolution.

4. Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

A/Res/63/166

December 18

Condemns all forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including through intimidation, which are and shall remain prohibited at any time and in any place whatsoever and can thus never be justified, and calls upon all states to implement fully the absolute prohibition of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment;

Condemns any action or attempt by states or public officials to legalize, authorize, or acquiesce in torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment under any circumstances, including on grounds of national security or through judicial decisions;

Calls upon all states to implement effective measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, particularly in places of detention and other places where persons are deprived of their liberty;

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Encourages all states to ensure that persons convicted of torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment have no subsequent involvement in the custody, interrogation, or treatment of any person under arrest, detention, imprisonment, or other deprivation of liberty;

Emphasizes that acts of torture in armed conflict are serious violations of international humanitarian law and in this regard constitute war crimes; that acts of torture can constitute crimes against humanity; and that the perpetrators of all acts of torture must be prosecuted and punished;

Urges states not to expel, return ("refouler"), extradite, or in any other way transfer a person to another state where there are substantial grounds for believing that the person would be in danger of being subjected to torture, and recognizes that diplomatic assurances, where used, do not release states from their obligations under international human rights humanitarian and refugee law, in particular the principle of non-refoulement;

Calls upon states parties to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment to comply strictly with their obligations under the Convention, and to fulfill their obligation to submit for prosecution or extradite those alleged to have committed acts of torture, and encourages other states to do likewise, bearing in mind the need to fight impunity;

Urges all states that have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention as a matter of priority, and calls upon states parties to give early consideration to signing and ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention;

Calls upon all states to cooperate with and assist the Special Rapporteur in the performance of his task; and

Recognizes the global need for international assistance to victims of torture, stresses the importance of the work of the Board of Trustees of the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture, appeals to all states and organizations to contribute annually to the Fund, and encourages contributions to the Special Fund established by the Optional Protocol.

Background and U.S. Position: Denmark traditionally sponsors this resolution, which the U.S. generally cosponsors. This year the United States cosponsored this resolution with over 50 countries from all regional groups.

U.S. criminal law and treaty obligations prohibit torture, and the United States will not engage in or condone torture anywhere. The United States is a party to the Convention against Torture.

5. Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief

A/Res/63/181

December 18

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Condemns all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief, as well as violations of freedom of thought, conscience, and religion or belief;

Stresses that the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion applies equally to all people, regardless of their religions or beliefs, and without any discrimination as to their equal protection by the law;

Emphasizes that, as underlined by the Human Rights Committee, restrictions on the freedom to manifest one's religion or belief are permitted only if limitations are prescribed by law, are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others, are non-discriminatory and are applied in a manner that does not vitiate the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion;

Recognizes with deep concern the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious and other communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and Christianophobia; expresses concern over the persistence of institutionalized social intolerance and discrimination practiced against many in the name of religion or belief;

Recalls that legal procedures pertaining to religious or belief-based groups and places of worship are not a prerequisite for the exercise of the right to manifest one's religion or belief; emphasizes that such procedures, as described above, at the national or local level, as and when legally required, should be non-discriminatory in order to contribute to the effective protection of the right of all persons to practice their religion or belief, either individually or in community with others, and in public or private;

Recognizes with concern the situation of persons in vulnerable situations, including persons deprived of their liberty, refugees, asylum-seekers and internally displaced persons, children, persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities and migrants, as regards their ability freely to exercise their right to freedom of religion or belief;

Urges states to step up their efforts to protect and promote freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief, and to eliminate intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief;

Condemns any advocacy of religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence; emphasizes that freedom of religion or belief and freedom of expression are interdependent, interrelated, and mutually reinforcing; emphasizes that no religion should be equated with terrorism, as this may have adverse consequences on the enjoyment of the right to freedom of religion or belief of all members of the religious communities concerned;

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Urges all governments to cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur, to respond favorably to her requests to visit their countries and to provide all necessary information for the effective fulfillment of her mandate; and requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Special Rapporteur receives the necessary resources to fully discharge her mandate.

Background and U.S. Position: This resolution is typically submitted by the European Union. It has been included almost annually since the introduction of the Declaration in 1995.

The United States cosponsors and strongly supports this resolution, and each year participates actively in negotiations in an effort to ensure that it is adopted by consensus. U.S. law prohibits discrimination against anyone on the basis of religion.

The United States is a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which prohibits discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

6. Doha Declaration on Financing for Development: outcome document of the Follow-up International Conference on Financing for Development to Review the Implementation of the Monterrey Consensus

A/Res/63/239

December 24

The General Assembly adopted the "Doha Declaration on Financing for Development" (December 2008) as a strong reaffirmation of the path-breaking 2002 Monterrey Consensus, which serves as a framework for the total economic engagement approach to development and stresses the importance of country ownership and responsibility in the development process, as well as engagement and partnership with the private sector. The Declaration underscores the need for an integrated approach to marshaling development financing that was initially set out in the Monterrey Consensus. It also recognizes that additional efforts and follow through on commitments made by both developed and developing countries are needed to realize the full promise of the Monterrey Consensus.

The Declaration acknowledges the importance of official development assistance (ODA) and the need for developed states to follow through on their commitments to provide assistance. The document also underscores that developing countries have important commitments to good governance, sound economic policies, and rule of law that must be fully realized. The Doha Declaration recognized the progress made and developing countries pledged "to build upon this progress ... by ensuring the necessary enabling environment for mobilizing public and private resources and expanding productive investments."

