

Nessen f.y.i.



Sixth General Assembly
of the
ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

SECRETARY KISSINGER

Human Rights

Cooperation for Development

OAS Reform

JOINT REPORT: U.S. and Panama

and

Secretary Kissinger's Statement

at the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America

Santiago, Chile

June 1976





**Sixth General Assembly
of the
ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES**

SECRETARY KISSINGER

Human Rights

Cooperation for Development

OAS Reform

JOINT REPORT: U.S. and Panama

and

Secretary Kissinger's Statement

at the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America

**Santiago, Chile
June 1976**



HUMAN RIGHTS

INTRODUCTION

As a result of vast change and considerable progress in Latin America in the 1960's and early seventies, the way was opened for an increasingly constructive relationship between the United States and Latin America—based on a new mutuality of respect and equality of sovereignty.

In the two years since the inauguration of the New Dialogue in 1974, the United States has sought to build steadily on this opportunity by advancing initiatives to address coherently the entire catalogue of hemispheric issues. An important step in this effort was the visit by Secretary of State Kissinger to Latin America in February of this year (Department of State Publication 8848).

A further milestone in this new policy effort came at the General Assembly of the Organization of American States held in Santiago, Chile from June 7 to 10, 1976. At that meeting, Secretary Kissinger presented proposals to advance common hemispheric interests in three key areas of concern: human rights, cooperation for development, and reform of the OAS system. Together, these proposals represent a new spirit in inter-American policy matters—one in which the United States no longer need refrain from offering major initiatives for fear of inspiring old notions of paternalism. It is a spirit which instead is marked by consultation, cooperation, and brighter prospects for building stronger and more mutually beneficial relations in the Western Hemisphere.



Secretary Kissinger on June 8, 1976.

One of the most compelling issues of our time, and one which calls for the concerted action of all responsible peoples and nations, is the necessity to protect and extend the fundamental rights of humanity.

The precious common heritage of our Western Hemisphere is the conviction that human beings are the subjects, not the objects, of public policy; that citizens must not become mere instruments of the state.

This is the conviction that brought millions to the Americas. It inspired our peoples to fight for their independence. It is the commitment that has made political freedom and individual dignity the constant and cherished ideal of the Americas and the envy of nations elsewhere. It is the ultimate proof that our countries are linked by more than geography and the impersonal forces of history.

Respect for the rights of man is written into the founding documents of every nation of our hemisphere. It has long been part of the common speech and daily lives of our citizens. And today, more than ever, the successful advance of our societies requires the full and free dedication of the talent, energy, and creative thought of men and women who are free from fear of repression.

The modern age has brought undreamed-of benefits to mankind—in medicine, in technological advance, and in human communication. But it has spawned plagues as well—in the form of new tools of oppression as well as of civil strife. In an era characterized by terrorism, by bitter ideological contention, by weakened bonds of social cohesion, and by the yearning for order even at the expense of liberty, the result all too often has been the violation of fundamental standards of humane conduct.

The obscene and atrocious acts systematically employed to devalue, debase, and destroy human life during World War II vividly and ineradicably impressed the responsible peoples of the world with the enormity of the challenge to human rights. It was precisely to end such abuses and to provide moral authority in international affairs that a new system was forged after that war—globally in the United Nations and regionally in a strengthened inter-American system.

The shortcomings of our efforts in an age which continues to be scarred by forces of intimi-

HUMAN RIGHTS

ation, terror, and brutality fostered sometimes from outside national territories and sometimes from inside have made it dramatically clear that basic human rights must be preserved, cherished, and defended if peace and prosperity are to be more than hollow technical achievements. For technological progress without social justice mocks humanity; national unity without freedom is sterile; nationalism without a consciousness of human community—which means a shared concern for human rights—refines instruments of oppression.

We in the Americas must increase our international support for the principles of justice, freedom, and human dignity—for the organized concern of the community of nations remains one of the most potent weapons in the struggle against the degradation of human values.

Human Rights Challenge in the Americas

The ultimate vitality and virtue of our societies spring from the instinctive sense of human dignity and respect for the rights of others that have long distinguished the immensely varied peoples and lands of this hemisphere. The genius of our inter-American heritage is based on the fundamental democratic principles of human and national dignity, justice, popular participation, and free cooperation among different peoples and social systems.

The observance of these essential principles of civility cannot be taken for granted even in the most tranquil of times. In periods of stress and uncertainty, when pressures on established authority grow and nations feel their very existence is tenuous, the practice of human rights becomes far more difficult.

The central problem of government has always been to strike a just and effective balance between freedom and authority. When freedom degenerates into anarchy, the human personality becomes subject to arbitrary, brutal, and capricious forces. When the demand for order overrides all other considerations, man becomes a means and not an end, a tool of impersonal machinery. Clearly some forms of human suffering are intolerable no matter what pressures nations may face or feel. Beyond that all societies have an obligation to enable their people to fulfill their potentialities and live a life of dignity and self-respect.

