

Mr. President:

In the wake of the diplomatic fiasco over the China question at the United Nations, we are now hearing the inevitable talk about retaliation.

This is understandable. And even if we recognize -- as we should -- that the expulsion of Nationalist China was in large measure a result of our own myopic and heavy-handed diplomacy, the sting of defeat and injustice is still very real.

I deplore the action of the General Assembly as much as anyone, and I would hope that when tempers have cooled we might still find a way to bring the people of Taiwan back to the representation they deserve in the UN. The Administration should devote no less energy to that task than they are now devoting to the President's travel plans to Peking.

But it is simply uninformed, and self-defeating to follow the Administration's defeat in New York with the further folly of cutting UN funds here in the Senate.

2.

Amid all the talk about the UN living beyond its means, let us ask aspecifically just who will be living so high on the \$141 millinn proposed for our voluntary contributions for United Nations programs.

Just what so-called fat do we cut?

-- Is it the \$100 million for the United Nations Development Program, the focal point of the entire UN effort to help developing countries? Is that the way we encourage multilateral efforts and burden-sharing in foreign assistance?

-- Or do we cut the \$13 millinn proposed for UNICEF? Why don't we ask the children of Biafra, who were saved by UNICEF milk, to tell us how much fat there is in this program?

-- Or do we cut the \$7 million proposed for the UN population program? Do we think that \$7 million is an excessive investment to try to help other nations stem the tide of population growth that could so relentlessly devour every other advance in education and health and jobs? If population continues to grow at its present pace in some countries in Latin America, they could invest their entire gross national product in nothing but schools for the next 30 years and still not have enough classrooms. Is this \$7 million what the Secretary of State means by taking a hard look at UN spending?

3.

-- And of course there is a number of other smaller programs we could cut. We could cut our contribution to the UN drug abuse program. But I need not describe the absurdity of that at a time when we are locked in a life or death battle against the international traffic in narcotics.

-- Or we could cut the \$1½ million we give to the World Meteorological Organization, except that we could be making a mockery of our efforts to provide international warning against climatic disasters such as the cyclone in East Pakistan, where the very lack of warning brought human suffering which cost us many millions in the end.

-- Perhaps we could cut the World Health Organization and further cripple its already strained efforts to fight disease and death for 2/3 of the world's people, and to control epidemics that threaten our own population.

-- Then there is the \$400,000 we spend for training and research, an incredibly meager investment in a program to help other people stand on their feet, and ultimately remove the very need for our foreign assistance.

-- And finally, there is the \$22 million we could provide for the Arab refugee program. How would this Administration or this Congress -- who so often plead for peace in the Middle East -- justify

4.

the suffocation of that program? This program is the only real alternative Arab refugee children have to the hate and despair and terrorism which undermine any hope for a just settlement in the area. Do we punish them -- and thereby all the people of the Middle East?

If the President or my colleagues in the Congress were offended at the behavior of UN delegates in New York when the China vote was announced, I would simply ask them to remember that a cut-off of UN funds would not punish those delegates. On the contrary, we would be exacting our retribution on innocent men, women and children in every corner of the world who had no part or responsibility in Monday night's spectacle.

Those people have no time for sophomoric antics and little reason for glee, no matter what happens in the General Assembly. Most of them are consumed in a day-by-day battle just to keep themselves and their children alive.

I would not for a moment pretend that the United Nations has even begun to meet its promise, or that our membership there, and our contributions to its programs, are not in many ways an act of forbearance in the face of provocation and chronic frustration.

But we must not make the poor and sick children of the world pay the price for our diplomatic blunder in New York, for the mindless



5.

behavior of UN diplomats...or for an Administration tactic to scuttle the foreign aid bill because it contains a provision to end the war in Vietnam.

We have already failed one great trust this week -- the trust of the 14 million people of Taiwan that we would find an honorable solution to the problem of their representation.

Let us not follow that failure by breaking faith with millions more.



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)