

I - INTRODUCTION

This is the 18th annual report to Congress on voting practices in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and the Security Council. It is submitted in compliance with Section 406 of Public Law 101-246. It covers voting in 2000. The report statistically measures the voting of UN member states at the 55th UNGA session in the fall of 2000 in comparison with the U.S. voting record (Section II). In addition to an alphabetical listing of all countries, the report presents the voting record in a rank-ordered listing by voting coincidence percentage and by geographic regions, by selected bloc groupings, and in a side-by-side comparison with the amount of bilateral U.S. aid given to each country in fiscal year 2000. It also lists and describes UNGA resolutions selected as important to U.S. interests, again with tables for regional and political groups (Section III). Security Council resolutions for the entire year are described, and voting on them is tabulated (Section IV). A final section pulls together information from the other sections and presents it by country (Section V).

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The 55th session of the General Assembly opened on September 5 and held 89 plenary sessions before recessing on December 23. It adopted 275 resolutions, about the same as in each of the past few years, and below the 332 of 1990. This reflects the success of the United States and others in their effort to reduce the number of resolutions—by combining some issues, considering others only every two or three years, and dropping some entirely. The subjects of the resolutions covered the full gamut of UN concerns: security, arms control, economic issues, human rights, budget and financial matters, and legal questions. Those resolutions on which recorded votes were taken continued to be primarily about arms control, the Middle East, and human rights.

Of the 275 resolutions adopted, 209 (76.0%) were adopted by consensus. This figure and those of recent years (76.9% in 1999, 78% in 1998, 75.2% in 1997, 72.9% in 1996, 76.6% in 1995, and 77.4% in 1994) illustrate the high rate of consensus agreement in the work of the General Assembly. Combining the 209 resolutions and the 80 of 81 decisions adopted by consensus, the percentage of questions adopted by consensus was 81.2%. (Decisions are less formal than resolutions and generally cover matters of lesser importance.)

Voting Coincidence with the United States

On non-consensus issues, i.e., those on which a vote was taken, the average overall General Assembly voting coincidence of all UN members with the

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

United States in 2000 was 43.0%, up slightly from 41.8% in 1999 but down from 44.2% in 1998, 46.7% in 1997, 49.4% in 1996, and 50.6% in 1995. This decline in the years since 1995 reverses the steady and dramatic increase in the several years following the end of the Cold War. (See the graphs at the end of this section.) The 50.6% in 1995 was the first time the coincidence figure had exceeded 50% since 1978, and is more than three times the low point of 15.4% in 1988.

When consensus resolutions are factored in as votes identical to those of the United States, a much higher measure of agreement with U.S. positions is reached. This figure (87.6%), which more accurately reflects the work of the General Assembly, has been in the 86-88% range since it was first included in this report in 1993. It was 86.4% in 1999, 88.3% in 1998, 87.3% in 1997, 87.3% also in 1996, 88.2% in 1995, 88.8% in 1994, and 88.3% in 1993.

The coincidence figure on votes considered important to U.S. interests (47.9%) is once again higher than the percentage registered on overall votes (43.0%). The graphs at the end of this section illustrate this point. A side-by-side comparison of important and overall votes for each UN member is at the end of Section III.

The following table illustrates the gradual decrease in voting coincidence with the United States since the post-Cold War high of 50.6% in 1995. This decrease is reflected also in the votes on human rights and Middle East issues. The trend has been generally up on arms control votes, except for the drop to a 5-year low in 1999. (See also the graph on votes by issue categories at the end of this section.)

Year	Arms Control	Middle East	Human Rights	Overall Votes
2000	66.1%	11.9%	55.7%	43.0%
1999	57.9%	22.7%	52.5%	41.8%
1998	64.0%	22.5%	62.8%	44.2%
1997	65.8%	26.2%	61.9%	46.7%
1996	62.3%	28.3%	68.3%	49.4%
1995	60.9%	35.2%	81.0%	50.6%

As in past years, Israel (96.2%) and the United Kingdom (71.7%) were among the highest in voting coincidence with the United States. Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Albania, Uzbekistan, Palau, Bosnia & Herzegovina, and Canada were also in the top 10. The Baltic countries, Germany, and France