As we address this challenge in practice, we must recognize that our efforts must engage the serious commitment of our societies. As a source of dynamism, strength, and inspiration, verbal posturings and self-righteous rhetoric are not enough. Human rights are the very essence of a meaningful life, and human dignity is the ultimate purpose of government. No government can ignore terrorism and survive, but it is equally true that a government that tramples on the rights of its citizens denies the purpose of its existence.

In recent years and even days, our newspapers have carried stories of kidnappings, ambushes, bombings, and assassinations. Terrorism and the denial of civility have become so widespread, political subversions so intertwined with official and unofficial abuse, and so confused with oppression and base criminality, that the protection of individual rights and the preservation of human dignity have become sources of deep concern—and worse—sometimes of demoralization and indifference.

No country, no people—for that matter no political system—can claim a perfect record in the field of human rights. But precisely because our societies in the Americas have been dedicated to freedom since they emerged from the colonial era, our shortcomings are more apparent and more significant. And let us face facts: Respect for the dignity of man is declining in too many countries of the hemisphere. There are several states where fundamental standards of humane behavior are not observed. All of us have a responsibility in this regard, for the Americas cannot be true to themselves unless they rededicate themselves to belief in the worth of the individual and to the defense of those individual rights which that concept entails. Our nations must sustain both a common commitment to the human rights of individuals and practical support for the institutions and procedures necessary to insure those rights.

The rights of man have been authoritatively identified both in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the OAS's American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. There will, of course, always be differences of view as to the precise extent of the obligations of government. But there are standards below which no government can fall without offending fundamental values—such as genocide, officially toler-

ated torture, mass imprisonment or murder, or comprehensive denials of basic rights to racial, religious, political, or ethnic groups. Any government engaging in such practices must face adverse international judgment.

The international community has created important institutions to deal with the challenge of human rights. We here are all participants in some of them—the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, the OAS, and the two Human Rights Commissions of the United Nations and the OAS. In Europe an even more developed international institutional structure provides other useful precedents for our effort.

Procedures alone cannot solve the problem, but they can keep it at the forefront of our consciousness and they can provide certain minimum protection for the human personality. International law and experience have enabled the development of specific procedures to distinguish reasonable from arbitrary government action on, for example, the question of detention. These involve access to courts, counsel, and families; prompt release or charge; and, if the latter, fair and public trial. Where such procedures are followed, the risk and incidence of unintentional government error, of officially sanctioned torture, of prolonged arbitrary deprivation of liberty, are drastically reduced. Other important procedures are habeas corpus or amparo, judicial appeal, and impartial review of administrative actions. And then there are the procedures available at the international level—appeal to, and investigations and recommendations by, established independent bodies such as the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, an integral part of the OAS and a symbol of our dedication to the dignity of man.

The Inter-American Commission has built an impressive record of sustained, independent, and highly professional work since its establishment in 1960. Its importance as a primary procedural alternative in dealing with the recurrent human rights problems of this hemisphere is considerable.

The United States believes this Commission is one of the most important bodies of the Organization of American States. At the same time it has a role which touches upon the most sensitive aspects of the national policies of each of the member governments. We must insure that the Commission functions so that it cannot be manipulated for in-

ternational politics in the name of human rights. We must also see to it that the Commission becomes an increasingly vital instrument of hemispheric cooperation in defense of human rights. The Commission deserves the support of the Assembly in strengthening further its independence, even-handedness, and constructive potential.

Reports of the OAS Human Rights Commission

We have all read the two reports submitted to this General Assembly by the Commission. They are sobering documents for they provide serious evidence of violations of elemental international standards of human rights.

In its annual report on human rights in the hemisphere, the Commission cites the rise of violence and speaks of the need to maintain order and protect citizens against armed attack. But it also upholds the defense of individual rights as a primordial function of the law and describes case after case of serious governmental actions in derogation of such rights.

A second report is devoted exclusively to the situation in Chile. We note the Commission's statement that the Government of Chile has cooperated with the Commission, and the Commission's conclusion that the infringement of certain fundamental rights in Chile has undergone a quantitative reduction since the last report. We must also point out that Chile has filed a comprehensive and responsive answer that sets forth a number of hopeful prospects which we hope will soon be fully implemented.

Nevertheless the Commission has asserted that violations continue to occur, and this is a matter of bilateral as well as international attention. In the United States concern is widespread in the executive branch, in the press, and in the Congress, which has taken the extraordinary step of enacting specific statutory limits on U.S. military and economic aid to Chile.

The condition of human rights as assessed by the OAS Human Rights Commission has impaired our relationship with Chile and will continue to do so. We wish this relationship to be close, and all friends of Chile hope that obstacles raised by conditions alleged in the report will soon be removed.

