

## 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 60th UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2005, 11 votes and 10 consensus resolutions were identified for inclusion in this section.

Section IV contains five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 11 important votes at the 60th UNGA; (2) a listing and description of the 10 important consensus resolutions at the 60th 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 10 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 number of Plenary votes (102).

### 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. 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, and then in numerical order.

#### 1. U.S. Embargo Against Cuba

**A/Res/60/12**                      November 8                      182-4(US)-1

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 entities or persons under their jurisdiction and the freedom of trade and navigation. Urges states to repeal such laws.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005

Background: 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 since 1992.

U.S. Position: The United States again voted against this resolution, emphasizing the trade embargo is a bilateral issue that is not an appropriate subject for UN consideration. This resolution constituted an attempt by Cuba to divert attention from its government's failings. The measures imposed by the United States do not constitute a blockade, as the embargo does not affect Cuba's trade with other nations. Cuba remains free to trade with any other country in the world, and indeed does so. Moreover, U.S. law permits the sale of food and medicine. Israel, the Marshall Islands, and Palau also voted No; Micronesia abstained.

2. Situation of Human Rights in Sudan (Third Committee vote)

**Defeated by** November 23 84-79(US)-12  
**no-action motion**

Welcomes the adoption of the interim constitution on July 9, 2005, and provisions for human rights therein. Welcomes the efforts of the African Union Mission in the Sudan in Darfur to stabilize the security situation on the ground. Encourages the African Union to continue to contribute towards international efforts to protect and promote human rights in Darfur, as well as to coordinate international efforts towards the protection of civilians, with particular attention to vulnerable groups including internally displaced persons, returning refugees, and women and children, within its capabilities and in close cooperation with other UN agencies, related organizations, and nongovernmental organizations.

Expresses concern at the delays in the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement and the establishment of the Assessment and Evaluation Commission; also concerned at the continuing climate of impunity in the Darfur region, particularly in the area of violence against women and girls, condemns the continued violence against civilians, including sexual violence, extrajudicial killings, disappearances, arbitrary detention, and torture; widespread displacement; denial of religious freedom; and other violations of human rights throughout the country. Also condemns attacks on humanitarian agencies and nongovernmental organizations and African Union staff.

Calls on all parties to the conflict to participate without preconditions at the Abuja talks and negotiate constructively to ensure a swift and sustainable agreement to resolve the Darfur conflict; cease all acts of violence and respect fully the N'djamena Ceasefire Agreement and the Abuja Protocols; and avoid the spread of violence to other parts of the Sudan.

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Specifically calls on the Government of National Unity to respect and protect human rights and to comply fully with its international human rights obligations and to fulfill commitments it has made to ratify as a matter of priority treaties to which it is not a party, including the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; stop violations of human rights and to end the prevailing culture of impunity and effectively investigate human rights violations and bring the perpetrators to justice, in accordance with international standards of due process; promote a peaceful solution in East Sudan based on dialogue and spirit of compromise; disarm the Janjaweed militias in conformity with the relevant Security Council resolutions; and continue its program to demobilize, disarm, and reintegrate former combatants.

Background: Despite several resolutions adopted by the Security Council, as well as one adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, during the year, the Government of Sudan had made little positive change in its human rights situation. Deeply concerned about the continuing violations of human rights in Sudan, particularly in Darfur, the European Union sponsored this draft resolution in the General Assembly's Third Committee. In the Committee, Nigeria, on behalf of the African Group, put forward the motion to block debate on the draft resolution. The motion was adopted by a vote of 84 to 79 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this resolution and was disappointed when it was defeated by Nigeria's no-action motion, the only such motion that succeeded in the Third Committee in 2005.

### 3. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

**A/Res/60/36**

December 1

106-8(US)-59

Requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, to support the Middle East peace process, and to mobilize international support for and assistance to the Palestinian people. Authorizes the Committee to make such adjustments in its approved program of work as it may consider appropriate and necessary in the light of developments and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 61st session and thereafter.

Background: In 1975, the General Assembly established the Committee by Resolution 3376 and renews its support of the Committee annually.

U.S. Position: The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee that embodies institutional discrimination against Israel is

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005

inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution. (The Quartet is a group comprised of the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and Russia.) The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution renewing the Committee's mandate.

4. Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat

**A/Res/60/37**

December 1

105-8(US)-59

Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Division with the necessary resources and to ensure that it continues to carry out its program of work as detailed in relevant earlier resolutions, in consultation with the committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and under its guidance. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the continued cooperation of the Department of Public Information and other units of the Secretariat in enabling the Division to perform its tasks. Also requests the Committee on Palestinian Rights and the Division to continue to organize an annual exhibit on Palestinian rights or a cultural event, in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

Background: The General Assembly established the Division for Palestinian Rights by Resolution 32/40 in 1977.

U.S. Position: 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 to achieve a just and durable solution. 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.

5. Compliance with Non-Proliferation, Arms Limitation, and Disarmament Agreements

**A/Res/60/55**

December 8

163(US)-0-10

Underscores the contribution that compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation, and disarmament agreements and other agreed obligations makes to enhancing confidence and strengthening security and stability. Urges all states to implement and to comply fully with their respective obligations. Urges those states not currently in compliance with their respective obligations to make the strategic decision to come back into compliance with those obligations.

Calls upon all member states to take concerted action in a manner consistent with relevant international law to encourage, through bilateral and multilateral means, the compliance by all states with their respective non-proliferation, arms limitation, and disarmament agreements and other agreed

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

obligations and to hold those not in compliance with such agreements accountable for their non-compliance in a manner consistent with the UN Charter.

Encourages efforts by all states parties, the United Nations, and other international organizations, pursuant to their mandates, to take action, consistent with the Charter, to prevent serious damage to international security and stability arising from non-compliance by states with their existing non-proliferation, arms limitation, and disarmament obligations.

Background: Given the significant challenges and threats the international community faced from states acting counter to signed, international, nonproliferation agreements, this resolution provided the broadest and strongest endorsement for compliance. Despite the failure of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference in 2005 to adequately deal with issues such as compliance due to obstruction from several delegations, the United States was able to secure strong support for this resolution at the UN General Assembly.

U.S. Position: The United States considered compliance to be a fundamental objective integral to all arms control and non-proliferation treaties and agreements. The United States intended for the resolution not only to bring the issue of compliance to the attention of the international community, but also to emphasize that compliance with international treaties and obligations is critical to international peace and security.

### 6. Follow-up to Nuclear Disarmament Obligations

**A/Res/60/72**

December 08 87-56(US)-26

Determines to pursue practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the decision on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty.

Calls for practical steps, as agreed to at the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, to be taken by all nuclear-weapon states that would lead to nuclear disarmament in a way that promotes international stability and, based upon the principle of undiminished security for all, for further efforts to be made by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally; increased transparency by the nuclear-weapon states with regard to nuclear weapons capabilities and the implementation of agreements pursuant to article VI of the Treaty and as a voluntary confidence-building measure to support further progress in nuclear disarmament; the further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process; concrete agreed measures to reduce further the operational status of nuclear

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

weapons systems; a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies so as to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination; and the engagement, as soon as appropriate, of all the nuclear-weapon states in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

Notes that the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty agreed that legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear-weapon states to the non-nuclear-weapon states parties to the Treaty strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. Urges the states parties to the Treaty to follow up on the implementation of the nuclear disarmament obligations under the Treaty agreed to at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty within the framework of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty and its preparatory committee.

*Background:* This resolution in essence called on the five NPT nuclear weapon states to comply with their nuclear disarmament obligations under the NPT and, in its initial draft, for the UN General Assembly to set up an NPT ad hoc committee (AHC). This was an effort by Iran to appeal to the unhappiness many states expressed over the perceived failure during 2005 of the multilateral disarmament machinery. It was also seen as an attempt to divert attention from the International Atomic Energy Agency's judgment that Iran was in violation of its nuclear safeguards agreement. The Iranian text received a cool response, and the provision calling for an AHC was withdrawn in the face of concern that it was too great an intrusion into the business of the NPT's parties. The resolution passed in committee by the strikingly weak vote of 70-52(U.S.)-22.

*U.S. Position:* In its explanation of vote in the First Committee, the United States said that it agreed with the need for full compliance with the NPT and all nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament obligations. However, the Iranian draft resolution diverted attention from proliferation and non-compliance by stressing the pace of disarmament of the nuclear weapon states. The shared objective of nuclear disarmament was being pursued in good faith and in a transparent manner. Steady, measurable progress was a matter of public record, and yet another resolution dealing with nuclear disarmament was not needed. What was needed was sincere, rigorous compliance by all nations with their international obligations. The time for paying lip service to treaty compliance had long passed, and the time was at hand to address the real threats to our common security.

7. 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/60/104**                      December 8                      86-10(US)-74

Commends the efforts of the Special Committee in performing the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly. Deplores those policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the occupied territories, expresses grave concern about the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate Israeli policies and practices.

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Special Committee with all necessary facilities and to continue to make available such staff as may be necessary so that the Special Committee may continue its work.

*Background:* The General Assembly established the Special Committee by Resolution 2443 in 1968.

*U.S. Position:* The United States believes that the continuation of this Committee that embodies institutional discrimination against Israel is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet to achieve a just and durable solution. The United States believes this Committee should be abolished and actively lobbies other countries to withdraw their support for the annual resolution that renews the Committee's mandate.

8. Strengthening the Role of the United Nations in Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Periodic and Genuine Elections and the Promotion of Democratization

**A/Res/60/162**                      December 16                      173(US)-0-1

Commends the electoral assistance provided by the United Nations to member states [upon request], and requests that such assistance continue on a case-by-case basis, while recognizing that the fundamental responsibility of organizing free and fair elections lies with governments. Requests that the United Nations continue its efforts to ensure that there is adequate time to organize and carry out an effective mission for providing such assistance, that conditions exist to allow free and fair elections and that the results of the mission will be reported comprehensively and consistently. Recommends that the United Nations continue to provide technical advice and other assistance to requesting states and electoral institutions throughout the entire electoral process time-span as appropriate in order to help strengthen their democratic processes.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005

Expresses appreciation to member states, regional organizations, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that have provided observers or technical experts in support of UN electoral assistance efforts. Calls upon member states to consider contributing to the UN Trust Fund for Electoral Observations.

Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Electoral Assistance Division and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights can continue to carry out their mandates. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its 62nd session on the implementation of this resolution. Requests that the UN Development Program continue its governance assistance programs in cooperation with other relevant organizations. Reiterates the importance of reinforced coordination within and outside the UN system in this regard.

Background: Since 1989, the United Nations has received over 140 requests for electoral assistance from member states. These have ranged from requests for technical assistance to legal, human rights, and administrative advice and support; to UN assistance and coordination of intergovernmental and NGO international observation of an electoral process. The United Nations has also been integral in the elections process as part of a comprehensive peacekeeping operations. UN electoral assistance has supported the fair and transparent implementation of electoral laws and practices that meet international standards.