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

The Doha Declaration makes clear that states must use all sources of financing in pursuing their development goals, including domestic resources, foreign investment, trade, ODA and debt. Despite the current global economic crisis, states recognized in the Declaration the unparalleled period of global economic prosperity since they set out the Consensus at Monterrey, as well as its effectiveness as an integrated approach to development through economic growth. The document underscores that "private international capital flows, particularly foreign direct investment ... are vital," and "international trade is an engine for development and sustained economic growth." The conference also recognized the "catalytic role" that ODA can play "as a complement to other sources of financing for development."

The Doha Declaration underscores that while "each country has primary responsibility for its own economic and social development," it also recognizes that "domestic economies are now interwoven with the global economic system," and we have a shared interest in each country's success and the need for "an enabling international economic environment." In addressing the issue of "policy space," the Doha Declaration states that "it is for each government to evaluate the trade-off between the benefits of accepting international rules and commitments, and the constraints posed by the loss of policy space."

(Note: The text above summarizes the resolution. The complete text, including its annex, may be found on: <http://documents.un.org/simple.asp> by searching for A/63/L.57.)

Background and U.S. Position: The United Nations Conference on Financing for Development (FfD) took place in Monterrey, Mexico, in March 2002. Over 50 heads of state and more than 200 ministers from around the world attended. They reached broad agreement on the need to increase the volume and effectiveness of all available domestic and international, but particularly private, resources for development.

The Monterrey Consensus stressed the primary responsibility of countries to advance their own development, coupled with international support for developing countries. General Assembly Resolution 62/187 (December 2007) set out the modalities for a process to review implementation of the Monterrey Consensus, which culminated in the review conference in Doha, Qatar (November-December 2008), where participating states adopted the Doha Declaration by consensus.

The Monterrey Consensus broke new ground as a UN development conference in which world leaders; representatives of the private sector; civil society; and major international economic, trade, financial, and monetary organizations engaged in serious dialogue to build a new approach to development work. They emphasized outcomes rather than inputs.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

The Monterrey Consensus helped to establish a shared vision for development that gives to recipient countries primary responsibility for their own development. It also recognized the importance of local ownership, accountability, and an integrated approach to financing for development, to include not only higher levels of ODA, but also other equally important and often financially larger sources of financing, including domestic resources, trade, investment, and debt relief.

There have been many notable FfD successes since the Monterrey Consensus, and the review helped to highlight and encourage discussions of best practices. It also served as a platform to reaffirm global development assistance commitments, and to urge both developed and emerging economies to undertake these commitments in order to continue to lift individuals and countries out of poverty.

Since Monterrey most developing countries have experienced high and sustained levels of economic growth, and the financial facilities and resources of the IMF and other international financial institutions have continued to develop. Participation by developing countries in international decision making and norm-setting processes has expanded significantly since Monterrey.

7. Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID)

A/Res/63/258

December 24

Endorses the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions; subject to the provisions of the present resolution, and requests the Secretary-General to ensure their full implementation;

Decides to apportion among member states the amount of (U.S.) \$449,855,000 for the period January-June 2009, in accordance with the updated levels approved by the General Assembly in its Resolution 61/243 (December 2006), and taking into account the scale of assessments for 2009 as set out in its Resolution 61/237 (December 2006), in addition to the amount of \$919,400,200 already apportioned among member states under the terms of Resolution 62/ B, comprising the amount of \$849,855,000 for the maintenance of the Operation for the period July-December 2008, the amount of \$60,624,500 for the support account for peacekeeping operations for the period July 2008-June 2009, and the amount of \$8,920,700 for the UN Logistics Base at Brindisi, Italy, for the period July 2008-June 2009;

Also decides that, in accordance with the provisions of its Resolution 973 (X) (December 1955), there shall be set off against the apportionment among member states, as provided for above, their respective share in the Tax Equalization Fund of \$6,373,050, representing the estimated staff assessment income approved for the Operation for the period January-June 2009;

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Authorizes the Secretary-General, upon the advice of the Controller, to assess member states, as required, a further amount of up to \$200,000,000 for the maintenance of the Operation for the period January-June 2009;

Decides that, for member states that have fulfilled their financial obligations to the Operation, their respective share of the unencumbered balance and other income in the total amount of \$225,443,200 in respect of the financial period ended June 2008, shall, on an exceptional basis, and in the light of the submission of a progress report during the budget period, be offset against either their apportionment as provided for above or the apportionment for the Operation effective for the period July 2009-June 2010, according to the preference of the relevant member state, in accordance with the updated levels approved by the General Assembly in its Resolution 61/243 (March 2007), taking into account the scale of assessments for 2008, as set out in its Resolution 61/237 (February 2007), and requests the Secretary-General to implement such an approach;

Also decides that, for member states that have not fulfilled their financial obligations to the Operation, there shall be set off against their outstanding obligations their respective share of the unencumbered balance and other income in the total amount of \$225,443,200 in respect of the financial period ended June 2008, in accordance with the scheme set out above; and

Further decides that the decrease of \$4,687,900 in staff assessment income in respect of the financial period ended June 2008 shall be set off against the credits from the amount of \$225,443,200 referred to above.

