

# U. S. LINKING AID TO VOTES AT U. N.

JAN 9 1976

Kissinger Reported to Aim  
Punitive Cuts at Nations  
Aiding Hostile Stands

NYTimes

By LESLIE H. GELB

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 8—Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger has formally initiated a policy of selecting for cutbacks in American aid those nations that have sided against the United States in votes in the United Nations. In some cases the cutbacks involve food and humanitarian relief.

According to State Department officials, Mr. Kissinger has already postponed agreements on development aid to Tanzania and Guyana because of their votes in the United Nations General Assembly to condemn Zionism and to oppose the Administration's position on Korea.

Other nations such as Malawi and the Ivory Coast, which supported Administration positions in the United Nations, will be given additional aid.

The new policy was described in both negative and positive terms. The official who disclosed this information to The New York Times, for example,

Continued on Page 5, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 1

called the policy no more than a "zap list" to punish small countries and do nothing about others like Egypt that were also voting against the United States.

On the other hand, State Department officials who confirmed the policy spoke of it as simply a way of showing developing nations that their behavior in international organizations would affect their direct relations with the United States.

## 'Something Tangible'

As one high official put it, "If bilateral concerns aren't overriding—like Middle East peace talks—we have to do something tangible to them to show that their opposition to us is not cost-free."

Congress appears to be divided on this issue. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has issued a report specifically prohibiting the politicizing of economic aid. The House International Relations Committee adopted a resolution that, in effect, endorsed some kind of get-tough approach after the United Nations vote condemning Zionism as a form of racism.

Some of the officials also acknowledged the following:

¶High officials of the Agency for International Development who are responsible for carrying out development programs have not been informed of the new policy.

¶Nations whose aid programs have been delayed or canceled are not explicitly being told why, although as one official said, "When our Ambassador comes to them and complains about their votes in the U.N., and a few weeks later an aid transaction falls through, they get the picture."

¶The policy will be carried out in a systematic and wide-ranging way, using all available aid programs—grant military aid, military credit sales, grant food aid, credit food sales, Export-Import Bank loans, development and humanitarian relief assistance—but relying initially and mainly on diplomatic protests.

## A Double Standard

High officials from previous Administrations often expressed anger about the votes of developing nations in the United Nations and their double standard of publicly attacking the United States, but not the Soviet Union, for doing just about the same things. But none could recall any policy to try to influence this situation.

State Department officials traced the origins of the new policy to three factors. One was the appointment of Daniel P. Moynihan as representative at the United Nations. Mr. Moynihan came to this position on the heels of an article in Commentary magazine calling for a strategy of "raising hell" in the United Nations.

A second was Mr. Kissinger's long-held belief that when nations acted against important interests of the United States on issues that were extraneous to their own interests, the Administration should take a stern line.

On United Nations votes in the fall concerning Korea, Zionism, independence for Puerto Rico and the removal of American bases from Guam, Mr. Kissinger had instructed Mr. Moynihan to make such strong representations.

The third factor was the United Nations vote condemning Zionism as a form of racism, which caused a number of Congressmen to press for cutting off American contributions to the United Nations and to many of its members. The House International Relations Committee asked President Ford

to provide a report in 90 days that would justify aid to countries that had voted for the anti-Zionist resolution.

A very different sentiment was being expressed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at about the same time. In its report on the economic aid bill, the committee stated that "insofar as possible, economic and disaster assistance should be insulated from traditional political considerations and the vicissitudes of the day-to-day conduct of foreign policy."

The resources provided for in this bill are not to be regarded as tools for the pursuit of short-term political objectives," the report continued.

State Department officials flatly rejected a charge that

they have produced a "zap list" and say that their policy has only a short-run objective. They said an office had been set up in the State Department to monitor and analyze United Nations votes. In analyzing the vote, the monitoring office looks at how the nation was expected to vote, whether the issue was important to that nation or whether it was taking "a free swipe" against the Administration, and other considerations such as direct United States interests in a particular nation.

The officials acknowledged that in most cases only small developing nations that could do little to the United States in return are chosen for action. Such nations include Cameroon, Cyprus, Benin, Niger, Senegal, Burundi, Chad and Malta. But

the analysts also select nations like India, Bangladesh and Nigeria for action.

The officials also explained that in most of these cases, it is a difficult choice to cut off economic aid because it would be the people of these countries who would suffer most.

"In nearly all cases," one high State Department official said, "there is good reason to limit our actions to diplomatic representations, sending in our ambassador to use persuasion."

Other officials agreed that the new policy would be vigorously carried out as new aid commitments were negotiated, and that the pattern of many nations acting against American interests, where it was easier for them to do so politically, should be broken.