U.S. Position: The U.S. Government has been pleased by the increase in UN programmatic emphasis on democracy and supports the work of the United Nations in election assistance and monitoring. The United States sponsored this resolution along with 91 other cosponsors, and voted for it.

## 9. Situation of Human Rights in Iran

**A/Res/60/171**

December 16 75(US)-50-43

Expresses serious concern at the ongoing violations of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran including the harassment, intimidation, and persecution of human rights defenders, nongovernmental organizations, political opponents, religious dissenters, and reformists; the continuing use of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment such as flogging and amputations; the ongoing executions in the absence of respect for internationally recognized safeguards and in particular deplors the execution of persons who were below 18 years of age at the time their offense was committed, contrary to Iran's obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the continuing violence and discrimination against women and girls in law and in practice; and the continuing discrimination and other human rights violations against persons belonging to minorities, recognized or otherwise, including Christians, Jews, Sunnis, and the increased discrimination against the Baha'i.



#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Calls upon the Government of Iran to ensure full respect for the rights to freedom of assembly, opinion and expression, and the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs in accordance with its obligations under the International Covenant for Civil and Political Rights and, in particular, to end the harassment, intimidation and persecution of political opponents and human rights defenders; to ensure full respect for the right to due process of law, including the right to counsel by those detained in criminal justice proceedings; to eliminate, in law and in practice, the use of torture and cruel, inhuman or other degrading treatment or punishment; to abolish public executions and other executions carried out in the absence of respect for internationally recognized safeguards; to eliminate, in law and in practice, all forms of discrimination and violence against women and girls, and, as proposed by the elected Iranian Parliament, to accede to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; and to eliminate all forms of discrimination based on religious, ethnic, or linguistic grounds or against persons belonging to minorities, including the Baha'i, Christians, Jews, and Sunnis, and to address this matter in an open manner, with the full participation of the minorities themselves, and to ensure respect for the freedom of religion or belief of all persons.

Background: The Government of Iran disqualified large numbers of prospective candidates, including all women, from the June 2005 presidential elections. The government also continued its practices of conducting summary executions in absence of internationally recognized safeguards; use of torture; discriminatory treatment towards women and girls; and persecution of minorities, journalists, students, academics, and clerics.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this Canadian-sponsored resolution and lobbied other delegations to vote in favor of the text. The United States believed that this 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 abuses and to improve the situation of human rights in Iran.

#### 10. International Trade and Development

**A/Res/60/184**

December 22 121-1(US)-51

Reaffirms the value of multilateralism to the global trading system and the commitment to achieving a universal, rule-based, open, non-discriminatory, and equitable multilateral trading system that contributes to growth, development, and employment generation. Reiterates that development concerns form an integral part of the Doha Ministerial Declaration (2001), and reaffirms the commitments made in the decision of August 1, 2004, of the General Council of the World Trade Organization (WTO) to fulfill the development dimension of the Doha development agenda, which places the needs and interests of developing countries, especially the

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005

least developed among them, at the heart of the Doha work program. Expresses its concern over the lack of progress in areas of negotiations of particular concern to developing countries, which led to missing deadlines provided in the decision of the General Council of the WTO.

Background: Recommended to the General Assembly by the Second Committee, this proposal from the Group of 77 and China dealt with, among other things, the Doha work program adopted at the Fourth Ministerial Conference of the WTO in 2001 and negotiations that led up to the WTO Ministerial in December 2005.

U.S. Position: The United States voted against this resolution. Although the United States endorses trade liberalization and economic development throughout the world, it views good governance as the foundation upon which trade can work to build economic prosperity. The WTO Ministerial meeting in December 2005 was an important stepping-stone toward the U.S. goal of completing the negotiations under the Doha Development Agreement by the end of 2006. In its explanation of vote, the United States explained that "...it is essential that our deliberations ...in the General Assembly not adversely affect the Doha negotiations. [Countries] must not construe previous WTO declarations and decisions in any manner that would attempt to prejudge the outcome of WTO negotiations."

## 11. Unilateral Economic Measures as a Means of Political and Economic Coercion Against Developing Countries

**A/Res/60/185**

December 22 120-1(US)-50

Gravely concerned that the use of unilateral coercive economic measures adversely affects the economy and development efforts of developing countries in particular and has a general negative impact on international economic cooperation and on worldwide efforts to move towards a non-discriminatory and open multilateral trading system.

Urges the international community to adopt urgent and effective measures to eliminate the use of unilateral coercive economic measures against developing countries that are not authorized by relevant organs of the United Nations or are inconsistent with the principles of the multilateral trading system.

Requests the Secretary-General to continue to monitor the imposition of measures of this nature and to study the impact of such measures on the affected countries, including the impact on trade and development.

Background: On behalf of G-77 and China, the representative from Jamaica introduced a draft resolution entitled "Unilateral economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries."

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

U.S. Position: The United States opposed this resolution on the grounds that it served as a direct challenge to the prerogative of sovereign states to conduct freely their commercial relations. The U.S. position was that this resolution was aimed at undermining the international community's ability to respond effectively to acts that by their very nature and enormity are offensive to international norms. There must be consequences for such actions; otherwise, offending states will have no incentive or reason to abandon them. Unilateral and multilateral economic sanctions can be an effective means to achieve legitimate foreign policy objectives. They constitute an influential diplomatic tool. The United States is not alone in holding this view or in following this practice. The UN Charter itself provides for use of sanctions to change the behavior of those who would challenge, or seek to undermine, international norms as in past cases of South Africa and Rhodesia.

### IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The 10 important consensus resolutions are listed and described below. All were selected on the same basis used in determining important votes discussed above, i.e., they were “issues which directly affected U.S. interests and on which the United States lobbied intensively.” 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 and then in numerical order.

#### 1. World Summit Outcome

**A/Res/60/1**

September 16

The heads of state and government gathered at UN headquarters in New York from September 14–16, 2005. UN members reaffirmed their faith in the United Nations and their commitment to the purposes and principles of the UN Charter and international law, which are indispensable foundations of a more peaceful, prosperous, and just world, and reiterated their determination to foster strict respect for them.

UN members reaffirmed that their common fundamental values, including freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for all human rights, respect for nature, and shared responsibility, are essential to international relations. UN members reaffirmed the vital importance of an effective multilateral system, in accordance with international law, in order to better address the multifaceted and interconnected challenges and threats confronting their world and to achieve progress in the areas of peace and security,

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

development, and human rights, underlining the UN's central role, and commit themselves to promoting and strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations through implementation of its decisions and resolutions.

UN members acknowledged that peace and security, development, and human rights are the pillars of the UN system and the foundations for collective security and well-being. UN members recognized that these pillars are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

UN members reaffirmed the UN Millennium Declaration. Members recognized the valuable role of the major UN conferences and summits in the economic, social, and related fields, including the Millennium Summit, in mobilizing the international community at the local, national, regional, and global levels and in guiding the work of the United Nations. Members reaffirmed that development is a central goal in itself and that sustainable development in its economic, social, and environmental aspects constitutes a key element of the overarching framework of UN activities. Members acknowledged that good governance and the rule of law at the national and international levels are essential for sustained economic growth, sustainable development, and the eradication of poverty and hunger.

UN members were determined to establish a just and lasting peace all over the world in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter. Members rededicated themselves to support all efforts to uphold the sovereign equality of all states; respect their territorial integrity and political independence; to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; to uphold resolution of disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with justice and international law; the right to self-determination of peoples which remain under colonial domination and foreign occupation; non-interference in the internal affairs of states; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; respect for the equal rights of all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and the fulfillment in good faith of the obligations assumed in accordance with the Charter. UN members believed that today, more than ever, they live in a global and interdependent world. No state can stand wholly alone. Members acknowledged that collective security depends on effective cooperation, in accordance with international law, against transnational threats. Members recognized that current developments and circumstances require that they urgently build consensus on major threats and challenges. UN members committed themselves to translating that consensus into concrete action, including addressing the root causes of those threats and challenges with resolve and determination.

UN members reaffirmed that gender equality and the promotion and protection of the full enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

for all are essential to advance development and peace and security. Members were committed to creating a world fit for future generations, which takes into account the best interest of the child. UN members reaffirmed the universality, indivisibility, interdependence, and interrelatedness of all human rights. Acknowledging the diversity of the world, members recognized that all cultures and civilizations contribute to the enrichment of humankind. UN members acknowledged the importance of respect and understanding for religious and cultural diversity throughout the world. In order to promote international peace and security, members committed themselves to advancing human welfare, freedom and progress everywhere, as well as to encouraging tolerance, respect, dialogue, and cooperation among different cultures, civilizations, and peoples.

UN members pledged to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, accountability, and credibility of the UN system. This is their shared responsibility and interest. Members therefore resolved to create a more peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world and to undertake concrete measures to continue finding ways to implement the outcome of the Millennium Summit and the other major UN conferences and summits so as to provide multilateral solutions to problems in the areas of development, peace and collective security, human rights and the rule of law, and strengthening of the United Nations.

UN members reaffirmed that democracy is a universal value based on the freely expressed will of people to determine their own political, economic, social, and cultural systems, and their full participation in all aspects of their lives. They also reaffirmed that while democracies share common features, there is no single model of democracy, that it does not belong to any country or region, and reaffirmed the necessity of due respect for sovereignty and the right to self-determination. They stressed that democracy, development, and respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. They also renewed their commitment to support democracy by strengthening countries' capacity to implement the principles and practices of democracy and resolved to strengthen the UN's capacity to assist member states upon their request. In this regard, they welcomed the establishment of a Democracy Fund at the United Nations and invited interested member states to give serious consideration to contributing to it.

UN members addressed topics including global partnerships for development; financing for development; domestic resource mobilization; investment; debt; trade; commodities; quick-impact initiatives; systemic issues and global economic decision-making; south-south cooperation; education; rural and agricultural development; employment; sustainable development; HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and other health issues; gender equality and empowerment of women; science and technology for development; migration and development; and countries with special needs.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

UN members additionally addressed topics dealing with peace and security including pacific settlement of disputes, use of force under the UN Charter, terrorism, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, sanctions, transnational crime, women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts, protecting children in situations of armed conflict, and human rights and the rule of law.

UN members also addressed topics related to human rights and the rule of law, including internally displaced persons; refugee protection and assistance; children's rights; responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity; human security; and a culture of peace and initiatives on dialogue among cultures, civilizations, and religions.

UN members reaffirmed the need to strengthen the United Nations, and included provisions regarding reform of the Security Council and the Secretariat; creation of a Human Rights Council capable of addressing situations of violations of human rights, including gross and systematic violations; and support of a stronger relationship between the General Assembly and other principal organs and between the United Nations and regional and subregional organizations, national and regional parliaments, and the private sector and nongovernmental organizations.