Background and U.S. Position: UNAMID was established by Security Council Resolution 1769 (2007) to support the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement, as well as to protect civilians. That followed the adoption of Security Council Resolution 1706 (2006), which first called for a UN force to deploy to Darfur. General Assembly Resolution 62/232 (February 2008) approved \$1.28 billion to launch UNAMID for the period July 2007-June 2008.

In August 2008 the General Assembly adopted Resolution 62/232 B, which approved \$1.57 billion to continue support to UNAMID for the period July 2008-June 2009. Member states were apportioned the amount of \$919.4 million by the terms of that resolution.

The United States continues to be committed to supporting this peacekeeping operation in Darfur. The United States pays one quarter of UNAMID's operating budget through its UN assessments, has provided an additional \$100 million in training and equipment to UNAMID troop-contributing countries, and has provided over \$15 million in airlift assistance to help deploy peacekeeping equipment to and within Darfur.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 63rd 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” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes.

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

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	23.1%
Albania	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Andorra	4	2	5	2	66.7%
Angola	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Argentina	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Armenia	1	8	3	1	11.1%
Australia	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Austria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Azerbaijan	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Bahamas	4	6	1	2	40.0%
Bahrain	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	15.4%
Barbados	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Belarus	0	11	1	1	0.0%
Belgium	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Belize	4	5	0	4	44.4%
Benin	0	8	4	1	0.0%
Bhutan	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Bolivia	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Botswana	5	5	2	1	50.0%
Brazil	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Bulgaria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Burkina Faso	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Burundi	3	5	3	2	37.5%
Cambodia	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Cameroon	0	4	8	1	0.0%
Canada	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	3	25.0%
Central African Rep.	0	6	4	3	0.0%
Chad	0	2	3	8	0.0%
Chile	4	8	1	0	33.3%
China	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Colombia	1	5	7	0	16.7%
Comoros	2	9	0	2	18.2%
Congo	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Costa Rica	4	6	3	0	40.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Côte d'Ivoire	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Croatia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Cuba	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Cyprus	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Czech Republic	6	2	5	0	75.0%
DPR of Korea	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Denmark	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Djibouti	0	8	1	4	0.0%
Dominica	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Ecuador	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Egypt	1	12	0	0	7.7%
El Salvador	3	3	4	3	50.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Eritrea	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Estonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Fiji	3	3	5	2	50.0%
Finland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
France	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	3	4	0.0%
Georgia	4	2	7	0	66.7%
Germany	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Ghana	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Greece	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Grenada	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Guatemala	2	4	7	0	33.3%
Guinea	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Guinea-Bissau	2	8	2	1	20.0%
Guyana	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Haiti	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Honduras	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Hungary	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Iceland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
India	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Indonesia	1	11	1	0	8.3%
Iran	1	12	0	0	7.7%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Ireland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Israel	11	1	1	0	91.7%
Italy	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Jamaica	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Japan	5	1	7	0	83.3%
Jordan	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Kenya	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kiribati	3	1	0	9	75.0%
Kuwait	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Kyrgyzstan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Laos	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Latvia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Lesotho	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Liberia	4	5	2	2	44.4%
Libya	1	11	0	1	8.3%
Liechtenstein	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Lithuania	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Luxembourg	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Madagascar	1	5	1	6	16.7%
Malawi	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Malaysia	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Maldives	3	8	0	2	27.3%
Mali	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Malta	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Marshall Islands	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Mauritania	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mauritius	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Mexico	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Micronesia	9	2	1	1	81.8%
Moldova	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Monaco	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	42.9%
Montenegro	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Morocco	2	9	1	1	18.2%
Mozambique	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	7.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Namibia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Nauru	7	2	2	2	77.8%
Nepal	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Netherlands	6	2	5	0	75.0%
New Zealand	5	2	5	1	71.4%
Nicaragua	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Niger	0	7	4	2	0.0%
Nigeria	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Norway	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Oman	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Pakistan	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Palau	11	1	1	0	91.7%
Panama	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Papua New Guinea	2	3	5	3	40.0%
Paraguay	3	7	3	0	30.0%
Peru	4	5	4	0	44.4%
Philippines	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Poland	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Portugal	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Qatar	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Republic of Korea	4	1	8	0	80.0%
Romania	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Russia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	4	5	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	2	2	7	50.0%
Saint Lucia	4	6	1	2	40.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Samoa	5	4	4	0	55.6%
San Marino	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Sao Tome/Principe	0	7	2	4	0.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	0.0%
Serbia	1	4	6	2	20.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	3	3	7	0.0%
Singapore	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Slovak Republic	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovenia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Solomon Islands	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
South Africa	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Spain	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Sri Lanka	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Sudan	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Suriname	0	8	3	2	0.0%
Swaziland	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Sweden	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Switzerland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Syria	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Tajikistan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Thailand	1	6	6	0	14.3%
TFYR Macedonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Timor-Leste	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Togo	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Tonga	1	2	5	5	33.3%
Trinidad and Tobago	1	7	2	3	12.5%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	0.0%
Turkey	2	8	1	2	20.0%