At the same time the Commission should not focus on some problem areas to the neglect of others. The cause of human dignity is not served

by those who hypocritically manipulate concerns with human rights to further their political preferences, nor by those who single out for human rights condemnation only those countries with whose political views they disagree.

We are persuaded that the OAS Commission, however, has avoided such temptations.

The Commission has worked and reported widely. Its survey of human rights in Cuba is ample evidence of that. Though the report was completed too late for formal consideration at this General Assembly, an initial review confirms our worst fears of Cuban behavior. We should commend the Commission for its efforts—in spite of the total lack of cooperation of the Cuban authorities—to unearth the truth that many Cuban political prisoners have been victims of inhuman treatment. We urge the Commission to continue its efforts to determine the truth about the state of human rights in Cuba.

In our view the record of the Commission this year in all these respects demonstrates that it deserves the support of the Assembly in strengthening further its independence, evenhandedness, and constructive potential.

We can use the occasion of this General Assembly to emphasize that the protection of human rights is an obligation not simply of particular countries whose practices have come to public attention. Rather, it is an obligation assumed by all the nations of the Americas as part of their participation in the hemispheric system.

To this end the United States proposes that the Assembly broaden the Commission's mandate so that instead of waiting for complaints, it can report regularly on the status of human rights throughout the hemisphere.

Through adopting this proposal the nations of the Americas would make plain our common commitment to human rights, increase the reliable information available to us, and offer more effec-

tive recommendations to governments about how best to improve human rights. In support of such a broadened effort, we propose that the budget and staff of the Commission be enlarged. By strengthening the contribution of this body, we can deepen our dedication to the special qualities of rich promise that make our hemisphere a standard-bearer for freedom-loving people in every quarter of the globe.

At the same time we should also consider ways to strengthen the inter-American system in terms of protection against terrorism, kidnapping, and other forms of violent threats to the human personality, especially those inspired from the outside.

Necessity for Concern and Concrete Action

It is a tragedy that the forces of change in our century—a time of unparalleled human achievement—have also visited upon many individuals around the world a new dimension of intimidation and suffering.

The standard of individual liberty of conscience and expression is the proudest heritage of our civilization. It summons all nations. But this hemisphere, which for centuries has been the hope of all mankind, has a special requirement for dedicated commitment.

Let us then turn to the great task before us. All we do in the world—in our search for peace, for greater political cooperation, for a fair and flourishing economic system—is meaningful only if linked to the defense of the fundamental freedoms which permit the fullest expression of mankind's creativity. No nations of the globe have a greater responsibility. No nations can make a greater contribution to the future. Let us look deeply within ourselves to find the essence of our human condition. And let us carry forward the great enterprise of liberty for which this hemisphere has been—and will again be—the honored symbol everywhere.

Secretary Kissinger on June 9, 1976.

For two centuries the peoples of this hemisphere have been forging a record of cooperation and accomplishment of which we can be proud. It is a record which gives good cause for the confidence we bring to the tasks we face today. But of greater importance is the truly special relationship we have achieved. The ties of friendship, mutual regard, and high respect that we have forged here set this hemisphere apart. The bond between the American republics is unmatched in the world today in both depth and potential.

First, we have maintained the awareness that our destinies are linked—a recognition of the reality that we are bound by more than geography and common historical experience. We are as diverse as any association of nations, yet this special relationship is known to us all, almost instinctively.

Second, ours is a hemisphere of peace. In no other region of the world has international conflict been so rare, or peaceful and effective cooperation so natural to the fabric of our relationships.

Third, we work together with a unique spirit of mutual respect. I personally am immensely grateful for the warm and serious relationships I have enjoyed with my colleagues and other Western Hemisphere leaders. I am convinced that this sense of personal *amistad* can play a decisive role in the affairs of mankind, and nowhere more so than in our hemisphere.

Fourth, we share the conviction that there is much to do and that working together for concrete progress is the surest way to get it done. Even our criticism presumes the feasibility of cooperation.

Fifth, we respect each other's independence. We accept the principle that each nation is—and must be—in charge of its own future. Each chooses its mode of development; each determines its own policies. But we know that our capacity to achieve our national goals increases as we work together.

Sixth, despite the differences among our political systems, our peoples share a common aspiration for the fulfillment of individual human dignity. This is the heritage of our hemisphere and the ideal toward which all our governments have an obligation to strive.

Finally, and of immediate importance, we are achieving a new and productive balance—based on real interests—in our relations within the Americas,

COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT



within other groupings, and with the rest of the world. All of us have ties outside the hemisphere. But our interests elsewhere do not impede our hemispheric efforts. Our traditions of independence and diversity have served us well.

This is both a strength and a challenge to us now as this Assembly takes up the issue of development.

The United States is dedicated to cooperate in development throughout the world. But as we seek to make progress in all our global development efforts, we recognize close and special ties to the nations of the Americas. We regard the concerns of this hemisphere as our first priority.