*Background:* Heads of state and government met at the UN summit at UN headquarters September 14–16 to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and to look ahead to make the United Nations more effective and efficient. In his March 2005 report, the Secretary-General submitted several proposals, in part drawing on recommendations from the 2004 report of an independent high-level panel on threats, challenges, and change. These ideas included establishing a Human Rights Council to replace the Commission on Human Rights and a new Peacebuilding Commission to help stabilize countries emerging from conflict, and implementing measures to improve management and accountability.

*U.S. Position:* U.S. priorities for a stronger more effective United Nations included support for management reform, and creation of a Peacebuilding Commission and a Human Rights Council.

Management reform was necessary to ensure that member states received the greatest benefit from resources and that UN personnel were held to the highest standards of ethical conduct and accountability. U.S. proposals to the draft Summit Outcome Document related to accountability and integrity, improved effectiveness, and boosting the UN's relevance in the modern world. The United States advocated for and helped achieve General Assembly decisions to approve additional temporary resources for the Office of Internal Oversight Services audit and investigations functions in the 2006–2007 budget; the decision to approve the immediate establishment of an Ethics office by including resources for it in the 2006–2007 biennium; and the

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

decision to approve extending the Secretary-General's authority to redeploy staff.

In December 2005, the United States joined consensus on concurrent UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions adopted to establish the Peacebuilding Commission.

The United States supported the Secretary-General's initiative to replace the Commission on Human Rights with an action-oriented Human Rights Council. The Council's mandate should be to address human rights emergencies and the most egregious human rights abuses, to provide technical assistance, and to promote human rights as a global priority. The final status of the Human Rights Council will be the result of working group negotiations.

The United States was pleased that member states adopted by consensus the World Summit Outcome Document as a resolution, agreeing to reform management of the United Nations, establish a Peacebuilding Commission, and create a Human Rights Council, underscoring a common commitment to improve the management, accountability, and effectiveness of the United Nations.

## 2. Holocaust Remembrance

**A/Res/60/7**

November 01

Resolves that the United Nations will designate January 27, 2006, as an annual International Day of Commemoration in memory of the victims of the Holocaust. Urges member states to develop educational programs that will inculcate future generations with the lessons of the Holocaust in order to help to prevent future acts of genocide, and in this context commends the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. Rejects any denial of the Holocaust as an historical event, either in full or part.

Commends those states which have actively engaged in preserving those sites that served as Nazi death camps, concentration camps, forced labor camps, and prisons during the Holocaust. Condemns without reserve all manifestations of religious intolerance, incitement, harassment, or violence against persons or communities based on ethnic origin or religious belief, wherever they occur.

Requests the Secretary-General to establish a program of outreach on the subject of the "Holocaust and the United Nations" as well as measures to mobilize civil society for Holocaust remembrance and education, in order to help to prevent future acts of genocide; to report to the General Assembly on the establishment of this program within six months from the date of the adoption of the present resolution; and to report thereafter on the implementation of the program at its 63rd session.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

*Background:* This resolution was introduced by the Government of Israel and was cosponsored by the United States, Russia, the European Union countries, and over 70 other countries. The resolution's provision that called upon the Secretary-General to establish a program of Holocaust outreach complemented the work undertaken by the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research, a group of 24 countries that worked with governments, nongovernmental organizations, and civil society to introduce into school curricula material about the Holocaust. Other international organizations, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, emphasized education, legislation, and law enforcement as the measures that will contain and eventually eliminate racial and religious hatred.

*U.S. Position:* The United States was pleased to cosponsor the resolution and encouraged all other nations to join as cosponsors. In addition, the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations noted that the resolution commemorated the 61st anniversary of the Holocaust, that it merits adoption in its own right and that the resolution should not be politicized.

### 3. Report of the International Criminal Court

**A/Res/60/29**

November 23

Calls upon all states from all regions of the world that are not yet parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) to consider ratifying or acceding to it. Welcomes the 101st ratification of the Rome Statute by Mexico on October 28, 2005. Calls upon all states that have not yet done so to consider becoming parties to the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the ICC. Encourages states Parties to the Rome Statute that have not yet done so to adopt national legislation to implement obligations emanating from the Rome Statute and to cooperate with the ICC in the exercise of its functions, and recalls the provision of technical assistance by states parties in this respect. Recalls that, by virtue of article 12 of the Rome Statute, a state which is not a party to the Statute may, by declaration lodged with the Registrar of the Court, accept the exercise of jurisdiction by the Court with respect to specific crimes that are mentioned in paragraph two of that article.

Looks forward to the fourth session of the Assembly of States Parties to be held in The Hague November 28–December 3, 2005, and the resumed fourth session in New York on January 26–27, 2006. Recalls the establishment of the Special Working Group on the Crime of Aggression by the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the ICC Court, open to all states on an equal footing, and encourages all states to consider participating actively in the Working Group with a view to elaborating proposals for a provision on the crime of aggression. Encourages states to contribute to the Trust Fund established for the benefit of victims of crimes within the jurisdiction of the



#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Court and of the families of such victims and encourages states to contribute to the Trust Fund for the participation of least developed countries, and acknowledges contributions made to both funds so far.

Welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the organization, in which reference is made to the important role of the ICC in advancing the cause of justice and the rule of law. Recalls the referral by the Security Council of the situation in Darfur since July 1, 2002, to the ICC Prosecutor.

Notes the significance of the conclusion and implementation of the Relationship Agreement between the United Nations and the ICC, which forms a framework for close cooperation between the two organizations and for consultation on matters of mutual interest pursuant to the provisions of that Agreement in conformity with the respective provisions of the UN Charter and the Rome Statute. Welcomes the ICC report for 2004 and invites the Court to submit annual reports on its activities to the General Assembly. Recalls that, pursuant to article 4 of the Relationship Agreement, the International Criminal Court may attend and participate in the work of the General Assembly as an observer.

Background: The General Assembly has adopted an annual resolution on the ICC each year since 1992, although the Statute wasn't adopted until 1998. The Relationship Agreement between the United Nations and the ICC, approved by the General Assembly in 2004, provides that the ICC may submit reports on its activities to the United Nations. The ICC submitted a first such report to the United Nations in 2005, and the General Assembly held a meeting to discuss the report.

U.S. Position: As it has done in past years, the United States dissociated itself from consensus on this resolution. In an explanation of position, the United States reiterated its well-known concerns about the ICC. These concerns included the ICC's assertion of jurisdiction over nationals of states not parties to the Rome Statute, including U.S. nationals, and the lack of adequate oversight of the ICC's activities. The United States also expressed a desire to move beyond the divisiveness that ICC issues have sometimes caused in the past. The United States emphasized that it shares the commitment of parties to the Rome Statute to bring to justice those who perpetrate genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, and stated that while the United States has honest differences of view on how accountability is best achieved, everyone must work together to ensure that perpetrators of such atrocities are held accountable for their actions.

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

**A/Res/60/148**

December 16

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. Calls upon all governments to implement fully the absolute prohibition on torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Urges governments to take effective measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including their gender-based manifestations.

Condemns any action or attempt by states or public officials to legalize or authorize torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment under any circumstances, including on grounds of national security or through judicial decisions, and calls upon governments to eliminate any practices of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Stresses that all acts of torture must be made offenses under domestic criminal law. Emphasizes that acts of torture are serious violations of international humanitarian law and constitute war crimes and can constitute crimes against humanity, and that the perpetrators of all acts of torture must be prosecuted and punished.

Recalls that states shall not expel, return, or extradite 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 law, in particular the principle of non-refoulement. Calls upon all governments to cooperate with and assist the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment in the performance of his task.

*Background:* The Convention against Torture established the Committee Against Torture, which among other things, is charged with reviewing periodic reports submitted by the States Parties to the Convention.

*U.S. Position:* The United States cosponsored this resolution with many countries. 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/60/166**

December 16

Reaffirms that freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief is a human right derived from the inherent dignity of the human person and guaranteed to all without discrimination. Urges states to ensure that no one within their jurisdiction is, because of their religion or belief, deprived of the right to life, liberty, and security of person; the right to freedom of expression; the right not to be arbitrarily arrested or detained; and to bring to justice all perpetrators of violations of these rights.

Urges states to devote particular attention to combating all practices motivated by religion or belief that lead, directly or indirectly, to human rights violations and to discrimination against women. Recognizes that legislation alone is not enough to prevent violations of human rights and that the exercise of tolerance and nondiscrimination by person and groups is necessary for the full realization of the aims of the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. In this regard invites states, religious bodies, and civil society to undertake dialogue at all levels to promote greater tolerance, respect, and understanding of freedom of religion or belief and to encourage and promote, through the educational system and by other means, understanding, tolerance, and respect in matters relating to freedom of religion or belief.

Recognizes with deep concern the overall rise in instances of intolerance and violence directed against members of many religious communities in various parts of the world, including cases motivated by Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and Christianophobia.

Urges states to exert their utmost efforts, in accordance with their national legislation and in conformity with international human rights law, to ensure that religious places, sites, and shrines are fully respected and protected, and to take additional measures in cases where they are vulnerable to desecration or destruction.

*Background:* The General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief in 1981, which spelled out the UN Charter provision to promote and encourage universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to religion. The General Assembly has adopted this follow-up resolution every year since 1981.

*U.S. Position:* Religious freedom is a principal cornerstone for the United States. Immigrants settled in the United States seeking freedom from

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

religious discrimination; freedom to practice religion is the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The United States believes that laws prohibiting religious discrimination can have the effect of reducing or eliminating other fears that divide people along ethnic, racial and national lines. The United States was one of more than 70 cosponsors of this resolution.

## 6. The Peacebuilding Commission

**A/Res/60/180**

December 20

Decides, in accordance with Articles 7, 22, and 29 of the UN Charter, with a view to operationalizing the World Summit decision, to establish the Peacebuilding Commission as an intergovernmental advisory body. Also decides that the following shall be the main purposes of the Commission: to bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on and propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; to focus attention on the reconstruction and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery from conflict and to support the development of integrated strategies in order to lay the foundation for sustainable development; and to provide recommendations and information to improve the coordination of all relevant actors, to develop best practices, to help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities, and to extend the period of attention given by the international community to post-conflict recovery.

Decides that the Commission shall have a standing Organizational Committee, responsible for developing its own rules of procedure and working methods, comprising seven members of the Security Council, including permanent members, selected by the Security Council; seven members of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), elected from regional groups by ECOSOC; five top providers of assessed contributions to UN budgets and of voluntary contributions to UN funds, programs, and agencies, selected by and among the 10 top providers; five top providers of military personnel and civilian police to UN missions, selected by and among the 10 top providers; and seven additional members elected by the General Assembly. Emphasizes that a member state can only be selected from one category at any one time. Decides that members shall serve for renewable terms of two years. Decides that the Commission shall act in all matters on the basis of consensus of its members.