Turkmenistan	0	7	1	5	0.0%
Tuvalu	2	3	2	6	40.0%
Uganda	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Ukraine	5	2	6	0	71.4%
United Arab Emirates	0	9	4	0	0.0%
United Kingdom	6	2	5	0	75.0%
UR Tanzania	1	5	5	2	16.7%
Uruguay	3	5	5	0	37.5%
Uzbekistan	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Vanuatu	3	3	2	5	50.0%
Venezuela	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Yemen	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Zimbabwe	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Average					27.6%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Israel	11	1	1	0	91.7%
Palau	11	1	1	0	91.7%
Australia	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Canada	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Marshall Islands	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Micronesia	9	2	1	1	81.8%
Nauru	7	2	2	2	77.8%
Czech Republic	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Denmark	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Netherlands	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Poland	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Romania	6	2	5	0	75.0%
United Kingdom	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Austria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Belgium	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Botswana	5	5	2	1	50.0%
Bulgaria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Croatia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Cyprus	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Estonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Finland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
France	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Germany	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Greece	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Hungary	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Iceland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Ireland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Italy	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Japan	5	1	7	0	83.3%
Latvia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Liechtenstein	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Lithuania	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Luxembourg	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Malta	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Moldova	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Monaco	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Montenegro	5	2	6	0	71.4%
New Zealand	5	2	5	1	71.4%
Norway	5	3	5	0	62.5%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Portugal	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Samoa	5	4	4	0	55.6%
San Marino	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovak Republic	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovenia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Spain	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Sweden	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Switzerland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
TFYR Macedonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Ukraine	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Albania	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Andorra	4	2	5	2	66.7%
Argentina	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Bahamas	4	6	1	2	40.0%
Belize	4	5	0	4	44.4%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Chile	4	8	1	0	33.3%
Costa Rica	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Georgia	4	2	7	0	66.7%
Honduras	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Liberia	4	5	2	2	44.4%
Mexico	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Panama	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Peru	4	5	4	0	44.4%
Republic of Korea	4	1	8	0	80.0%
Saint Lucia	4	6	1	2	40.0%
Timor Leste	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	23.1%
Burundi	3	5	3	2	37.5%
El Salvador	3	3	4	3	50.0%
Fiji	3	3	5	2	50.0%
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Kiribati	3	1	0	9	75.0%
Maldives	3	8	0	2	27.3%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	42.9%
Paraguay	3	7	3	0	30.0%
Uruguay	3	5	5	0	37.5%
Vanuatu	3	3	2	5	50.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	15.4%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Cape Verde	2	6	2	3	25.0%
Comoros	2	9	0	2	18.2%
Eritrea	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Guatemala	2	4	7	0	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	8	2	1	20.0%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Morocco	2	9	1	1	18.2%
Papua New Guinea	2	3	5	3	40.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	2	2	7	50.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Togo	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Turkey	2	8	1	2	20.0%
Tuvalu	2	3	2	6	40.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Armenia	1	8	3	1	11.1%
Bahrain	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Barbados	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Bhutan	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Brazil	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	2	0	9.1%
China	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Colombia	1	5	7	0	16.7%
DPR of Korea	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Dominica	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Ecuador	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Egypt	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Ghana	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Grenada	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Guyana	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Haiti	1	7	3	2	12.5%
India	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Indonesia	1	11	1	0	8.3%
Iran	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Jamaica	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Kuwait	1	10	2	0	9.1%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Libya	1	11	0	1	8.3%
Madagascar	1	5	1	6	16.7%
Malawi	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Malaysia	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Mauritius	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Nigeria	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Pakistan	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Qatar	1	10	2	0	9.1%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Serbia	1	4	6	2	20.0%
Singapore	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Solomon Islands	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Sudan	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Swaziland	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Syria	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Thailand	1	6	6	0	14.3%
Tonga	1	2	5	5	33.3%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	2	3	12.5%
Uganda	1	9	2	1	10.0%
U.R. Tanzania	1	5	5	2	16.7%
Yemen	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Zimbabwe	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Angola	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Azerbaijan	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Belarus	0	11	1	1	0.0%
Benin	0	8	4	1	0.0%
Bolivia	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Cambodia	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Cameroon	0	4	8	1	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	6	4	3	0.0%
Chad	0	2	3	8	0.0%
Congo	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Cuba	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Djibouti	0	8	1	4	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	12	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	3	4	0.0%
Guinea	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Jordan	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kenya	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Laos	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Lesotho	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Mali	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mauritania	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mozambique	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Namibia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Nepal	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Nicaragua	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Niger	0	7	4	2	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Philippines	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Russia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	4	5	0.0%
Sao Tome & Principe	0	7	2	4	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	0.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	3	3	7	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	0.0%
South Africa	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Sri Lanka	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Suriname	0	8	3	2	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	7	1	5	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Venezuela	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Average					27.6%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 13 important votes.