It is for this reason that we support the suggestions which have been made for a special assembly of the OAS to be devoted to hemispheric cooperation for development. Such an assembly should deal with concrete problems capable of practical solutions. To this end the United States proposes that a preparatory meeting of experts be held in advance of the special assembly.

But we do not intend to delay our efforts while we await the processes of international institutions and conferences. The U.S. Administration will begin now:

- First, to give special attention to the economic concerns of Latin America in every area in which our executive branch possesses the power of discretionary decision;
- Second, to undertake detailed consultations with Latin American nations to coordinate our positions on all economic issues of concern to the hemisphere prior to the consideration of those issues in major international forums;
- Third, to consider special arrangements in the hemisphere in economic areas of particular concern to Latin America, such as the transfer and development of technology;
- In addition, we will put forth every effort to bring about the amendment of the U.S. Trade Act to eliminate the automatic exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from the generalized system of preferences.

The United States is prepared to proceed in these four areas whatever may occur in other development forums. But this Assembly offers an excellent opportunity to advance our joint progress.

The United States believes that there are three major issues that this Assembly should address—commodities, trade, and technology. These involve:

- More stable and beneficial conditions for the production and marketing of primary commodities upon which the economic aspirations of so many countries in Latin America rely;
- Expansion of the trade opportunities and capabilities that are an essential part of the development strategies of all countries in the hemisphere; and
- Improved arrangements for the development, acquisition, and utilization of higher technology to speed the modernization of the hemisphere.

Let me address each of these issues in turn.

Commodities

Most of our members depend heavily on the production and export of primary commodities for essential earnings. Yet production and export of these resources are vulnerable to the cycles of scarcity and glut, underinvestment and overcapacity that disrupt economic conditions in both the developing and the industrial world.

At the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD] last month, we joined in the common commitment to search for concrete, practical solutions in the interests of both producers and consumers.

Despite reservations about some aspects of the final resolution at Nairobi, the United States believes that the final commodities resolution of the Conference represented a major advance in the dialogue between North and South; we will participate in the major preparatory conferences on individual commodities and in the preparatory conference on financing.

One key element, however, is missing from the final catalogue of Nairobi's proposals—machinery to spur the flow of new investment for resource production in the developing countries. The United States made a proposal aimed at that problem—an International Resources Bank [IRB]. A resolution to study the IRB was rejected by a vote that can best be described as accidental. Ninety nations abstained or were absent. Those nations of Latin America that reject such self-defeating

tactics can make a special contribution to insure that the progress of all is not defeated by the sterile and outmoded confrontational tactics of a few.

As a contribution to the commitment we undertook at Nairobi to deal comprehensively with commodities problems, the United States proposes that the nations of the hemisphere undertake a three-part program to secure the contribution of commodities to development in this hemisphere.

First, I propose that we establish a regional consultative mechanism on commodities. This mechanism could well be under the aegis of the OAS. It should bring together experts with operational responsibilities and experience. The inter-American commodities mechanism could precede—or at least supplement—those established with a global mandate, where we are prepared to exchange views regularly and in depth on the state of commodities markets of most interest to us—including coffee, grains, meat, and the minerals produced in this hemisphere. Our objective will be to concert our information on production and demand in order to make the best possible use of our investment resources. These consultations will provide us with an early-warning system to identify problems in advance and enable us to take appropriate corrective action nationally, regionally, or through worldwide organizations.

Second, I propose we give particular attention to global solutions for commodities important to one or more countries of the hemisphere. The United States has signed the Coffee and Tin Agreements; it is crucial to the coffee- and tin-producing countries of this hemisphere that those agreements be implemented in a fashion that will most appropriately contribute to their development.

In Nairobi, and at other forums, the United States proposed that we examine on a global basis other commodities of particular importance to Latin America—bauxite, iron ore, and copper. I suggest that we in the hemisphere have a special role to play in considering how these steps might be taken and in identifying other high priority subjects for global commodity discussions.

Third, I propose that the consultative group take a new look at the problem of insuring adequate investment in commodities in this hemisphere under circumstances that respect the

sovereignty of producers and provide incentive for investment. We should examine all reasonable proposals, especially those which would help to assure effective resource development financing. If global solutions are not possible, we are willing to consider regional mechanisms.

Trade

Trade has been an engine of growth for all countries; and for many developing countries—above all those in Latin America—it is an essential vehicle of development. Recognizing the importance of trade to sustained growth, the United States has taken, within our global trade policy, a number of initiatives of particular significance to Latin America. We have reduced trade barriers, especially those affecting processed goods; provided preferential access to our market for many exports of developing countries; worked in the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva for reduction of barriers, giving priority to tropical products; and recognized in our general trade policy the special needs of developing countries.