I - Introduction

were close behind. Most members of the Western European and Others group (WEOG) continued to score high coincidence levels; the average was 61.5%, which is down from 67.1% in 1999, 65.2% in 1998, and 70.9% in 1997. There has been a growing divergence between the United States and the European Union (which, at 62.5%, was down from 68.5% in 1999, 66.7% in 1998, and 73.0% in 1997). The Eastern European group also scored high again; but, at an average of 58.0%, was down from 61.7% in 1999 and 1998, and 68.6% in 1997 and 1996. After this group's meteoric rise in coincidence with the United States following the dissolution of the Soviet bloc, it largely matched the coincidence level of the Western European countries before its decline in the past three years. The NATO and Nordic countries also decreased in voting coincidence with the United States in 2000, reversing the rise in 1999 and previous recent years. The African and Asian groups, the Islamic Conference, and the Non-Aligned Movement, on the other hand, all rose in voting coincidence with the United States, reversing their recent declines. The voting coincidence for the Latin American and Caribbean group was also up. (See the graph at the end of this section.)

Sixteen countries agreed with the U.S. vote less than 25% of the time: Libya, Myanmar (Burma), Vietnam, India, Cuba, Laos, Egypt, Lebanon, Democratic Republic of the Congo (formerly Zaire), Pakistan, Syria, Chad, Comoros, Mauritania, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Kiribati.

Realization of U.S. Priorities

At the 55th General Assembly session, realization of U.S. priorities was once again mixed. U.S. arrears in payment of assessed contributions, and the linking of arrears payments to UN reforms, continued to present a challenge to U.S. leadership at the United Nations. The U.S. embargo of Cuba—viewed as extraterritorial, interventionist, restrictive of free trade, and contradictory to the post-Cold War spirit of cooperation—remained a contentious issue. The United States had the following successes—and failures—on Security Council membership, budget matters, arms control issues, human rights questions, economic concerns, Middle East resolutions, and other matters:

— **Mauritius was selected over Sudan for a two-year term as a member of the Security Council.** It was the U.S. view that Mauritius — a vibrant democracy with a strong market economy and a history of constructive participation in regional forums — would make an excellent addition to the Council. On the other hand, Sudan, the country in competition for the African seat on the Council, was not a suitable candidate because it was under UN sanctions, continued to sponsor terrorism, bombed UN relief envoys, and had a poor human rights record. Because of the stark dichotomy between the two choices, the United States took the unusual position of openly opposing Sudan's candi-

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

dacy. After an extremely tight race, UN members elected Mauritius to the Security Council.

— **On budget and management issues, the maximum assessment rate for the UN regular budget was reduced from 25 percent to 22 percent, thereby reducing the U.S. assessment to 22 percent.** In addition, the scale of assessments for peacekeeping was modified, **reducing the U.S. share of peacekeeping costs from 30.28 percent in 2000 to 28.134 percent for the first half of 2001 and to 27.6307 percent from July through December 31, 2001. The rate declines further in 2002 and 2003 to an expected level of just over 27 percent.** Although the peacekeeping scale reductions fell somewhat short of U.S. goals, both reductions were major achievements at the General Assembly session. In the budget for the current biennium and the proposed budget for 2002-2003, the United States and others were able to **maintain budget discipline**, with budget levels consistent with U.S. goals. In a significant move aimed at improving the UN budget process, the General Assembly adopted a resolution authorizing the Secretary General to implement **results-based budgeting** beginning in 2002, with the start of the next two-year budget cycle. This action follows the implementation of numerous technical changes pushed by the United States and others over the past few years to move UN budget procedures away from their input/output orientation and toward a system keyed to measuring program effectiveness and impact. Lastly, the U.S. representative to the important Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) served the first year of the three-year term to which she was elected in 1999.