African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Botswana	5	5	2	1	50.0%
Liberia	4	5	2	2	44.4%
Burundi	3	5	3	2	37.5%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	3	25.0%
Comoros	2	9	0	2	18.2%
Eritrea	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Guinea-Bissau	2	8	2	1	20.0%
Morocco	2	9	1	1	18.2%
Sudan	2	2	2	7	50.0%
Uganda	2	3	2	6	40.0%
Egypt	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Ghana	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Libya	1	11	0	1	8.3%
Madagascar	1	5	1	6	16.7%
Malawi	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Mauritius	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Nigeria	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Swaziland	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Togo	1	6	6	0	14.3%
Tunisia	1	2	5	5	33.3%
Zimbabwe	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Angola	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Benin	0	8	4	1	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Cameroon	0	4	8	1	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	6	4	3	0.0%
Chad	0	2	3	8	0.0%
Congo	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Djibouti	0	8	1	4	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	3	4	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

African Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Guinea	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Kenya	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Lesotho	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Mali	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mauritania	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mozambique	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Namibia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Niger	0	7	4	2	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	4	5	0.0%
Sao Tome & Principe	0	7	2	4	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	0.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	3	3	7	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	0.0%
South Africa	0	10	3	0	0.0%
U.R. Tanzania	0	7	1	5	0.0%
Zambia	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Average					8.2%

Asian Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Palau	11	1	1	0	91.7%
Marshall Islands	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Micronesia	9	2	1	1	81.8%
Nauru	7	2	2	2	77.8%
Cyprus	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Japan	5	1	7	0	83.3%
Samoa	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Republic of Korea	4	1	8	0	80.0%
Timor Leste	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	23.1%
Fiji	3	3	5	2	50.0%
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Maldives	3	8	0	2	27.3%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	42.9%
Vanuatu	3	3	2	5	50.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	15.4%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Asian Group (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Papua New Guinea	2	3	5	3	40.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Tuvalu	2	3	2	6	40.0%
Bahrain	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Bhutan	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	2	0	9.1%
China	1	12	0	0	7.7%
DPR of Korea	1	12	0	0	7.7%
India	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Indonesia	1	11	1	0	8.3%
Iran	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Kuwait	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Malaysia	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Pakistan	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Qatar	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Singapore	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Solomon Islands	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Syria	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Thailand	1	6	6	0	14.3%
Tonga	1	2	5	5	33.3%
Yemen	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Cambodia	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Jordan	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Laos	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Nepal	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Philippines	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Sri Lanka	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	7	1	5	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Average					20.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Argentina	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Bahamas	4	6	1	2	40.0%
Belize	4	5	0	4	44.4%
Chile	4	8	1	0	33.3%
Costa Rica	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Honduras	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Mexico	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Panama	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Peru	4	5	4	0	44.4%
Saint Lucia	4	6	1	2	40.0%
El Salvador	3	3	4	3	50.0%
Paraguay	3	7	3	0	30.0%
Uruguay	3	5	5	0	37.5%
Guatemala	2	4	7	0	33.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	2	2	7	50.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Barbados	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Brazil	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Colombia	1	5	7	0	16.7%
Dominica	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Ecuador	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Grenada	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Guyana	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Haiti	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Jamaica	1	8	4	0	11.1%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	2	3	12.5%
Bolivia	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Cuba	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Nicaragua	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Suriname	0	8	3	2	0.0%
Venezuela	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Average					22.1%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Western European and Others Group (WEOG)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Israel	11	1	1	0	91.7%
Australia	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Canada	10	2	1	0	83.3%
Denmark	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Netherlands	6	2	5	0	75.0%
United Kingdom	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Austria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Belgium	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Finland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
France	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Germany	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Greece	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Iceland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Ireland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Italy	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Liechtenstein	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Luxembourg	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Malta	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Monaco	5	2	6	0	71.4%
New Zealand	5	2	5	1	71.4%
Norway	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Portugal	5	2	6	0	71.4%
San Marino	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Spain	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Sweden	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Switzerland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Andorra	4	2	5	2	66.7%
Turkey	2	8	1	2	20.0%
Average					69.8%

Eastern European Group (EE)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Czech Republic	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Poland	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Romania	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Bulgaria	5	2	6	0	71.4%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Croatia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Estonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Hungary	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Latvia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Lithuania	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Moldova	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Montenegro	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovak Republic	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovenia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
TFYR Macedonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Ukraine	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Albania	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Georgia	4	2	7	0	66.7%
Armenia	1	8	3	1	11.1%
Serbia	1	4	6	2	20.0%
Azerbaijan	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Belarus	0	11	1	1	0.0%
Russia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Average					53.2%

OTHER GROUPINGS

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with the U.S. for major groups on the 13 important votes, in rank order by identical votes.

Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	15.4%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Morocco	2	9	1	1	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Bahrain	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Egypt	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Kuwait	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Libya	1	11	0	1	8.3%
Qatar	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Sudan	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Syria	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Djibouti	0	8	1	4	0.0%
Jordan	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Mauritania	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	0.0%
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Average					8.5%

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Indonesia	1	11	1	0	8.3%
Malaysia	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Singapore	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Thailand	1	6	6	0	14.3%
Cambodia	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Laos	0	10	3	0	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Philippines	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Average					5.6%

European Union (EU)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Czech Republic	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Denmark	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Netherlands	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Poland	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Romania	6	2	5	0	75.0%
United Kingdom	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Austria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Belgium	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Bulgaria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Cyprus	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Estonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Finland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
France	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Germany	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Greece	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Hungary	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Ireland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Italy	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Latvia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Lithuania	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Luxembourg	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Malta	5	4	4	0	55.6%
Portugal	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovak Republic	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovenia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Spain	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Sweden	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Average					70.9%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Islamic Conference (OIC)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Albania	4	2	6	1	66.7%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	23.1%
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Maldives	3	8	0	2	27.3%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	15.4%
Comoros	2	9	0	2	18.2%
Guinea-Bissau	2	8	2	1	20.0%
Kazakhstan	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Morocco	2	9	1	1	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Togo	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Turkey	2	8	1	2	20.0%
Bahrain	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Egypt	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Guyana	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Indonesia	1	11	1	0	8.3%
Iran	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Kuwait	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Libya	1	11	0	1	8.3%
Malaysia	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Nigeria	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Pakistan	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Qatar	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Sudan	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Syria	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Uganda	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Yemen	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Azerbaijan	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Benin	0	8	4	1	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Cameroon	0	4	8	1	0.0%
Chad	0	2	3	8	0.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Djibouti	0	8	1	4	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	3	4	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Guinea	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Jordan	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kyrgyzstan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Mali	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mauritania	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mozambique	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Niger	0	7	4	2	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	3	3	7	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	0.0%
Suriname	0	8	3	2	0.0%
Tajikistan	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	7	1	5	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Average					8.5%