Decides that the Organizational Committee shall establish the Commission's agenda based on requests for advice from the Security Council, ECOSOC, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, and member states in exceptional circumstances on the verge of lapsing or relapsing into conflict and which are not on the Security Council's agenda. Underlines that in post-conflict situations on the agenda of the Security Council with which it is actively seized, in particular when there is a UN-mandated peacekeeping mission on the ground or under way and given the primary responsibility of

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

the Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, the main purpose of the Commission will be to provide advice to the Council at its request.

Decides that country-specific meetings of the Commission, upon invitation of the Organizational Committee, shall include as members representatives from the country under consideration; countries in the region engaged in the post-conflict process and other countries that are involved in relief efforts and/or political dialogue, as well as relevant regional and subregional organizations; major financial, troop, and civilian police contributors involved in the recovery effort; senior UN representative in the field and other relevant UN representatives; and such regional and international financial institutions as may be relevant. Decides that representatives from the Secretary-General, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other institutional donors shall be invited to participate in all meetings of the Commission. Emphasizes that the Commission shall work in cooperation with national or transitional authorities in the country under consideration with a view to ensuring national ownership of the peacebuilding process. Notes the importance of participation of regional and local actors, and stresses the importance of adopting flexible working methods, including the use of videoconferencing and meetings outside of New York, in order to provide for the active participation of those most relevant to the deliberations of the Commission.

Decides that the Commission shall make the outcome of its discussions and recommendations publicly available as UN documents. Invites all relevant UN bodies and other bodies and actors to take action on the Commission's advice.

Reaffirms its request to the Secretary-General to establish a small peacebuilding support office to support the Commission. Also reaffirms its request to the Secretary-General to establish a multi-year standing peacebuilding fund for post-conflict peacebuilding, funded by voluntary contributions, with the objective of ensuring the immediate release of resources needed to launch peacebuilding activities availability of appropriate financing for recovery.

Notes that the Commission shall submit an annual report to the General Assembly and that the Assembly shall hold an annual debate to review the report. Decides that the arrangements set out in this resolution will be reviewed in five years to ensure that they are appropriate to fulfill the agreed functions of the Commission.

Background: On September 14–16, 2005, world leaders met at UN headquarters to take action on a number of global challenges as part of a thorough reform effort. Participants recognized the need for a coordinated, coherent, and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding to achieve

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

sustainable peace, since nearly half the countries that emerge from conflict relapse within five years. The Commission will provide advice to the Security Council and other UN bodies and organs to help prevent such lapses.

On December 20, both the Security Council and the General Assembly adopted this resolution.

*U.S. Position:* The United States was pleased to support the concurrent resolutions in the Security Council and the General Assembly. In his statement to the General Assembly, the U.S. representative noted that the resolution emphasized that the Commission must take into account the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security by ensuring that the Council is aware of all the elements that are essential to achieving sustainable peace in a given nation.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission was part of U.S. efforts to help make the United Nations more effective. The United States was pleased that the General Assembly adopted this resolution by consensus.

## 7. Preventing and Combating Corrupt Practices and Transfer of Assets of Illicit Origin and Returning Such Assets to the Countries of Origin

**A/Res/60/207**

December 22

Condemns corruption in all its forms, including bribery, money-laundering, and transfer of assets of illicit origin, and encourages states to work for the return of such assets consistent with the UN Convention against Corruption. Invites all member states and competent regional economic integration organizations to ratify or accede to and fully implement the Convention. Welcomes the initiatives taken by the Commonwealth Secretariat and the Group of Eight with regard to fighting corruption and improving transparency.

Welcomes the efforts of member states that have enacted laws in the fight against corruption in all its forms. Encourages all governments to prevent, combat, and penalize corruption consistent with the principles of the Convention. Further encourages regional cooperation in the efforts to prevent and combat corrupt practices and the transfer of assets of illicit origin as well as for asset recovery consistent with the Convention.

Urges all member states, consistent with the UN Convention against Corruption, to abide by the principles of proper management of public affairs and public property, fairness, responsibility, and equality before the law. Welcomes actions by the private sector to remain fully engaged in the fight against corruption. Calls upon the private sector to continue to make efforts in this regard and emphasizes the need to continue to promote corporate responsibility and accountability.

#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Background: The emphasis of this resolution has changed over the years. Over the past two years in particular, the resolution shifted from a focus on asset return to a more broad and balanced focus on implementing the UN Convention against Corruption in all its aspects.

U.S. Position: This resolution represented a step forward in focusing attention on the importance of combating corruption and the central role of the UN Convention against Corruption in this effort. The United States therefore joined consensus on this resolution.

Nevertheless, in an explanation of position, the United States joined the European Union, Canada, Australia, Japan, and Liechtenstein in expressing strong disappointment that consensus could not be reached on a title that was more consistent with the Convention and with the World Summit Outcome on the issue of asset return and joined these delegations in urging member states to adopt a more appropriate title in the next session. The United States also joined these delegations in declaring that it interpreted the title to mean that assets should be returned consistent with the Convention.

### 8. Towards Global Partnerships

**A/Res/60/215**

December 22

Recalls the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in regard to developing partnerships with the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and civil society in general so as to enable them to contribute to the pursuit of development and the eradication of poverty. Emphasizes that all relevant partners, including the private sector, can contribute in several ways to addressing the obstacles confronted by developing countries in mobilizing the resources needed to finance their sustainable development and to the realization of the development goals of the United Nations through, among other things, financial resources, access to technology, management expertise and support for programs.

Stresses that partnerships are voluntary and collaborative relationships between the various parties, while reiterating that they are a complement to, but not intended to substitute for, the commitments made by governments with a view to achieving these goals. Further stresses that partnerships should be consistent with national laws and national development strategies and plans, as well as the priorities of countries where their implementation takes place, bearing in mind the relevant guidance provided by governments. Recalls that the 2005 World Summit encourages public-private partnerships in the following areas: the generation of new investments and employment, financing for development, health, agriculture, conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and environmental management, energy, forestry, and the impact of climate change.

Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005

Encourages the UN system to place greater emphasis on impact, transparency, accountability, and sustainability, without imposing undue rigidity in partnership agreements, and with due consideration being given to the following partnership principles: common purpose, transparency, bestowing no unfair advantages upon any partner of the United Nations, mutual benefit and mutual respect, accountability, respect for the modalities of the United Nations, striving for balanced representation of relevant partners from developed and developing countries and countries with economies in transition, sectoral and geographic balance, and not compromising the independence and neutrality of the UN system in general and the agencies in particular. Also encourages the Global Compact Office to promote the sharing of best practices and positive action through learning, dialogue, and partnerships.

Background: The Millennium Development Goals were developed as quantifiable targets for addressing extreme poverty in its many dimensions—income poverty, hunger, disease, lack of adequate shelter, and exclusion—while promoting gender equality, education, and environmental sustainability.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution because it strongly supported efforts by the UN system to make greater use of partnerships, in particular public-private partnerships, in carrying out its activities. In addition, the U.S. Government supported good corporate citizenship but recognized that political and social agendas that are the responsibility of governments must not be shifted to businesses under the guise of corporate responsibility initiatives.

## 9. Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar (Burma)

A/Res/60/233

December 23

Expresses grave concern at the ongoing systematic violation of the human rights of the people of Burma; the continuing detention and house arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi and other members of the National League for Democracy, as well as the detention of the leadership of other political parties or ethnic nationalities; the consistent harassment of members of the National League for Democracy; the absence of a substantive and structured dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi; the renewed attacks by military forces on the ceasefire groups in violation of ceasefire agreements, and the subsequent and continuing violations of human rights; the continuing denial of the freedom of human rights defenders to pursue their legitimate activities; the situation of the large number of internally displaced persons and the flow of refugees to neighboring countries; the failure of the Government of Burma to implement the recommendations of the International Labor Organization Commission of Inquiry; and the refusal of Burmese authorities to allow the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Burma and the Special Rapporteur of the



#### IV—General Assembly Important Votes

Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in Burma to visit the country for almost two years.

Strongly calls upon the Government of Burma to end all systematic violations of human rights in Burma to ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to end impunity; to allow all human rights defenders to pursue their activities unhindered; to put an immediate end to the recruitment and use of child soldiers; to end widespread rape and other forms of sexual violence persistently carried out by members of the armed forces; to end the systematic enforced displacement of persons and other causes of refugee flows to other neighboring countries; to release all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally; to lift all restraints on peaceful political activity by, among other things, guaranteeing freedom of association, freedom of expression, and freedom of the media; to cooperate fully with the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Burma and the Special Rapporteur; and to ensure that discipline in prisons does not constitute torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

Calls upon the government to ensure that the remainder of the National Convention and in particular the subsequent constitution drafting exercise is fully inclusive of all political parties and representatives of ethnic nationalities.

*Background:* In 2003 and 2004, the General Assembly adopted resolutions condemning Burma's human rights record. This resolution was adopted without a vote, although Burma disassociated from consensus.

Burma's rights record continued to worsen in 2004 and 2005, despite repeated efforts of the international community to enact change. Burmese authorities have not allowed the Special Rapporteur to visit the country since November 2003, and the Envoy has not visited Burma since March 2004.

*U.S. Position:* In supporting and cosponsoring this resolution, the United States continued to call on the junta to release Aung San Suu Kyi, U Tin Oo, Khun Htun Oo, Sai Nyunt Lwin, Sao Hso Ten, and all political prisoners immediately and unconditionally; to allow the National League for Democracy to re-open its offices nationwide; to engage the democratic opposition in a meaningful dialogue leading to genuine national reconciliation and the establishment of democracy; and to respect and ensure the free exercise of the fundamental human rights of the people of Burma.

#### 10. Program Budget for the Biennium 2006–2007

**A/Res/60/247 A-C**      December 23

Appropriations totaling \$3,798,912,500 are hereby approved. The two-year budget will permit a full assessment on all member states for 2006. The Secretary-General, while adhering to the existing procedures regarding the

### Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005

annual assessment on member states, is authorized to enter into expenditure of a first tranche, limited to \$950 million, as an exceptional measure.

Resolves for the biennium 2006–2007, estimates of income other than assessments on member states totaling \$427,355,200 are approved.

Resolves that, for 2006, budget appropriations consisting of \$1,899,456,250, being half of the appropriation approved for the biennium, plus \$47,626,700, being the increase in revised appropriations for the biennium 2004–2005 approved by the Assembly on April 13, 2005; June 22, 2005; and December 23, 2005, shall be financed in accordance with regulations 3.1 and 3.2 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations.

*Background:* The General Assembly approved the UN budget for a two-year biennium, but with a cap on spending of \$950 million. It is estimated that these funds will run out in June 2006. At that point, member states will assess progress on management reform efforts before making decisions on further funding.

*U.S. Position:* The United States was a proponent of this spending cap as a way to ensure that discussion on management reform would continue. The United States joined consensus on this resolution.

## COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 60th 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 10 important consensus resolutions as identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See 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.