Today, at this Assembly, we can begin to consider ways in which our commitment to trade cooperation can contribute to economic progress in our hemisphere. The United States sees three key areas which this Organization could usefully address:

- The need to provide opportunities for developing countries to expand and diversify exports of manufactured and semiprocessed goods;
- The need to promote the hemisphere's trade position through the multilateral trade negotiations at Geneva; and
- The need for effective regional and subregional economic integration.

Let me turn to each of these three points.

No single element is more important to Latin America's trade opportunities than the health of the U.S. economy. I can confirm to you today that our economy is in full recovery, with prospects brighter than they have been for years.

The preferences system contained in the U.S. Trade Act has been in effect since January. It gives Latin American countries duty-free entry on more than \$1 billion worth of their exports to the United States. Even more important, it provides vast op-

opportunities for Latin America to diversify into new product areas in its exports to the United States.

In addition to the effort we will undertake to end the exclusion of Ecuador and Venezuela from the benefits of the U.S. Trade Act, President Ford has asked me to state today that:

- He will make every effort to add to the preferences system products that are of direct interest to Latin America;

- The executive branch will bend every effort to accommodate the export interests of Latin America in all matters in which we have statutory discretion. President Ford's recent choice of adjustment assistance rather than import restrictions in response to the petition of the U.S. footwear industry clearly demonstrates the commitment of the U.S. Government to a liberal trade policy and the use of the Trade Act to expand trade in the hemisphere;

- The President will direct the U.S. Department of Commerce to respond positively to requests from your governments for assistance in the development of export promotion programs. The Department of Commerce will make available technical advice on promotion techniques and personnel training to help develop new markets for Latin American exports worldwide.

The United States believes that the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva warrant the special attention of Latin America. Our view is that the international codes on subsidies and countervailing duties and on safeguard actions now being negotiated should recognize the special conditions facing developing countries. To this end:

- The United States will seek agreement at Geneva that the code on countervailing duties and subsidies now being negotiated should contain special rules to permit developing countries to assist their exports under agreed criteria for an appropriate time linked to specific development objectives.

- The United States next month will propose that the safeguards code under negotiation in Geneva grant special treatment to developing countries that are minor suppliers or new entrants in a developed-country market during the period that safeguards are in effect.

- The United States will send a trade policy team to Latin America shortly to identify ways to promote increased hemisphere trade through the Geneva negotiations; we are prepared to intensify consultations in Geneva and Washington with Latin American delegations to explore both general issues and positions for specific meetings.

Finally, the United States supports the concept and practice of regional and subregional economic integration as a means of magnifying the positive impact of trade on development. Expanded trade, based on the development of industries that will be able to compete successfully within and outside the integration area, will strengthen the growth process of participating countries. We seek means to support the far-reaching integration plans that have been drawn up in the hemisphere—for the Andean group, the Caribbean community, the Central American Common Market, and the Latin American Free Trade Area.

We are ready to support responsible efforts to further integration. The administration of U.S. trade laws and the improvement of our preferences system on matters such as rules of origin are two possible incentives to greater Latin American integration. We welcome your views as to a further U.S. role toward enhancing the momentum of economic integration in Latin America.

We are not persuaded, however, that we have fully exploited all the possibilities of how best to provide expanded trade opportunities to Latin America. We know that the issue is complex and that it involves not only expanded access to the markets of the United States but also measures to enhance opportunities for Latin American products in Europe and Japan—and throughout Latin America itself.

Some permanent, expert forum is necessary. We, therefore, propose that within the OAS there be established a special inter-American commission for trade cooperation. If the suggestion for a special assembly on cooperation for development prospers, we think that assembly should set guidelines for the functioning of the commission. We see the commission as an opportunity, in major part through the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, to bring together those policy-level officials most familiar with the actual trade problems and opportunities for trade creation under a firm

mandate to seek innovative means of cooperating to expand exports—expanding, in short, on a regular and long-term basis the catalogue of trade expansion proposals I have elaborated above.

Technology

Technology is basic to economic development. It is technology that enables us to master the raw gifts of nature and transform them into the products needed for the well-being of our peoples.

But technology is not evenly distributed. There are impediments to its development, to its transfer, and, most importantly, to its effective utilization. The United States believes that technology should become a prime subject of hemispheric cooperation. The countries in this region have reached stages of development that enable them to adapt and create modern technologies. Our potential thus matches the urgency of practical needs.

At this point, what are the new directions we should take together? We have three proposals. The United States believes we in the hemisphere should:

First, take immediate advantage of promising global initiatives. To seek maximum benefit from the U.N. Conference on Science and Development set for 1979, we propose that the nations here today undertake preparatory consultations on that subject in the Economic Commission for Latin America, whose meeting has been prescribed as a regional forum within the Conference program. We will enlist the experience and resources of leading U.S. technology institutions in this hemispheric preparatory effort.