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Botswana	5	5	2	1	50.0%
Bahamas	4	6	1	2	40.0%
Belize	4	5	0	4	44.4%
Chile	4	8	1	0	33.3%
Honduras	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Liberia	4	5	2	2	44.4%
Panama	4	6	3	0	40.0%
Peru	4	5	4	0	44.4%
Saint Lucia	4	6	1	2	40.0%
Timor Leste	4	7	2	0	36.4%
Afghanistan	3	10	0	0	23.1%
Burundi	3	5	3	2	37.5%
Fiji	3	3	5	2	50.0%
Iraq	3	7	0	3	30.0%
Maldives	3	8	0	2	27.3%
Mongolia	3	4	3	3	42.9%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Vanuatu	3	3	2	5	50.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	0	0	15.4%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	3	25.0%
Comoros	2	9	0	2	18.2%
Eritrea	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Guatemala	2	4	7	0	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	8	2	1	20.0%
Lebanon	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Morocco	2	9	1	1	18.2%
Papua New Guinea	2	3	5	3	40.0%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	1	0	16.7%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	2	2	7	50.0%
Togo	2	10	1	0	16.7%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Bahrain	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Barbados	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Bhutan	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Colombia	1	5	7	0	16.7%
Dominica	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Dominican Republic	1	8	4	0	11.1%
DPR of Korea	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Ecuador	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Egypt	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Ghana	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Grenada	1	7	5	0	12.5%
Guyana	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Haiti	1	7	3	2	12.5%
India	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Indonesia	1	11	1	0	8.3%
Iran	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Jamaica	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Kuwait	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Libya	1	11	0	1	8.3%
Madagascar	1	5	1	6	16.7%
Malawi	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Malaysia	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Mauritius	1	8	4	0	11.1%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Nigeria	1	7	3	2	12.5%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Pakistan	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Qatar	1	10	2	0	9.1%
Singapore	1	9	3	0	10.0%
St.Vincent/Grenadines	1	7	3	2	12.5%
Sudan	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Swaziland	1	9	3	0	10.0%
Syria	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Thailand	1	6	6	0	14.3%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	2	3	12.5%
U.R. Tanzania	1	5	5	2	16.7%
Uganda	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Yemen	1	9	2	1	10.0%
Zimbabwe	1	12	0	0	7.7%
Algeria	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Angola	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Belarus	0	11	1	1	0.0%
Benin	0	8	4	1	0.0%
Bolivia	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Burkina Faso	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Cambodia	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Cameroon	0	4	8	1	0.0%
Central African Rep.	0	6	4	3	0.0%
Chad	0	2	3	8	0.0%
Congo	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Cuba	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Djibouti	0	8	1	4	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Ethiopia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Gabon	0	7	0	6	0.0%
Gambia	0	6	3	4	0.0%
Guinea	0	10	1	2	0.0%
Jordan	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Kenya	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Laos	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Lesotho	0	7	5	1	0.0%
Mali	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Mauritania	0	10	3	0	0.0%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Mozambique	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Namibia	0	10	3	0	0.0%
Nepal	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Nicaragua	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Niger	0	7	4	2	0.0%
Oman	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Philippines	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Rwanda	0	4	4	5	0.0%
Sao Tome & Principe	0	7	2	4	0.0%
Senegal	0	10	2	1	0.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	12	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	3	3	7	0.0%
Somalia	0	8	0	5	0.0%
South Africa	0	11	2	0	0.0%
Sri Lanka	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Suriname	0	8	3	2	0.0%
Tunisia	0	10	0	3	0.0%
Turkmenistan	0	7	1	5	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	9	4	0	0.0%
Uzbekistan	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Venezuela	0	13	0	0	0.0%
Vietnam	0	12	1	0	0.0%
Zambia	0	8	5	0	0.0%
Average					11.6%

Nordic Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Denmark	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Finland	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Iceland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Norway	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Sweden	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Average					68.4%