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	2	7	0	2	59.2%	22.2%
Albania	5	1	5	0	93.1%	83.3%
Algeria	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Andorra	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Angola	1	6	1	3	46.5%	14.3%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	8	1	0	59.4%	20.0%
Argentina	4	5	2	0	73.7%	44.4%
Armenia	3	6	2	0	68.3%	33.3%
Australia	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Austria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	1	59.0%	20.0%
Bahamas	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Bahrain	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Bangladesh	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Barbados	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Belarus	1	8	2	0	57.2%	11.1%
Belgium	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Belize	3	7	1	0	62.2%	30.0%
Benin	2	8	1	0	58.2%	20.0%
Bhutan	2	8	1	0	56.1%	20.0%
Bolivia	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	5	1	2	3	91.8%	83.3%
Botswana	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Brazil	2	7	2	0	62.8%	22.2%
Brunei Darussalam	2	9	0	0	56.9%	18.2%
Bulgaria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Burkina Faso	2	7	2	0	61.2%	22.2%
Burundi	2	5	2	2	65.4%	28.6%
Cambodia	2	7	0	2	60.5%	22.2%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	72.1%	33.3%
Canada	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	1	63.3%	25.0%
Central African Rep.	1	4	2	4	63.2%	20.0%
Chad	0	1	0	10	51.9%	0.0%
Chile	4	6	1	0	70.0%	40.0%
China	1	8	1	1	57.5%	11.1%
Colombia	2	6	3	0	65.5%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	3	55.8%	25.0%
Congo	1	5	0	5	54.9%	16.7%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Costa Rica	4	5	2	0	73.3%	44.4%
Côte d'Ivoire	2	4	2	3	69.1%	33.3%
Croatia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Cuba	0	9	1	1	51.6%	0.0%
Cyprus	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Czech Republic	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
DPR of Korea	1	9	0	1	49.6%	10.0%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	1	5	70.0%	40.0%
Denmark	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Djibouti	2	9	0	0	56.3%	18.2%
Dominica	2	7	0	2	58.4%	22.2%
Dominican Republic	4	4	3	0	77.7%	50.0%
Ecuador	4	6	1	0	69.9%	40.0%
Egypt	1	9	1	0	55.0%	10.0%
El Salvador	4	3	2	2	81.9%	57.1%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Eritrea	2	8	1	0	58.6%	20.0%
Estonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Ethiopia	2	6	3	0	63.5%	25.0%
Fiji	4	5	2	0	71.0%	44.4%
Finland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
France	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	62.1%	28.6%
Gambia	1	5	0	5	44.7%	16.7%
Georgia	4	1	5	1	93.2%	80.0%
Germany	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Ghana	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Greece	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Grenada	3	4	0	4	71.3%	42.9%
Guatemala	4	3	4	0	82.4%	57.1%
Guinea	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Guinea-Bissau	2	7	1	1	58.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Haiti	4	6	1	0	66.9%	40.0%
Honduras	4	1	4	2	92.0%	80.0%
Hungary	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Iceland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
India	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Indonesia	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Iran	1	9	1	0	54.1%	10.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Iraq	2	6	2	1	65.9%	25.0%
Ireland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Israel	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Italy	5	1	5	0	93.5%	83.3%
Jamaica	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Japan	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Jordan	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	1	62.4%	22.2%
Kenya	2	8	1	0	56.8%	20.0%
Kiribati	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Kuwait	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Kyrgyzstan	2	7	2	0	62.6%	22.2%
Laos	1	8	1	1	52.8%	11.1%
Latvia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Lebanon	2	9	0	0	52.2%	18.2%
Lesotho	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Liberia	1	5	1	4	59.9%	16.7%
Libya	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Liechtenstein	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Lithuania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Luxembourg	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Madagascar	2	3	0	6	73.4%	40.0%
Malawi	2	4	0	5	70.5%	33.3%
Malaysia	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Maldives	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Mali	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Malta	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Marshall Islands	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Mauritania	3	8	0	0	61.7%	27.3%
Mauritius	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Mexico	4	5	2	0	73.5%	44.4%
Micronesia	8	1	1	1	93.9%	88.9%
Monaco	5	1	5	0	93.4%	83.3%
Mongolia	3	4	2	2	73.1%	42.9%
Morocco	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Mozambique	2	8	1	0	55.7%	20.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Namibia	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Nauru	4	1	0	6	83.8%	80.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING INCLUDING CONSENSUS	COINCIDENCE VOTES ONLY
Nepal	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Netherlands	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
New Zealand	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Nicaragua	4	2	4	1	86.1%	66.7%
Niger	2	4	1	4	72.1%	33.3%
Nigeria	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Norway	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Oman	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Pakistan	1	8	1	1	57.0%	11.1%
Palau	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Panama	3	5	3	0	71.9%	37.5%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	5	0	78.2%	50.0%
Paraguay	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
Peru	4	3	4	0	82.3%	57.1%
Philippines	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Poland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Portugal	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Qatar	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Republic of Korea	4	1	6	0	93.2%	80.0%
Republic of Moldova	4	1	5	1	92.6%	80.0%
Romania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Russia	2	4	5	0	74.8%	33.3%
Rwanda	1	2	1	7	67.9%	33.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	3	0	8	20.7%	0.0%
Saint Lucia	2	9	0	0	53.4%	18.2%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	7	0	0	64.2%	36.4%
Samoa	5	3	3	0	82.6%	62.5%
San Marino	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	2	0	8	65.8%	33.3%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Senegal	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Serbia/Montenegro	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Seychelles	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Sierra Leone	1	5	0	5	50.6%	16.7%
Singapore	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Slovak Republic	5	2	4	0	88.2%	71.4%
Slovenia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Solomon Islands	4	3	4	0	79.7%	57.1%
Somalia	2	9	0	0	51.0%	18.2%
South Africa	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Spain	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Sri Lanka	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Sudan	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Suriname	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Swaziland	0	6	0	5	21.7%	0.0%
Sweden	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Switzerland	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Syria	1	9	0	1	54.3%	10.0%
Tajikistan	2	8	1	0	55.9%	20.0%
Thailand	2	5	4	0	70.6%	28.6%
TFYR Macedonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Timor-Leste	4	1	0	6	92.4%	80.0%
Togo	2	9	0	0	53.9%	18.2%
Tonga	2	1	1	7	86.5%	66.7%
Trinidad and Tobago	1	5	2	3	65.8%	16.7%
Tunisia	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Turkey	3	4	2	2	75.6%	42.9%
Turkmenistan	2	7	0	2	53.3%	22.2%
Tuvalu	3	3	3	2	75.8%	50.0%
Uganda	2	5	4	0	68.4%	28.6%
Ukraine	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
United Arab Emirates	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
United Kingdom	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
UR Tanzania	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Uruguay	3	5	2	1	71.8%	37.5%
Uzbekistan	1	9	0	1	51.7%	10.0%
Vanuatu	5	1	3	2	92.2%	83.3%
Venezuela	1	9	1	0	53.9%	10.0%
Vietnam	1	9	0	1	49.3%	10.0%
Yemen	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Zambia	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Zimbabwe	2	9	0	0	55.5%	18.2%
Average	3	5	2	1	70.2%	37.6%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Marshall Islands	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Palau	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Australia	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Canada	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Micronesia	8	1	1	1	93.9%	88.9%
Albania	5	1	5	0	93.1%	83.3%
Andorra	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Austria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Belgium	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	5	1	2	3	91.8%	83.3%
Bulgaria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Croatia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Czech Republic	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Denmark	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Estonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Finland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
France	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Germany	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Greece	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Hungary	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Iceland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Ireland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Italy	5	1	5	0	93.5%	83.3%
Japan	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Latvia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Liechtenstein	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Lithuania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Luxembourg	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Monaco	5	1	5	0	93.4%	83.3%
Netherlands	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
New Zealand	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Norway	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Poland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Portugal	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Romania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
San Marino	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Serbia/Montenegro	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Slovenia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Spain	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%