Second, increase public and private contacts on research, development, and the application of technology. To this end the United States will:

- Open a technology exchange service for Latin America to provide information on U.S. laws and regulations relating to technology flows and to sources of public and private technology;

- Explore cooperative ventures in which small and medium-sized U.S. firms would provide practical technologies to individual Latin American firms, along with the management expertise needed to select, adapt, and exploit those technologies; and

- Expand and strengthen Latin America's access to the National Technical Information Service and other facilities of the technology information network of the U.S. Government, which covers 90 percent of the technical information that flows from the \$20 billion worth of research that the U.S. Government sponsors annually.

Third, develop new regional and subregional structures of consultation and cooperation on problems of technology. To this end, the United States proposes:

- That we establish a consultative group under the OAS to address and provide recommendations on information problems that Latin America faces in acquiring technology;

- That the OAS, in line with the UNCTAD IV consensus, establish a regional center on technology. The center would facilitate cooperative research and development activities, drawing on both public and private sources. It could stimulate exchanges of qualified technical personnel. And it could begin to attack the problem of incentives to the thousands of technologically trained Latin Americans now living abroad to return to and serve with their own countries. In the view of the United States, such a center should be a cooperative enterprise requiring commitment and contributions in funds, technological resources, and personnel from all of the countries that take part. To get us underway I propose that we convene a group of experts to examine the need, feasibility, characteristics, and role of an inter-American technology center and report to us before the next OAS General Assembly.

Importance of Cooperative Development

Economic development is a central concern of all nations today. The community of nations has become, irrevocably, a single global economy. We know that peace and progress will rest fundamentally on our ability to forge patterns of economic cooperation that are fair, productive, and open to all.

We in this hemisphere have a special opportunity and responsibility to advance the recent favorable mood, and the practical achievements, in cooperation between the developed and developing

nations. We start from a firmer foundation today; our prospects for working together are brighter than ever before—more so in this hemisphere than in any other region of the world. We should have reason for confidence in our ability to advance our own people's well-being, while simultaneously contributing to a more prosperous world. It is in this sense that I have sought today to advance our practical progress in important areas.

The United States stands ready to give its sister republics in the hemisphere special attention in the great task of cooperation for development. We shall make a major effort to prepare for the special assembly on development. We shall listen to your proposals, work with you in a serious and cooperative spirit of friendship, and commit ourselves to carry on the great heritage of the Americas as we go forward together.

Secretary Kissinger's statement distributed by the U.S. Delegation June 11, 1976.

The Organization of American States is the cornerstone of the inter-American system, the oldest institution of regional cooperation in the world. Its member states have exceptional ties of respect and a common heritage, and a considerable stake in maintaining those ties for the future.

The inter-American system pioneered the principles of nonintervention and collective security among cooperating sovereign states. Because the Americas also have enormous vitality and achievement, we have a major opportunity and obligation to continue to provide an example and impetus to the global search for better ways to mediate the common destiny of mankind.

Many ask, why think of OAS reform? Why, some wonder, does our Secretary General [Alejandro Orfila] refer to an "identity crisis" in his latest annual report?

The answer lies in the fact that the pace and complexity of the international and domestic changes of the recent past have made the organization as it is presently constituted less effective as an instrument of our respective foreign policies, and less significant to the real issues on the new inter-American agenda than our minimum efforts deserve.

This Hemisphere is unique; there is no other grouping like it in the world. We have indeed a special relationship. The fundamental purpose of the OAS must be to continue to nurture and strengthen our fundamental, shared values. We must have an organization that reflects our permanent and irrevocable engagement to work together and maintain our continent as a Hemisphere of peace, cooperation, and development.

The United States is committed to the OAS. We have pledged to make it a continually more effective instrument for action in pursuit of the common goals of prosperity and human dignity.

It was to that end that the member states agreed three years ago to an effort to reform, restructure, and modernize the OAS. The results of that effort are disappointing. A proposed new draft of the charter of the OAS has emerged from the permanent council. I regret to say that it is one

OAS REFORM

that our Government could neither sign nor recommend that our Senate ratify. It includes prescriptive and hortatory statements of general principle which are as poorly defined as they are ominous. No effort is made in the new charter draft to come to grips with the need to modernize or improve the structure of the organization. We believe the real shortcomings of the OAS have yet to be adequately addressed.

We propose a new effort to reform, modernize, and restructure the organization. We think that effort should concentrate, not on words, but on three major substantive issues: structure, membership, and finance.

Structure

The United States would like to advance four points as possible guidelines for the future effort, in the interest of modernization of the organization. The purposes of the organization should be stated simply and clearly in the new charter. Those purposes should be:

- The promotion of cooperation for development;
- The maintenance of the peace and security of our region; and
- The preservation of our common tradition of respect for human dignity and the rights of the individual.