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE
Canada	10	2	1	0	83.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Czech Republic	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Denmark	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Netherlands	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Poland	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Romania	6	2	5	0	75.0%
United Kingdom	6	2	5	0	75.0%
Belgium	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Bulgaria	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Estonia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
France	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Germany	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Greece	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Hungary	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Iceland	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Italy	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Latvia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Lithuania	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Luxembourg	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Norway	5	3	5	0	62.5%
Portugal	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovak Republic	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Slovenia	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Spain	5	2	6	0	71.4%
Turkey	2	8	1	2	20.0%
Average					69.6%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2008 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	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Afghanistan	3	10	23.1%	15	69	17.9%
Albania	4	2	66.7%	32	39	45.1%
Algeria	0	13	0.0%	5	71	6.6%
Andorra	4	2	66.7%	29	33	46.8%
Angola	0	10	0.0%	13	65	16.7%
Antigua-Barbuda	1	8	11.1%	14	66	17.5%
Argentina	4	6	40.0%	21	61	25.6%
Armenia	1	8	11.1%	17	55	23.6%
Australia	10	2	83.3%	41	31	56.9%
Austria	5	2	71.4%	30	43	41.1%
Azerbaijan	0	12	0.0%	13	66	16.5%
Bahamas	4	6	40.0%	19	57	25.0%
Bahrain	1	10	9.1%	5	66	7.0%
Bangladesh	2	11	15.4%	15	70	17.6%
Barbados	1	9	10.0%	14	66	17.5%
Belarus	0	11	0.0%	12	66	15.4%
Belgium	5	2	71.4%	32	40	44.4%
Belize	4	5	44.4%	18	55	24.7%
Benin	0	8	0.0%	13	62	17.3%
Bhutan	1	7	12.5%	15	53	22.1%
Bolivia	0	9	0.0%	12	69	14.8%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4	2	66.7%	29	39	42.6%
Botswana	5	5	50.0%	20	59	25.3%
Brazil	1	7	12.5%	16	63	20.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	10	9.1%	14	71	16.5%
Bulgaria	5	2	71.4%	32	38	45.7%
Burkina Faso	0	7	0.0%	13	61	17.6%
Burundi	3	5	37.5%	15	60	20.0%
Cambodia	0	10	0.0%	13	68	16.0%
Cameroon	0	4	0.0%	13	46	22.0%
Canada	10	2	83.3%	41	28	59.4%
Cape Verde	2	6	25.0%	16	53	23.2%
Central African Rep	0	6	0.0%	0	32	0.0%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Chad	0	2	0.0%	7	20	25.9%
Chile	4	8	33.3%	22	61	26.5%
China	1	12	7.7%	13	66	16.5%
Colombia	1	5	16.7%	15	60	20.0%
Comoros	2	9	18.2%	8	59	11.9%
Congo	0	10	0.0%	13	68	16.0%
Costa Rica	4	6	40.0%	20	63	24.1%
Cote d'Ivoire	0	9	0.0%	13	62	17.3%
Croatia	5	2	71.4%	31	39	44.3%
Cuba	0	12	0.0%	10	72	12.2%
Cyprus	5	4	55.6%	31	47	36.1%
Czech Republic	6	2	75.0%	33	39	45.8%
DPR of Korea	1	12	7.7%	6	61	9.0%
Dem. Rep. Of Congo	0	1	0.0%	6	19	24.0%
Denmark	6	2	75.0%	34	38	47.2%
Djibouti	0	8	0.0%	6	68	8.1%
Dominica	1	7	12.5%	14	58	19.4%
Dominican Republic	1	8	11.1%	16	66	19.5%
Ecuador	1	9	10.0%	15	68	18.1%
Egypt	1	12	7.7%	5	70	6.7%
El Salvador	3	3	50.0%	19	52	26.8%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0.0%	12	22	35.3%
Eritrea	2	10	16.7%	15	69	17.9%
Estonia	5	2	71.4%	32	39	45.1%
Ethiopia	0	8	0.0%	13	63	17.1%
Fiji	3	3	50.0%	18	33	35.3%
Finland	5	2	71.4%	31	41	43.1%
France	5	2	71.4%	39	33	54.2%
Gabon	0	7	0.0%	2	38	5.0%
Gambia	0	6	0.0%	0	30	0.0%
Georgia	4	2	66.7%	28	39	41.8%
Germany	5	2	71.4%	32	41	43.8%
Ghana	1	7	12.5%	14	63	18.2%
Greece	5	2	71.4%	32	40	44.4%
Grenada	1	7	12.5%	13	62	17.3%
Guatemala	2	4	33.3%	19	62	23.5%
Guinea	0	10	0.0%	11	66	14.3%
Guinea-Bissau	2	8	20.0%	15	56	21.1%
Guyana	1	7	12.5%	14	59	19.2%
Haiti	1	7	12.5%	16	55	22.5%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Honduras	4	7	36.4%	21	63	25.0%
Hungary	5	2	71.4%	32	39	45.1%
Iceland	5	3	62.5%	32	42	43.2%
India	1	10	9.1%	18	58	23.7%
Indonesia	1	11	8.3%	13	73	15.1%
Iran	1	12	7.7%	4	69	5.5%
Iraq	3	7	30.0%	8	63	11.3%
Ireland	5	2	71.4%	30	44	40.5%
Israel	11	1	91.7%	64	9	87.7%
Italy	5	2	71.4%	32	41	43.8%
Jamaica	1	8	11.1%	14	64	17.9%
Japan	5	1	83.3%	28	41	40.6%
Jordan	0	8	0.0%	6	66	8.3%
Kazakhstan	2	10	16.7%	17	62	21.5%
Kenya	0	8	0.0%	12	64	15.8%
Kiribati	3	1	75.0%	5	1	83.3%
Kuwait	1	10	9.1%	6	66	8.3%
Kyrgyzstan	0	11	0.0%	13	65	16.7%
Laos	0	10	0.0%	10	62	13.9%
Latvia	5	2	71.4%	32	37	46.4%
Lebanon	2	10	16.7%	7	70	9.1%
Lesotho	0	7	0.0%	13	62	17.3%
Liberia	4	5	44.4%	19	54	26.0%
Libya	1	11	8.3%	5	68	6.8%
Liechtenstein	5	3	62.5%	31	44	41.3%
Lithuania	5	2	71.4%	33	39	45.8%
Luxembourg	5	2	71.4%	32	38	45.7%
Madagascar	1	5	16.7%	14	53	20.9%
Malawi	1	7	12.5%	14	59	19.2%
Malaysia	1	12	7.7%	13	71	15.5%
Maldives	3	8	27.3%	16	66	19.5%
Mali	0	10	0.0%	13	68	16.0%
Malta	5	4	55.6%	30	45	35.7%
Marshall Islands	10	2	83.3%	49	21	70.0%
Mauritania	0	10	0.0%	6	70	7.9%
Mauritius	1	8	11.1%	15	61	19.7%
Mexico	4	6	40.0%	20	63	24.1%
Micronesia	9	2	81.8%	49	14	77.8%
Moldova	5	2	71.4%	31	40	43.7%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Monaco	5	2	71.4%	30	34	46.9%
Mongolia	3	4	42.9%	16	60	21.1%
Montenegro	5	2	71.4%	31	41	43.1%
Morocco	2	9	18.2%	8	67	10.7%
Mozambique	0	9	0.0%	13	65	16.7%
Myanmar (Burma)	1	12	7.7%	7	68	9.3%
Namibia	0	10	0.0%	12	69	14.8%
Nauru	7	2	77.8%	33	27	55.0%
Nepal	0	8	0.0%	15	64	19.0%
Netherlands	6	2	75.0%	34	39	46.6%
New Zealand	5	2	71.4%	29	45	39.2%
Nicaragua	0	12	0.0%	13	72	15.3%
Niger	0	7	0.0%	12	62	16.2%
Nigeria	1	7	12.5%	13	62	17.3%
Norway	5	3	62.5%	32	42	43.2%
Oman	0	12	0.0%	4	72	5.3%
Pakistan	1	10	9.1%	14	60	18.9%
Palau	11	1	91.7%	56	16	77.8%
Panama	4	6	40.0%	21	60	25.9%
Papua New Guinea	2	3	40.0%	15	48	23.8%
Paraguay	3	7	30.0%	18	64	22.0%
Peru	4	5	44.4%	21	59	26.3%
Philippines	0	9	0.0%	15	65	18.8%
Poland	6	2	75.0%	33	39	45.8%
Portugal	5	2	71.4%	32	40	44.4%
Qatar	1	10	9.1%	5	66	7.0%
Republic of Korea	4	1	80.0%	25	38	39.7%
Romania	6	2	75.0%	32	40	44.4%
Russia	0	10	0.0%	12	58	17.1%
Rwanda	0	4	0.0%	12	45	21.1%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	2	50.0%	2	8	20.0%
Saint Lucia	4	6	40.0%	19	58	24.7%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	1	7	12.5%	14	57	19.7%
Samoa	5	4	55.6%	23	52	30.7%
San Marino	5	2	71.4%	31	42	42.5%
Sao Tome/Principe	0	7	0.0%	13	53	19.7%
Saudi Arabia	2	10	16.7%	6	66	8.3%
Senegal	0	10	0.0%	13	68	16.0%
Serbia	1	4	20.0%	22	46	32.4%

IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Seychelles	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Sierra Leone	0	3	0.0%	0	15	0.0%
Singapore	1	9	10.0%	14	65	17.7%
Slovak Republic	5	2	71.4%	32	40	44.4%
Slovenia	5	2	71.4%	32	38	45.7%
Solomon Islands	1	7	12.5%	14	66	17.5%
Somalia	0	8	0.0%	0	30	0.0%
South Africa	0	11	0.0%	13	71	15.5%
Spain	5	2	71.4%	32	41	43.8%
Sri Lanka	0	13	0.0%	13	74	14.9%
Sudan	1	12	7.7%	6	68	8.1%
Suriname	0	8	0.0%	13	58	18.3%
Swaziland	1	9	10.0%	13	70	15.7%
Sweden	5	2	71.4%	30	43	41.1%
Switzerland	5	3	62.5%	29	44	39.7%
Syria	1	12	7.7%	4	68	5.6%
Tajikistan	0	11	0.0%	12	63	16.0%
Thailand	1	6	71.4%	14	64	17.9%
TFYR Macedonia	5	2	14.3%	32	38	45.7%
Timor Leste	4	7	36.4%	20	62	24.4%
Togo	2	10	16.7%	15	67	18.3%
Tonga	1	2	33.3%	8	28	22.2%
Trinidad/Tobago	1	7	12.5%	14	62	18.4%
Tunisia	0	10	0.0%	6	67	8.2%
Turkey	2	8	20.0%	24	48	33.3%
Turkmenistan	0	7	0.0%	5	46	9.8%
Tuvalu	2	3	40.0%	14	47	23.0%
Uganda	1	9	16.7%	14	65	17.7%
Ukraine	5	2	10.0%	32	39	45.1%
United Arab Emirates	0	9	71.4%	4	64	5.9%
United Kingdom	6	2	0.0%	42	32	56.8%
U.R. Tanzania	1	5	75.0%	13	59	18.1%
Uruguay	3	5	37.5%	18	62	22.5%
Uzbekistan	0	13	0.0%	11	63	14.9%
Vanuatu	3	3	50.0%	18	35	34.0%
Venezuela	0	13	0.0%	11	68	13.9%
Vietnam	0	12	0.0%	4	69	5.5%
Yemen	1	9	10.0%	5	64	7.2%
Zambia	0	8	0.0%	13	68	16.0%
Zimbabwe	1	12	7.7%	12	72	14.3%

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2008