— **On arms control issues,** the United States was able in 2000, unlike in past years, to support a resolution calling for a **new agenda for nuclear disarmament**, because it recognized that nuclear disarmament is a step-by-step process that requires pragmatic proposals, not political calls for impossible goals. The United States joined consensus on a resolution calling for restrictions on the **illicit trade in small arms**. A resolution urging ratification of the **Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)** and adherence to test moratoriums was adopted overwhelmingly. Some progress was made on a resolution on a **cut-off of fissionable material production**. On the other hand, a resolution on the **U.S.-Russia Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty** was adopted despite the U.S. objection that it was based on the false premise that preserving and strengthening the ABM treaty was incompatible with amending it, even when the ABM treaty specifically provides for amendments. The United States also voted against a resolution calling for a review of nuclear doctrines and **reduction of nuclear danger** because it was unrealistic and failed to acknowledge the real progress being made on unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral fronts to reduce nuclear danger. The United States also opposed a resolution calling for a convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, bearing in mind that the U.S. nuclear deterrent has helped to keep the peace for more than half a century. Also passing over U.S. objection was an unbalanced and exces-

I - Introduction

sively discriminatory resolution calling on **Israel** not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons, while ignoring other threats of proliferation in the Middle East.

— **On human rights issues, the General Assembly adopted a U.S.-initiated resolution on the situation in parts of South-Eastern Europe**, including Kosovo and the former Yugoslavia, again in 2000. Adoption of this and other resolutions on human rights reinforced the message that such matters are not purely internal issues. Also, the General Assembly adopted other country-specific human rights resolutions cosponsored or supported by the United States: human rights in Afghanistan, Burma (Myanmar), Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (the former Zaire), Haiti, Iran, and Iraq. The United States abstained on the resolution dealing with human rights in the Sudan because it did not adequately condemn the practice of slavery or of persecution for religious beliefs. The United States also supported Assembly adoption of resolutions on promoting and consolidating democracy, eliminating crimes against women committed in the name of honor, strengthening the rule of law, advancing the status of women, protecting the rights of children, eliminating religious intolerance, preventing torture, enforced disappearances, and summary and arbitrary executions, protecting indigenous people, assisting refugees, and eliminating racial discrimination. On the other hand, the United States found it necessary to vote against some human rights resolutions—globalization and human rights, unilateral coercive measures, promotion of a humanitarian and equitable international order, and a perennial Cuba-sponsored resolution on travel—because of problems with some of the text or concepts. There was again no resolution noting the human rights violations in Cuba.

— **On Middle East issues**, the Assembly in an emergency special session **condemned Israel for “excessive use of force”** against Palestinian civilians at the holy places in September, but efforts by the United States and others held the affirmative votes to less than half the membership and raised the number of abstentions to triple the usual number on such resolutions. At the regular Assembly session, the resolutions on the Middle East were again unbalanced and unhelpful to the peace process. The resolution calling on Israel not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons, while ignoring other threats of proliferation in the region, was especially discriminatory and unhelpful. The General Assembly’s Asia caucus group continued the injustice of excluding Israel from membership, but the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) gave Israel temporary membership in its group. **Israeli credentials were again accepted** without challenge or limitation, despite Iran’s “reservation.”

— **On economic issues, resolutions that contain language on the benefits of trade liberalization were adopted.** These resolutions also emphasized the importance of trade as an engine of growth and development, the need to uphold and strengthen an open and rule-based trading system, the need for

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

countries to devote domestic financial resources to development instead of relying excessively on official development assistance from abroad, the importance for developing countries of creating an environment that is conducive to development, and the need for governments to create an enabling environment for business, including through appropriate social policies.

— The United States joined consensus on a resolution calling on all countries to help **break the link between the sale of diamonds and the purchase of arms** for conflicts in Africa.

— **Resolutions were adopted on terrorism, drugs, and transnational organized crime, including the criminal misuse of information technology**, thus moving forward the struggle against these transnational criminal activities.

— **A resolution on HIV/AIDS was adopted.** The United States, believing that HIV/AIDS is one of the greatest threats facing human kind and that it should be a primary focus of all countries, strongly supported this resolution.

— **A resolution on reform of peacekeeping operations was adopted.** This resolution welcomed the report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Brahimi Report). The United States strongly supported the recommendations of the Brahimi Report, which correctly identified many of the reasons why peacekeeping operations had proven difficult and offered good suggestions for improving them.

— **The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) was admitted to membership in the United Nations.** The Assembly, on the grounds that the FRY could not automatically continue the UN membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, excluded the FRY in 1992 from further participation until it applied for membership and was admitted. The United States welcomed the FRY's ultimate acquiescence in this UN ruling.

SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council was again in 2000 a major focus of U.S. attention in the United Nations. The continuing tendency toward consensus among its members facilitated the Council's adoption of 50 resolutions during the year, fewer than during the post-Cold War peak of Security Council action in 1992-1994, but far more than during the Cold War era when Council action was often frustrated. The Council also issued 41 presidential statements; these are consensus documents issued by the Council president on behalf of the members. The large number of resolutions adopted and statements issued reflects the continuing reliance of member countries on Security Council action to assist in resolving threats to peace and security following the end of the Cold War.

I - Introduction

The Security Council was again heavily involved in giving direction to UN peacekeeping and mediation efforts throughout the world in 2000. These efforts are described in Section IV.

Voting coincidence percentages for Security Council members were again high. Most resolutions were adopted unanimously: 43 out of 50 (86%). One resolution was adopted by acclamation, i.e., without a vote (admission of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) to UN membership in October). There were no vetoes. One resolution (to establish a UN observer mission in Palestine) was not adopted because it received only 8 affirmative votes (9 are required); all other members, including the United States, abstained. A proposed decision (to permit the FRY to participate in Security Council discussion of Balkan matters in June, before readmission to UN membership) was defeated by the negative votes of 7 members, including the United States; Argentina, Jamaica, Mali, and Tunisia abstained. Other abstentions included one by the United States (on criticism of Israeli activities); two by China (admission of Tuvalu to UN membership, and sanctions against the Taliban in Afghanistan); two by Mali (on the conflict diamonds issue and on renewal of the UN mission in Western Sahara); and one each by Russia (on renewal of peacekeeping forces in Bosnia and Kosovo), Malaysia (sanctions against the Taliban), and Jamaica (renewal of the UN mission in Western Sahara). See the table on voting summaries at the end of Section IV.

FORMAT AND METHODOLOGY

The format and presentation of this report are consistent with provisions of PL 101-246, and the methodology employed is the same since the report's inception.

This report also includes an additional column in the tables in Section II (Overall Votes) and Section III (Important Votes), which presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, we have credited to each country a portion of the 209 consensus resolutions based on its participation in the 83 recorded plenary votes. Each country's participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes/No/Abstain votes it cast in plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total of plenary votes. These added columns, by including consensus actions, provide another perspective on UN activity. In our view, they reflect more accurately the extent of cooperation and agreement in the General Assembly.

The tables in this report provide a measurement of the voting coincidence of UN member countries with the United States. However, readers are cautioned about interpreting voting coincidence percentages. The percentages in

Voting Practices in the United Nations - 2000

the last column, using the older methodology, are calculated using only votes on which both the United States and the other country in question voted Yes or No; not included are those instances when either abstained or was absent. Abstentions and absences are often difficult to interpret, but they make a mathematical difference, sometimes major, in the percentage results. Inclusion of the number of abstentions and absences in the tables of this report enables readers to include them in calculating voting coincidence percentages if they wish to do so. The percentages in the second column from the right reflect more fully the activity of the General Assembly. However, this calculation assumes, for want of an attendance record, that all countries were present or absent for consensus resolutions in the same ratio as for recorded votes. Moreover, the content of resolutions should be considered in interpreting the figures in either column. There may be overwhelming agreement with the U.S. position on a matter of less importance to us and less support on a resolution we consider more important. These differences are difficult to quantify and to present in one or two coincidence figures.

A country's voting record in the United Nations is only one dimension of its relations with the United States. Bilateral economic, strategic, and political issues are often more directly important to U.S. interests. Nevertheless, a country's behavior at the United Nations is always relevant to its bilateral relationship with the United States, a point the Secretary of State regularly makes in letters of instruction to new U.S. ambassadors. This is also why copies of this report are presented to UN member foreign ministries throughout the world and to member state missions to the United Nations in New York. The Security Council and the General Assembly are arguably the most important international bodies in the world, dealing as they do with such vital issues as threats to peace and security, disarmament, development, humanitarian relief, human rights, the environment, and narcotics—all of which can and do directly affect major U.S. interests.

Questions about this report may be directed to the Bureau of International Organization Affairs in the Department of State.