The structure of the organization serving these goals should be flexible. We should write a constitutive document for the organization which will serve us well into the future. That an organization finds it necessary to rewrite its charter every 5 to 10 years does not speak well for that organization's sense of its role or function. We are now in an age of great change. Our efforts in the coming years to achieve the three basic goals of the organization will take place under rapidly changing circumstances. Thus, flexibility and adaptability must be the key considerations guiding the reform effort. We should not hamstring ourselves with a charter brimfull of the details of the day, with procedural minutiae, or with regulatory prescriptions hindering our ability to meet contingencies.

The governance of the organization should be in the hands of the Ministers. Over the years, the

proliferation of functions assigned haphazardly to the OAS has produced an overelaborated organization that is ponderous and unresponsive. Instead of closer and more frequent contact between Foreign Ministers in ways that truly reflect our foreign policies as we are attempting to manage them from our respective capitals, we find ourselves insulated from each other by a plethora of councils and committees with conflicting mandates and a cumbersome permanent bureaucracy.

To strengthen communication, we must cut through the existing organizational underbrush and replace it with a structure capable of responding to the authentic foreign policies of our governments, as expressed directly by Foreign Ministers, and of relating concretely to our institutions and the needs of our peoples. Particularly, the three council system has not fulfilled the hopes which led to its adoption in 1967.

The General Assembly, as the central pillar of the inter-American system, might well be convened more frequently, perhaps twice a year, with special additional sessions to consider our common concerns, particularly the great challenges of cooperation for development. As contacts at the Ministerial level intensify, the need for an elaborate structure of councils will disappear. Our encounters at the General Assembly will offer sufficient opportunities to set organizational policy.

This is all the organizational superstructure we really need. A leaner, more responsive organization would be serviced by a smaller expert Secretariat responsive to the guidelines established by the General Assembly and the functional committees the General Assembly may create.

We should improve the OAS mechanisms for promoting respect for human rights in the Americas.

Membership

To insure that the OAS represents all of the peoples of our region, we should open up the organization to the newly independent states and those which may become independent, both on the continent and in the Caribbean. Although these questions of membership require further study, we believe Article 8 of the present charter, which automatically excludes certain states, is an anachronism and should be removed.

Financing

A serious effort to reform the Organization of American States should include a review of present provisions for its financing.

You are all aware of the critical attention the Congress of the United States has focused on the proportion of the organization's cost the United States is now bearing. Obviously, this has been a factor in recent U.S. budget cuts affecting the OAS. We do not claim that the United States is paying too much, or more than its fair share of the cost in terms of our relative ability to pay. It is only that it is wrong and damaging for an organization of two dozen—soon to be 25—sovereign states, whose purpose is to advance the interests of each, to be so heavily dependent on the contributions of a single member. It places the organization in a vulnerable position, and projects a false image of the OAS.

It is important to find some basis for OAS financing that will, over time, reduce the U.S. share

of the assessed costs while insuring that the activities of the OAS in the vital development assistance field are not weakened.

The United States is committed to the Organization of American States. We know that it provides an institutional base which will continue to be vital to our common progress. In these years of great change, the nations of the world have seen fresh proof of an old truth—that the most durable and responsive institutions are those which bear a lighter burden of bureaucratic machinery and whose procedures permit the flexibility required for swift and imaginative action.

We believe our proposals can help bring the drawn-out reform debate to a successful conclusion over the course of the next year. And we believe this is the kind of organization we can and must have if we in the Americas are to fulfill our promise and our responsibility to advance international cooperation in an era of interdependence.

careful and painstaking negotiating efforts if we are to achieve a treaty which is truly just and equitable—a treaty which will balance the respective interests of both countries and those of the other nations of the Hemisphere and the world in such a way as to definitely eliminate the potential for causes of conflict in the future. It is in this sense that both Governments are in agreement with the concept expressed by General Torrijos that we are not simply seeking any new treaty—we are seeking a treaty that will fully meet our common goals in the future and be seen by our sister republics as reflecting a new era of cooperation in the Americas. The United States and the Republic of Panama reiterate their commitment to continue their most serious efforts to achieve such a treaty as promptly as possible.

The negotiation offers both peoples a peaceful alternative for the solution of a prolonged disagreement between them, and both Governments are convinced that it is their responsibility to explore to the utmost this path which offers such real possibilities for a satisfactory agreement which will cement on solid foundations the friendship and cooperation between our two countries.

If we continue the serious work presently being carried out and if we maintain the reciprocal good will of both missions toward reaching a solution to the pending problems, we cherish the hope that soon we will be able to advise you that a treaty has been agreed upon—a treaty which not only all America, but the entire world, awaits as an effective contribution to consolidate peace and friendship among all peoples.

PANAMA CANAL

Statement by Henry A. Kissinger at the Headquarters of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America [ECLA], June 9, 1976.

Mr. Secretary [Executive Secretary Enrique Iglesias], I appreciate very much the complimentary remarks that you have made and I would like you and your distinguished staff to know that while it is a meeting of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States that brings me to Santiago at this time, I value this opportunity to meet with you and to visit this renowned fountainhead of ideas.