*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sweden	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Switzerland	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
TFYR Macedonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Ukraine	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
United Kingdom	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Vanuatu	5	1	3	2	92.2%	83.3%
Slovak Republic	5	2	4	0	88.2%	71.4%
Cyprus	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Malta	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Samoa	5	3	3	0	82.6%	62.5%
Georgia	4	1	5	1	93.2%	80.0%
Honduras	4	1	4	2	92.0%	80.0%
Nauru	4	1	0	6	83.8%	80.0%
Republic of Korea	4	1	6	0	93.2%	80.0%
Republic of Moldova	4	1	5	1	92.6%	80.0%
Timor-Leste	4	1	0	6	92.4%	80.0%
Nicaragua	4	2	4	1	86.1%	66.7%
El Salvador	4	3	2	2	81.9%	57.1%
Guatemala	4	3	4	0	82.4%	57.1%
Peru	4	3	4	0	82.3%	57.1%
Solomon Islands	4	3	4	0	79.7%	57.1%
Dominican Republic	4	4	3	0	77.7%	50.0%
Argentina	4	5	2	0	73.7%	44.4%
Costa Rica	4	5	2	0	73.3%	44.4%
Fiji	4	5	2	0	71.0%	44.4%
Mexico	4	5	2	0	73.5%	44.4%
Bolivia	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
Chile	4	6	1	0	70.0%	40.0%
Ecuador	4	6	1	0	69.9%	40.0%
Haiti	4	6	1	0	66.9%	40.0%
Paraguay	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	7	0	0	64.2%	36.4%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	5	0	78.2%	50.0%
Tuvalu	3	3	3	2	75.8%	50.0%
Grenada	3	4	0	4	71.3%	42.9%
Mongolia	3	4	2	2	73.1%	42.9%
Turkey	3	4	2	2	75.6%	42.9%
Panama	3	5	3	0	71.9%	37.5%
Uruguay	3	5	2	1	71.8%	37.5%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Armenia	3	6	2	0	68.3%	33.3%
Belize	3	7	1	0	62.2%	30.0%
Mauritania	3	8	0	0	61.7%	27.3%
Tonga	2	1	1	7	86.5%	66.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	1	5	70.0%	40.0%
Madagascar	2	3	0	6	73.4%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	72.1%	33.3%
Côte d'Ivoire	2	4	2	3	69.1%	33.3%
Malawi	2	4	0	5	70.5%	33.3%
Niger	2	4	1	4	72.1%	33.3%
Russia	2	4	5	0	74.8%	33.3%
Burundi	2	5	2	2	65.4%	28.6%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	62.1%	28.6%
Thailand	2	5	4	0	70.6%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	4	0	68.4%	28.6%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	1	63.3%	25.0%
Colombia	2	6	3	0	65.5%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	3	55.8%	25.0%
Ethiopia	2	6	3	0	63.5%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	2	1	65.9%	25.0%
Afghanistan	2	7	0	2	59.2%	22.2%
Bahamas	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Brazil	2	7	2	0	62.8%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	2	0	61.2%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	7	0	2	60.5%	22.2%
Dominica	2	7	0	2	58.4%	22.2%
Guinea-Bissau	2	7	1	1	58.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	1	62.4%	22.2%
Kyrgyzstan	2	7	2	0	62.6%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Philippines	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Turkmenistan	2	7	0	2	53.3%	22.2%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	8	1	0	59.4%	20.0%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	1	59.0%	20.0%
Benin	2	8	1	0	58.2%	20.0%
Bhutan	2	8	1	0	56.1%	20.0%
Eritrea	2	8	1	0	58.6%	20.0%
Ghana	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
India	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Jordan	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Kenya	2	8	1	0	56.8%	20.0%
Lesotho	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Mali	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Morocco	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Mozambique	2	8	1	0	55.7%	20.0%
Namibia	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Nepal	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Singapore	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Sri Lanka	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Tajikistan	2	8	1	0	55.9%	20.0%
UR Tanzania	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
United Arab Emirates	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Zambia	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Algeria	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Bahrain	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Bangladesh	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Botswana	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam	2	9	0	0	56.9%	18.2%
Djibouti	2	9	0	0	56.3%	18.2%
Guinea	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Kuwait	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	9	0	0	52.2%	18.2%
Libya	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Malaysia	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Maldives	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Myanmar (Burma)	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Oman	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Qatar	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Saint Lucia	2	9	0	0	53.4%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Senegal	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Somalia	2	9	0	0	51.0%	18.2%
Sudan	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	0	0	53.9%	18.2%
Tunisia	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Yemen	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Zimbabwe	2	9	0	0	55.5%	18.2%
Rwanda	1	2	1	7	67.9%	33.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	2	0	8	65.8%	33.3%
Central African Rep.	1	4	2	4	63.2%	20.0%
Congo	1	5	0	5	54.9%	16.7%
Gambia	1	5	0	5	44.7%	16.7%
Liberia	1	5	1	4	59.9%	16.7%
Sierra Leone	1	5	0	5	50.6%	16.7%
Trinidad and Tobago	1	5	2	3	65.8%	16.7%
Angola	1	6	1	3	46.5%	14.3%
Barbados	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Belarus	1	8	2	0	57.2%	11.1%
China	1	8	1	1	57.5%	11.1%
Jamaica	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Laos	1	8	1	1	52.8%	11.1%
Pakistan	1	8	1	1	57.0%	11.1%
DPR of Korea	1	9	0	1	49.6%	10.0%
Egypt	1	9	1	0	55.0%	10.0%
Indonesia	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Iran	1	9	1	0	54.1%	10.0%
South Africa	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Syria	1	9	0	1	54.3%	10.0%
Uzbekistan	1	9	0	1	51.7%	10.0%
Venezuela	1	9	1	0	53.9%	10.0%
Vietnam	1	9	0	1	49.3%	10.0%
Chad	0	1	0	10	51.9%	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Kiribati	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	3	0	8	20.7%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	6	0	5	21.7%	0.0%
Cuba	0	9	1	1	51.6%	0.0%
Average	3	5	2	1	70.2%	37.6%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**UN REGIONAL GROUPS**

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 11 important votes.

**African Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritania	3	8	0	0	61.7%	27.3%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	1	5	70.0%	40.0%
Madagascar	2	3	0	6	73.4%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	72.1%	33.3%
Côte d'Ivoire	2	4	2	3	69.1%	33.3%
Malawi	2	4	0	5	70.5%	33.3%
Niger	2	4	1	4	72.1%	33.3%
Burundi	2	5	2	2	65.4%	28.6%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	62.1%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	4	0	68.4%	28.6%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	1	63.3%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	3	55.8%	25.0%
Ethiopia	2	6	3	0	63.5%	25.0%
Burkina Faso	2	7	2	0	61.2%	22.2%
Guinea-Bissau	2	7	1	1	58.0%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Benin	2	8	1	0	58.2%	20.0%
Eritrea	2	8	1	0	58.6%	20.0%
Ghana	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Kenya	2	8	1	0	56.8%	20.0%
Lesotho	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Mali	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Morocco	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Mozambique	2	8	1	0	55.7%	20.0%
Namibia	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
UR Tanzania	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Zambia	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Algeria	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Botswana	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Djibouti	2	9	0	0	56.3%	18.2%
Guinea	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Libya	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Senegal	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Somalia	2	9	0	0	51.0%	18.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**African Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sudan	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	0	0	53.9%	18.2%
Tunisia	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Zimbabwe	2	9	0	0	55.5%	18.2%
Rwanda	1	2	1	7	67.9%	33.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	2	0	8	65.8%	33.3%
Central African Rep.	1	4	2	4	63.2%	20.0%
Congo	1	5	0	5	54.9%	16.7%
Gambia	1	5	0	5	44.7%	16.7%
Liberia	1	5	1	4	59.9%	16.7%
Sierra Leone	1	5	0	5	50.6%	16.7%
Angola	1	6	1	3	46.5%	14.3%
Egypt	1	9	1	0	55.0%	10.0%
South Africa	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Chad	0	1	0	10	51.9%	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	6	0	5	21.7%	0.0%
Average	1.7	6.4	0.8	2.1	58.7%	20.7%

**Asian Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Marshall Islands	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Micronesia	8	1	1	1	93.9%	88.9%
Japan	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Vanuatu	5	1	3	2	92.2%	83.3%
Cyprus	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Samoa	5	3	3	0	82.6%	62.5%
Nauru	4	1	0	6	83.8%	80.0%
Republic of Korea	4	1	6	0	93.2%	80.0%
Timor-Leste	4	1	0	6	92.4%	80.0%
Solomon Islands	4	3	4	0	79.7%	57.1%
Fiji	4	5	2	0	71.0%	44.4%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	5	0	78.2%	50.0%
Tuvalu	3	3	3	2	75.8%	50.0%
Mongolia	3	4	2	2	73.1%	42.9%
Tonga	2	1	1	7	86.5%	66.7%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Asian Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	2	5	4	0	70.6%	28.6%
Iraq	2	6	2	1	65.9%	25.0%
Afghanistan	2	7	0	2	59.2%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	7	0	2	60.5%	22.2%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	1	62.4%	22.2%
Kyrgyzstan	2	7	2	0	62.6%	22.2%
Philippines	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Turkmenistan	2	7	0	2	53.3%	22.2%
Bhutan	2	8	1	0	56.1%	20.0%
India	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Jordan	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Nepal	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Singapore	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Sri Lanka	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Tajikistan	2	8	1	0	55.9%	20.0%
United Arab Emirates	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Bahrain	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Bangladesh	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam	2	9	0	0	56.9%	18.2%
Kuwait	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	9	0	0	52.2%	18.2%
Malaysia	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Maldives	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Myanmar	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Oman	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Qatar	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Yemen	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
China	1	8	1	1	57.5%	11.1%
Laos	1	8	1	1	52.8%	11.1%
Pakistan	1	8	1	1	57.0%	11.1%
DPR of Korea	1	9	0	1	49.6%	10.0%
Indonesia	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Iran	1	9	1	0	54.1%	10.0%
Syria	1	9	0	1	54.3%	10.0%
Uzbekistan	1	9	0	1	51.7%	10.0%
Vietnam	1	9	0	1	49.3%	10.0%
Average	2.6	6.4	1.2	0.8	63.8%	28.5%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Honduras	4	1	4	2	92.0%	80.0%
Nicaragua	4	2	4	1	86.1%	66.7%
El Salvador	4	3	2	2	81.9%	57.1%
Guatemala	4	3	4	0	82.4%	57.1%
Peru	4	3	4	0	82.3%	57.1%
Dominican Republic	4	4	3	0	77.7%	50.0%
Argentina	4	5	2	0	73.7%	44.4%
Costa Rica	4	5	2	0	73.3%	44.4%
Mexico	4	5	2	0	73.5%	44.4%
Bolivia	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
Chile	4	6	1	0	70.0%	40.0%
Ecuador	4	6	1	0	69.9%	40.0%
Haiti	4	6	1	0	66.9%	40.0%
Paraguay	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	7	0	0	64.2%	36.4%
Grenada	3	4	0	4	71.3%	42.9%
Panama	3	5	3	0	71.9%	37.5%
Uruguay	3	5	2	1	71.8%	37.5%
Belize	3	7	1	0	62.2%	30.0%
Colombia	2	6	3	0	65.5%	25.0%
Bahamas	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Brazil	2	7	2	0	62.8%	22.2%
Dominica	2	7	0	2	58.4%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Antigua-Barbuda	2	8	1	0	59.4%	20.0%
Saint Lucia	2	9	0	0	53.4%	18.2%
Trinidad and Tobago	1	5	2	3	65.8%	16.7%
Barbados	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Jamaica	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Venezuela	1	9	1	0	53.9%	10.0%
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	3	0	8	20.7%	0.0%
Cuba	0	9	1	1	51.6%	0.0%
Average	2.8	5.7	1.8	0.7	67.1%	32.7%



*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Western European and Others Group (WEOG)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	9	0	2	0	100.0%	100.0%
Australia	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Canada	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Andorra	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Austria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Belgium	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Denmark	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Finland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
France	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Germany	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Greece	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Iceland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Ireland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Italy	5	1	5	0	93.5%	83.3%
Liechtenstein	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Luxembourg	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Monaco	5	1	5	0	93.4%	83.3%
Netherlands	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
New Zealand	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Norway	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Portugal	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
San Marino	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Spain	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Sweden	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Switzerland	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
United Kingdom	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Malta	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Turkey	3	4	2	2	75.6%	42.9%
Average	5.3	1.1	4.5	0.1	93.0%	82.2%

**Eastern European Group (EE)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	5	1	5	0	93.1%	83.3%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	5	1	2	3	91.8%	83.3%
Bulgaria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Croatia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Czech Republic	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Estonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Hungary	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Latvia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Lithuania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Poland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Romania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Serbia/Montenegro	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Slovenia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
TFYR Macedonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Ukraine	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Slovak Republic	5	2	4	0	88.2%	71.4%
Georgia	4	1	5	1	93.2%	80.0%
Republic of Moldova	4	1	5	1	92.6%	80.0%
Armenia	3	6	2	0	68.3%	33.3%
Russia	2	4	5	0	74.8%	33.3%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	1	59.0%	20.0%
Belarus	1	8	2	0	57.2%	11.1%
Average	4.4	2.0	4.3	0.3	87.2%	68.1%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

## OTHER GROUPINGS

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

### Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritania	3	8	0	0	61.7%	27.3%
Iraq	2	6	2	1	65.9%	25.0%
Jordan	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Morocco	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
United Arab Emirates	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Algeria	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Bahrain	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Djibouti	2	9	0	0	56.3%	18.2%
Kuwait	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	9	0	0	52.2%	18.2%
Libya	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Oman	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Qatar	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Somalia	2	9	0	0	51.0%	18.2%
Sudan	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Tunisia	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Yemen	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Egypt	1	9	1	0	55.1%	10.0%
Syria	1	9	0	1	54.3%	10.0%
Average	2.0	8.7	0.2	0.2	57.0%	18.4%

### Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Thailand	2	5	4	0	70.6%	28.6%
Cambodia	2	7	0	2	60.5%	22.2%
Philippines	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Singapore	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam	2	9	0	0	56.9%	18.2%
Malaysia	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Myanmar (Burma)	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Laos	1	8	1	1	52.8%	11.1%
Indonesia	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Vietnam	1	9	0	1	49.3%	10.0%
Average	1.7	8.0	0.9	0.4	57.9%	17.5%

**European Union (EU)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Austria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Belgium	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Czech Republic	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Denmark	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Estonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
Finland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
France	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Germany	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Greece	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Hungary	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Ireland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Italy	5	1	5	0	93.5%	83.3%
Latvia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Lithuania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Luxembourg	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Netherlands	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Poland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Portugal	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Slovenia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Spain	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Sweden	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
United Kingdom	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Slovak Republic	5	2	4	0	88.2%	71.4%
Cyprus	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Malta	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Average	5.0	1.2	4.8	0.0	92.6%	80.6%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

**Islamic Conference (OIC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	5	1	5	0	93.1%	83.3%
Turkey	3	4	2	2	75.6%	42.9%
Mauritania	3	8	0	0	61.7%	27.3%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	72.1%	33.3%
Côte d'Ivoire	2	4	2	3	69.1%	33.3%
Niger	2	4	1	4	72.1%	33.3%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	62.1%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	4	0	68.4%	28.6%
Comoros	2	6	0	3	55.8%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	2	1	65.9%	25.0%
Afghanistan	2	7	0	2	59.2%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	2	0	61.2%	22.2%
Guinea-Bissau	2	7	1	1	58.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Kazakhstan	2	7	1	1	62.4%	22.2%
Kyrgyzstan	2	7	2	0	62.6%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Turkmenistan	2	7	0	2	53.3%	22.2%
Azerbaijan	2	8	0	1	59.0%	20.0%
Benin	2	8	1	0	58.2%	20.0%
Jordan	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Mali	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Morocco	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Mozambique	2	8	1	0	55.7%	20.0%
Nigeria	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Tajikistan	2	8	1	0	55.9%	20.0%
United Arab Emirates	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Algeria	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Bahrain	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Bangladesh	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam	2	9	0	0	56.9%	18.2%
Djibouti	2	9	0	0	56.3%	18.2%
Guinea	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Kuwait	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	9	0	0	52.2%	18.2%
Libya	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Malaysia	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Maldives	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Oman	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Qatar	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Senegal	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Somalia	2	9	0	0	51.0%	18.2%
Sudan	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	0	0	53.9%	18.2%
Tunisia	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Yemen	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Gambia	1	5	0	5	44.7%	16.7%
Sierra Leone	1	5	0	5	50.6%	16.7%
Pakistan	1	8	1	1	57.0%	11.1%
Egypt	1	9	1	0	55.0%	10.0%
Indonesia	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Iran	1	9	1	0	54.1%	10.0%
Syria	1	9	0	1	54.3%	10.0%
Uzbekistan	1	9	0	1	51.7%	10.0%
Chad	0	1	0	10	51.9%	0.0%
Average	1.9	7.5	0.7	0.9	58.7%	20.3%

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Vanuatu	5	1	3	2	92.2%	83.3%
Cyprus	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Malta	5	3	3	0	83.3%	62.5%
Honduras	4	1	4	2	92.0%	80.0%
Nicaragua	4	2	4	1	86.1%	66.7%
Guatemala	4	3	4	0	82.4%	57.1%
Peru	4	3	4	0	82.3%	57.1%
Dominican Republic	4	4	3	0	77.7%	50.0%
Bolivia	4	6	1	0	67.6%	40.0%
Chile	4	6	1	0	70.0%	40.0%
Ecuador	4	6	1	0	69.9%	40.0%
Papua New Guinea	3	3	5	0	78.2%	50.0%
Grenada	3	4	0	4	71.3%	42.9%
Mongolia	3	4	2	2	73.1%	42.9%
Panama	3	5	3	0	71.9%	37.5%
Belize	3	7	1	0	62.2%	30.0%

*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mauritania	3	8	0	0	61.7%	27.3%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	3	1	5	70.0%	40.0%
Madagascar	2	3	0	6	73.4%	40.0%
Cameroon	2	4	4	1	72.1%	33.3%
Côte d'Ivoire	2	4	2	3	69.1%	33.3%
Malawi	2	4	0	5	70.5%	33.3%
Niger	2	4	1	4	72.1%	33.3%
Burundi	2	5	2	2	65.4%	28.6%
Gabon	2	5	0	4	62.1%	28.6%
Thailand	2	5	4	0	70.6%	28.6%
Uganda	2	5	4	0	68.4%	28.6%
Cape Verde	2	6	2	1	63.3%	25.0%
Colombia	2	6	3	0	65.5%	25.0%
Comoros	2	6	0	3	55.8%	25.0%
Ethiopia	2	6	3	0	63.5%	25.0%
Iraq	2	6	2	1	65.9%	25.0%
Afghanistan	2	7	0	2	59.2%	22.2%
Bahamas	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	7	2	0	61.2%	22.2%
Cambodia	2	7	0	2	60.5%	22.2%
Guinea-Bissau	2	7	1	1	58.0%	22.2%
Guyana	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Mauritius	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Philippines	2	7	2	0	63.0%	22.2%
Suriname	2	7	2	0	59.8%	22.2%
Turkmenistan	2	7	0	2	53.3%	22.2%
Benin	2	8	1	0	58.2%	20.0%
Bhutan	2	8	1	0	56.1%	20.0%
Eritrea	2	8	1	0	58.6%	20.0%
Ghana	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
India	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Jordan	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Kenya	2	8	1	0	56.8%	20.0%
Lesotho	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Mali	2	8	1	0	59.6%	20.0%
Morocco	2	8	0	1	59.6%	20.0%
Mozambique	2	8	1	0	55.7%	20.0%
Namibia	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Nepal	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Nigeria	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Singapore	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
Sri Lanka	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
UR Tanzania	2	8	1	0	60.0%	20.0%
United Arab Emirates	2	8	1	0	59.8%	20.0%
Zambia	2	8	1	0	59.0%	20.0%
Algeria	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Bahrain	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Bangladesh	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Botswana	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Brunei Darussalam	2	9	0	0	56.9%	18.2%
Djibouti	2	9	0	0	56.3%	18.2%
Guinea	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Kuwait	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Lebanon	2	9	0	0	52.2%	18.2%
Libya	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Malaysia	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Maldives	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Myanmar (Burma)	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Oman	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Qatar	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Saint Lucia	2	9	0	0	53.4%	18.2%
Saudi Arabia	2	9	0	0	56.7%	18.2%
Senegal	2	9	0	0	53.7%	18.2%
Somalia	2	9	0	0	51.0%	18.2%
Sudan	2	9	0	0	55.3%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	0	0	53.9%	18.2%
Tunisia	2	9	0	0	56.1%	18.2%
Yemen	2	9	0	0	57.1%	18.2%
Zimbabwe	2	9	0	0	55.5%	18.2%
Rwanda	1	2	1	7	67.9%	33.3%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	2	0	8	65.8%	33.3%
Central African Rep.	1	4	2	4	63.2%	20.0%
Congo	1	5	0	5	54.9%	16.7%
Gambia	1	5	0	5	44.7%	16.7%
Liberia	1	5	1	4	59.9%	16.7%
Sierra Leone	1	5	0	5	50.6%	16.7%
Trinidad and Tobago	1	5	2	3	65.8%	16.7%
Angola	1	6	1	3	46.5%	14.3%
Barbados	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%



*IV—General Assembly Important Votes*

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

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Belarus	1	8	2	0	57.2%	11.1%
Jamaica	1	8	2	0	57.9%	11.1%
Laos	1	8	1	1	52.8%	11.1%
Pakistan	1	8	1	1	57.0%	11.1%
DPR of Korea	1	9	0	1	49.6%	10.0%
Egypt	1	9	1	0	55.0%	10.0%
Indonesia	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Iran	1	9	1	0	54.1%	10.0%
South Africa	1	9	1	0	54.8%	10.0%
Syria	1	9	0	1	54.3%	10.0%
Uzbekistan	1	9	0	1	51.7%	10.0%
Venezuela	1	9	1	0	53.9%	10.0%
Vietnam	1	9	0	1	49.3%	10.0%
Chad	0	1	0	10	51.9%	0.0%
Equatorial Guinea	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Seychelles	0	1	0	10	8.9%	0.0%
Swaziland	0	6	0	5	21.7%	0.0%
Cuba	0	9	1	1	51.6%	0.0%
Average	2.0	6.7	1.1	1.2	60.7%	22.8%

**Nordic Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Finland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Iceland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Norway	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Sweden	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Average	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Canada	8	1	2	0	94.7%	88.9%
Belgium	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Bulgaria	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Czech Republic	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Denmark	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Estonia	5	1	5	0	93.7%	83.3%
France	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Germany	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Greece	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Hungary	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Iceland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Italy	5	1	5	0	93.5%	83.3%
Latvia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Lithuania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Luxembourg	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Netherlands	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Norway	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Poland	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Portugal	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Romania	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Slovenia	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Spain	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
United Kingdom	5	1	5	0	93.8%	83.3%
Slovak Republic	5	2	4	0	88.2%	71.4%
Turkey	3	4	2	2	75.6%	42.9%
Average	5.0	1.2	4.7	0.1	92.8%	81.3%

## COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2005 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.....	2	7	22.2%	11	61	15.3%
Albania .....	5	1	83.3%	29	22	56.9%
Algeria .....	2	9	18.2%	6	71	7.8%
Andorra.....	5	1	83.3%	32	44	42.1%
Angola .....	1	6	14.3%	7	28	20.0%
Antigua-Barbuda .....	2	8	20.0%	12	66	15.4%
Argentina .....	4	5	44.4%	21	57	26.9%
Armenia .....	3	6	33.3%	19	57	25.0%
Australia .....	8	1	88.9%	43	31	58.1%
Austria .....	5	1	83.3%	32	41	43.8%
Azerbaijan.....	2	8	20.0%	13	62	17.3%
Bahamas .....	2	7	22.2%	8	59	11.9%
Bahrain .....	2	9	18.2%	7	68	9.3%
Bangladesh .....	2	9	18.2%	13	72	15.3%
Barbados .....	1	8	11.1%	14	66	17.5%
Belarus.....	1	8	11.1%	11	63	14.9%
Belgium .....	5	1	83.3%	33	40	45.2%
Belize.....	3	7	30.0%	11	59	15.7%
Benin .....	2	8	20.0%	10	63	13.7%
Bhutan .....	2	8	20.0%	6	55	9.8%
Bolivia .....	4	6	40.0%	16	55	22.5%
Bosnia/Herzegovina.....	5	1	83.3%	26	21	55.3%
Botswana .....	2	9	18.2%	12	59	16.9%
Brazil .....	2	7	22.2%	16	64	20.0%
Brunei Darussalam .....	2	9	18.2%	14	69	16.9%
Bulgaria .....	5	1	83.3%	34	42	44.7%
Burkina Faso.....	2	7	22.2%	8	65	11.0%
Burundi .....	2	5	28.6%	7	49	12.5%
Cambodia.....	2	7	22.2%	14	63	18.2%
Cameroon .....	2	4	33.3%	9	43	17.3%
Canada .....	8	1	88.9%	37	39	48.7%
Cape Verde .....	2	6	25.0%	8	56	12.5%
Central African Rep.....	1	4	20.0%	6	41	12.8%
Chad.....	0	1	0.0%	1	8	11.1%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Chile .....	4	6	40.0%	21	62	25.3%
China .....	1	8	11.1%	10	67	13.0%
Colombia .....	2	6	25.0%	6	63	8.7%
Comoros .....	2	6	25.0%	3	43	6.5%
Congo .....	1	5	16.7%	3	38	7.3%
Costa Rica.....	4	5	44.4%	22	56	28.2%
Côte d'Ivoire.....	2	4	33.3%	11	42	20.8%
Croatia .....	5	1	83.3%	32	41	43.8%
Cuba.....	0	9	0.0%	5	72	6.5%
Cyprus .....	5	3	62.5%	32	46	41.0%
Czech Republic.....	5	1	83.3%	34	41	45.3%
DPR of Korea .....	1	9	10.0%	2	64	3.0%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo ...	2	3	40.0%	9	32	22.0%
Denmark .....	5	1	83.3%	35	41	46.1%
Djibouti.....	2	9	18.2%	7	69	9.2%
Dominica .....	2	7	22.2%	10	58	14.7%
Dominican Republic .....	4	4	50.0%	19	58	24.7%
Ecuador.....	4	6	40.0%	19	65	22.6%
Egypt .....	1	9	10.0%	7	72	8.9%
El Salvador .....	4	3	57.1%	19	58	24.7%
Equatorial Guinea .....	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Eritrea .....	2	8	20.0%	9	67	11.8%
Estonia .....	5	1	83.3%	32	40	44.4%
Ethiopia .....	2	6	25.0%	9	55	14.1%
Fiji .....	4	5	44.4%	12	53	18.5%
Finland.....	5	1	83.3%	33	41	44.6%
France .....	5	1	83.3%	38	34	52.8%
Gabon .....	2	5	28.6%	7	50	12.3%
Gambia .....	1	5	16.7%	1	26	3.7%
Georgia .....	4	1	80.0%	31	40	43.7%
Germany .....	5	1	83.3%	33	41	44.6%
Ghana.....	2	8	20.0%	11	63	14.9%
Greece.....	5	1	83.3%	33	41	44.6%
Grenada.....	3	4	42.9%	15	43	25.9%
Guatemala.....	4	3	57.1%	22	58	27.5%
Guinea .....	2	9	18.2%	12	67	15.2%
Guinea-Bissau.....	2	7	22.2%	10	54	15.6%
Guyana.....	2	7	22.2%	14	65	17.7%
Haiti.....	4	6	40.0%	11	49	18.3%
Honduras.....	4	1	80.0%	15	42	26.3%
Hungary.....	5	1	83.3%	34	40	45.9%

*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
Iceland .....	5	1	83.3%	34	41	45.3%
India.....	2	8	20.0%	14	59	19.2%
Indonesia.....	1	9	10.0%	12	71	14.5%
Iran.....	1	9	10.0%	7	70	9.1%
Iraq.....	2	6	25.0%	7	65	9.7%
Ireland.....	5	1	83.3%	31	44	41.3%
Israel .....	9	0	100.0%	57	6	90.5%
Italy.....	5	1	83.3%	32	38	45.7%
Jamaica .....	1	8	11.1%	13	66	16.5%
Japan.....	5	1	83.3%	35	39	47.3%
Jordan .....	2	8	20.0%	10	70	12.5%
Kazakhstan .....	2	7	22.2%	17	63	21.3%
Kenya.....	2	8	20.0%	9	58	13.4%
Kiribati.....	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Kuwait .....	2	9	18.2%	7	66	9.6%
Kyrgyzstan.....	2	7	22.2%	15	63	19.2%
Laos .....	1	8	11.1%	5	64	7.2%
Latvia.....	5	1	83.3%	35	39	47.3%
Lebanon .....	2	9	18.2%	8	61	11.6%
Lesotho .....	2	8	20.0%	14	67	17.3%
Liberia .....	1	5	16.7%	6	45	11.8%
Libya.....	2	9	18.2%	8	72	10.0%
Liechtenstein.....	5	1	83.3%	32	41	43.8%
Lithuania.....	5	1	83.3%	34	41	45.3%
Luxembourg .....	5	1	83.3%	34	41	45.3%
Madagascar.....	2	3	40.0%	9	43	17.3%
Malawi.....	2	4	33.3%	9	51	15.0%
Malaysia .....	2	9	18.2%	12	70	14.6%
Maldives .....	2	9	18.2%	15	72	17.2%
Mali .....	2	8	20.0%	14	67	17.3%
Malta.....	5	3	62.5%	31	47	39.7%
Marshall Islands.....	9	0	100.0%	47	18	72.3%
Mauritania.....	3	8	27.3%	14	69	16.9%
Mauritius.....	2	7	22.2%	12	64	15.8%
Mexico.....	4	5	44.4%	19	62	23.5%
Micronesia .....	8	1	88.9%	47	16	74.6%
Monaco.....	5	1	83.3%	33	37	47.1%
Mongolia.....	3	4	42.9%	11	54	16.9%
Morocco.....	2	8	20.0%	11	68	13.9%
Mozambique.....	2	8	20.0%	5	58	7.9%
Myanmar (Burma) .....	2	9	18.2%	10	66	13.2%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Namibia .....	2	8	20.0%	15	68	18.1%
Nauru .....	4	1	80.0%	8	1	88.9%
Nepal .....	2	8	20.0%	12	66	15.4%
Netherlands.....	5	1	83.3%	35	41	46.1%
New Zealand.....	5	1	83.3%	33	47	41.3%
Nicaragua.....	4	2	66.7%	15	51	22.7%
Niger.....	2	4	33.3%	13	54	19.4%
Nigeria.....	2	8	20.0%	17	67	20.2%
Norway.....	5	1	83.3%	34	42	44.7%
Oman.....	2	9	18.2%	7	71	9.0%
Pakistan.....	1	8	11.1%	6	65	8.5%
Palau.....	9	0	100.0%	47	14	77.0%
Panama.....	3	5	37.5%	18	62	22.5%
Papua New Guinea.....	3	3	50.0%	15	35	30.0%
Paraguay.....	4	6	40.0%	16	54	22.9%
Peru.....	4	3	57.1%	20	61	24.7%
Philippines.....	2	7	22.2%	16	66	19.5%
Poland.....	5	1	83.3%	35	40	46.7%
Portugal.....	5	1	83.3%	33	43	43.4%
Qatar.....	2	9	18.2%	8	69	10.4%
Republic of Korea.....	4	1	80.0%	26	41	38.8%
Republic of Moldova.....	4	1	80.0%	24	34	41.4%
Romania.....	5	1	83.3%	34	41	45.3%
Russia.....	2	4	33.3%	15	54	21.7%
Rwanda.....	1	2	33.3%	2	25	7.4%
St. Kitts and Nevis.....	0	3	0.0%	2	4	33.3%
Saint Lucia.....	2	9	18.2%	7	60	10.4%
St. Vincent/Grenadines.....	4	7	36.4%	16	58	21.6%
Samoa.....	5	3	62.5%	19	49	27.9%
San Marino.....	5	1	83.3%	32	44	42.1%
Sao Tome and Principe.....	1	2	33.3%	4	20	16.7%
Saudi Arabia.....	2	9	18.2%	10	68	12.8%
Senegal.....	2	9	18.2%	7	62	10.1%
Serbia/Montenegro.....	5	1	83.3%	33	42	44.0%
Seychelles.....	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Sierra Leone.....	1	5	16.7%	5	30	14.3%
Singapore.....	2	8	20.0%	15	62	19.5%
Slovak Republic.....	5	2	71.4%	34	43	44.2%
Slovenia.....	5	1	83.3%	34	40	45.9%
Solomon Islands.....	4	3	57.1%	15	45	25.0%
Somalia.....	2	9	18.2%	5	56	8.2%

*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
South Africa.....	1	9	10.0%	11	69	13.8%
Spain.....	5	1	83.3%	33	42	44.0%
Sri Lanka.....	2	8	20.0%	13	64	16.9%
Sudan.....	2	9	18.2%	11	70	13.6%
Suriname.....	2	7	22.2%	8	58	12.1%
Swaziland.....	0	6	0.0%	1	15	6.3%
Sweden.....	5	1	83.3%	32	43	42.7%
Switzerland.....	5	1	83.3%	31	41	43.1%
Syria.....	1	9	10.0%	6	71	7.8%
Tajikistan.....	2	8	20.0%	7	57	10.9%
Thailand.....	2	5	28.6%	13	65	16.7%
TFYR Macedonia.....	5	1	83.3%	31	41	43.1%
Timor-Leste.....	4	1	80.0%	20	52	27.8%
Togo.....	2	9	18.2%	9	62	12.7%
Tonga.....	2	1	66.7%	7	26	21.2%
Trinidad and Tobago.....	1	5	16.7%	11	59	15.7%
Tunisia.....	2	9	18.2%	7	68	9.3%
Turkey.....	3	4	42.9%	27	48	36.0%
Turkmenistan.....	2	7	22.2%	5	50	9.1%
Tuvalu.....	3	3	50.0%	8	34	19.0%
Uganda.....	2	5	28.6%	7	52	11.9%
Ukraine.....	5	1	83.3%	27	45	37.5%
United Arab Emirates.....	2	8	20.0%	6	68	8.1%
United Kingdom.....	5	1	83.3%	43	35	55.1%
UR Tanzania.....	2	8	20.0%	17	67	20.2%
Uruguay.....	3	5	37.5%	19	61	23.8%
Uzbekistan.....	1	9	10.0%	10	62	13.9%
Vanuatu.....	5	1	83.3%	15	29	34.1%
Venezuela.....	1	9	10.0%	8	72	10.0%
Vietnam.....	1	9	10.0%	4	64	5.9%
Yemen.....	2	9	18.2%	9	70	11.4%
Zambia.....	2	8	20.0%	10	68	12.8%
Zimbabwe.....	2	9	18.2%	6	72	7.7%
Average.....	3.0	5.0	37.6%	17.0	50.9	25.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations—2005*