You have much of which to be proud. You, Mr. Secretary, with all your well-known energy and wisdom have followed and successfully built upon the work of your very capable predecessors, Prebisch, Mayobre, and Quintana. These men, like you, were well known within and beyond our Hemisphere as statesmen. My colleagues and I have great respect for the work you have done and for the tremendous accomplishments of the Economic Commission for Latin America. This center of study and action has done much to ignite the consciences of men everywhere to take on the challenges of economic development. Your approach is progressive and, especially because it is non-political, it is effective.

As is only to be expected, we have at times not seen eye-to-eye with regard to certain problems or the prescriptions for dealing with them. But we have avoided ideological postures: our thinking, and I believe yours, have evolved. In the process we have moved closer together with respect to many, if not most, essentials. We have listened and learned as this institution has led the movement for economic integration among the developing countries of this Hemisphere. We have worked together on trade and development, and we have agreed with your shift in emphasis from import-substitution to export-oriented strategies.

The problem of economic development is not primarily a technical issue. It is profoundly a political and moral issue. It is not possible to build a world community which is divided between the rich and the poor. If we are to live in a world of peace and justice, all nations must have a sense of participation, and all nations must have the con-

U.N. ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

sciousness that the world community either takes into account their concerns—or at least listens to their concerns.

This is why we attach such extreme importance to the dialogue that is now taking place between the developed and developing nations, for regardless of the technical solutions we find, the spirit we can help engender can contribute to a world of peace and to a sense of community. And this is why we are concerned when there are attitudes of confrontation or technical majorities, because it is the essence of an international structure that solutions cannot be imposed by one group on another, but that a consensus must be established in which all share. The nations of Latin America have a very special role to play in this process. They are among the most developed of the developing nations, or among the least developed of the developed nations. They belong to the Organization of American States and they are tied to us, a country which has a great concern with security and global equilibrium. But they are also a part of other groupings of the so-called Third World, and they can, therefore, in important respects act as a bridge between the views of the different groups that exist in the world today.

In the field of development, the United States has offered important proposals for dealing with current international economic difficulties. At the Seventh Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly we put forth suggestions and agreement was reached on a number of measures designed to enhance economic security and to cope with the cycles that in the past have devastated export earnings and undermined development, and we dealt with other issues relating to trade, technology, and capital flows.

In Nairobi, we advocated a comprehensive plan for addressing major commodity issues and set forth additional proposals for dealing with technology and other requirements for development.

Our proposal for the establishment of an International Resources Bank failed for reasons of an accidental majority. But I cannot scold every forum that I meet on this topic. I think we have made our point. The more fundamental problem I would like to put to this distinguished group is how to relate these general proposals for global

development which are important to the special requirements of the Western Hemisphere. My colleagues and I are doing a great deal of thinking on how, in a global context of development, we can at the same time reflect the special ties and the special values, and the particular institutions that have grown up in this Hemisphere—how we can avoid being caught between the extremes of dogmatic globalism and dogmatic regionalism. We favor regional integration of the Western Hemisphere or of the nations of Latin America either in sub-regional groupings or in regional groupings, and we are going to give very serious study to how, within a global framework, we can spur the very special concerns for development of our old friends and associates in the Hemisphere.

Today, at the meeting of the OAS General Assembly, I made some specific proposals of what can be done within the framework of existing legislation and within the discretion that our Executive has, but I also pointed out that at the Special Session on Development that has been proposed by several members at the General Assembly and that we assume will take place next spring, the United States will be prepared to address the more fundamental questions that I'm putting to my friends here: how to relate the global concerns for development with the regional concerns of the Western Hemisphere, because it would be wrong to waste the traditions of cooperation and the special relationships that have grown up in this Hemisphere. I am providing your Executive Secretary with a copy of the paper in which we made a series of comments and recommendations regarding cooperation for development, and I hope that ECLA will find that it can play a role with regard to some of the arrangements we suggested on vital issues; for example, on technology for development. We hope also that you will not feel yourself confined to the proposals that we have made, and will feel free to offer your own suggestions. In looking at the record, the danger that you will feel yourself confined by our proposals is minimal.

The nations of this Hemisphere are bound by historical and other special ties and interests. The United States consequently supported and has been interested in the work of ECLA since its

founding in 1948. I would also like to reciprocate the very warm words of the Secretary General [U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim]* whose

**As conveyed by Roberto Guyer, personal representative of the Secretary General.*

dedication to the cause of peace we admire and whose indefatigable efforts in all areas of world problems we support. I wish you and the Executive Secretary the very best as you carry on your important work, and I would like to thank you for this very warm reception I have had here.



DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 8866

Inter-American Series 111
Released June 1976
Office of Media Services
Bureau of Public Affairs

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, U.S.A.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20520

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
STA-501



Third Class Bulk Rt.