

This memorandum provides a brief personal review of the history of DRL. Of course the human rights theme is both complicated and controversial, and I thought it would be helpful to attach extensive background material and press articles, in approximately chronological order.

Over the past 25 years I have become convinced that the development of our human rights policy was one of the best decisions the USG has ever made. Not only have we helped many millions of people around the globe, but the human rights factor has clearly given us a much better foreign policy. Just a few years ago who would have imagined the Soviet Union would disappear without a war, that Blacks and White would shake hands in South Africa, and that thousands of Chinese students would be coming to the U.S. and then returning safely home?

Clearly much remains to be done and many complicated problems are still unsolved, but the world has become much more open than ever before, and I feel this is the best chance the human race has ever had. A good many years ago ^I came to the conclusion that the human rights cause has become the authentic world revolution, democratic, peaceful and invincible, as long as we keep it honest, the same for every living person. But we must learn to make better use of this enormous opportunity.

~~I am sure you already have a good perspective on DRE's overall human rights history.~~ Many assume the human rights push began with the Carter Administration, but actually Cong. Don Fraser (D.-Minn.) and Sen. Tom Harkin (D.-Iowa) got things started around 1973. Then the Carter Administration created our Bureau ^(HA) in 1977, with a handful of personnel. Of course it was hard going at first. Bureaucratic inexperience plus bureaucratic resistance on the part of other Bureaus were a tough combination. Incredibly, one regional Bureau actually ordered its personnel to avoid contact with HA!. But HA pushed on under Patt Derian and things got off to a pretty good start. Then, early on, the Reagan Administration decided to sideline human rights, but soon realized that would be difficult and politically costly, since there already was strong and widespread support for the human rights cause. So after almost a year Elliott Abrams came on board and our policy became authentic and began to move ahead again. Since then, over the years, with Dick Schifter, John Shattuck, and now you, our policy has become more effective year by year, and there has been growing support for human rights around the world.

The following are some relevant details of this history, in approximately chronological order.

One of the first steps forward was the March, 1974 Report issued by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, by Don Fraser, Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements (attachment 1). As stated by Fraser, the Report was a call for U.S. human rights leadership in the world community.

Of course Secretary Kissinger was no advocate of human rights. He moderated his opposition somewhat as the support for human rights developed

round the world, but he remained basically opposed to making human rights a part of our overall policy. Please note the attached November, 1978 Kissinger interview published in Dialogue (attachment 2).

Meanwhile, Department dialogue with the human rights community began to increase and improve. My attached September, 1978 speech (attachment 3) was cleared by the Department, of course.

However, after the first couple of years, the Carter human rights policy ^{STARTED} began to falter to some extent. The December, 1978 interview with Patt Derian is relevant (attachment 4).

As ^{was} ~~me~~ to be expected, soon after coming on board Ms. Derian began to ask for more personnel. Her March, 1979 memorandum (attachment 5) is one early example.

Inevitably there were many difficulties in trying to start our human rights policy. For example, the early annual Reports were very deficient. I was the ARA Human Rights Officer and prepared a Confidential candid critique of the 1978 exercise. Since it is Confidential I have not attached it, ~~but you might~~ ^{with} ~~to declassify~~ it. As you will note from her February, 1979 Unclassified response, Patt Derian thanked me for my contribution. And Steve Palmer began to arrange for a special task force to handle the future annual Reports (attachment 6).

Meanwhile, there was growing Republican criticism of the Carter human rights policy. The attached Jeane Kirkpatrick November, 1979 Commentary article provides an excellent example of the Republican support for distinguishing between right-wing and left-wing dictatorships (attachment 7).

Then ^{came} the Reagan Administration and the nomination of Ernest Lefever to replace Patt Derian. Since Lefever had made no secret of his views

on human rights there was much criticism from the Movement and the press. Please note attachments 8 through 11.

Also please note attachment 12, reporting a relevant discussion held in the State Department, regarding Lefever. And attachment 13 is my memorandum concerning Lefever's appearance on the May 26, 1981 Today Show.

After Lefever's nomination was voted down, 13 to 2, the Reagan Administration simply let the issue drag on, leaving HA without an Assistant Secretary. As reported in my October, 1981 memorandum (attachment 14), with a covering memorandum dated March 19, 1991, the gloom in HA was deep and widespread. Meanwhile, Ms. Kirkpatrick certainly did not help things with her 1981 visit to Chile (attachment 15).

Then, finally, in what proved to be a major turning point, Elliott Abrams came on board. My November, 1981 memorandum urged extensive inclusion of the human rights Movement at his swearing in (attachment 16). Although many consider Abrams to be an ultraconservative I found him very easy to work with, and he was consistently supportive of my efforts. For example, please note Elliott's comments on my campaign on behalf of democracy and human rights in Chile (attachment 17).

Once Abrams got going our human rights policy was firmly established and began to improve year by year. As I said in my report on our Korea policy, I think Prof. Lee Man-woo summarized much of this very well in his 1987 paper (attachment 18). And John Shattuck's July, 1998 letter cites South Korea as an example of how the human rights factor helped to improve our foreign policy. (attachment 19)

But of course endless urgent problems still remain. I could not possibly review all of them, but I have briefly discussed a few of them in the following paragraphs. Let's start with women, 51% of the human race.

As you might imagine, the inclusion of women's rights in our overall policy encountered some difficulties. A few years after we began to provide annual human rights reports, back in the 70s, it was decided that at least one sentence on women's rights should be included in every annual country report. I was the ARA Human Rights Officer at the time, and routinely reviewed all first drafts for Latin America. I recall noting a statement in the Honduran draft that "there is no sex discrimination in Honduras". In reviewing the text with the Honduran Desk Officer, of course, I questioned that statement, mentioning in passing that there is sex discrimination in the U.S. The Desk Officer expressed surprise, asking "You mean there is sex discrimination in the U.S.?" I assured him there is. Whereupon he turned to his draft and said "Oh well, hell, then, let's change this. We don't want Honduras ahead of the U.S."

But within a year or two women's rights became firmly established as part of our annual report.

I would also like to include another example of women's rights in Latin America. When the Government of Chile invited me to Santiago in 1995, to receive an award for my efforts on behalf of human rights and democracy in that country, it was suggested that I give several human rights speeches, including a talk at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I will never forget that occasion. Attendance came to around 15 foreign affairs personnel, including one woman. I spoke for about a half hour, and then answered numerous questions. There was a relaxed low key discussion and I felt the meeting had been quite

useful. However, I noted that the only female participant had never said a word, much less asked a question. Then I started up the hall to return to our Embassy, and suddenly I heard someone running up behind me. It was the woman who had attended the meeting, ~~only female participant~~. As I turned around she leaned over quickly and whispered one word in my ear: "Gracias"!

However, it should also be emphasized that women's rights have turned out to be a problem for both sexes. I recall a meeting in the Department in the mid-70s, organized by a female U.S. human rights activist friend of mine, in which she addressed some 150 women, about 100 from the U.S. and 50 from Latin America, comparing women's rights in both areas. After my friend finished speaking a well dressed woman from Brazil stood up and thanked her for her remarks^s, but then added that she hopes^d my friend would not be offended if she were told she did not really understand the difference between women's rights in the U.S. and Latin America. The Brazilian explained: "We women in Latin America are much better off than you are here. You see, my dear, we women in Latin America have servants". It never occurred to that ^{upper class} ~~that~~ ^a Brazilian women that we were discussing the rights of all women, ~~not just the~~ ^{TOP} ~~upper~~ 10%

And that brings us to the ugly, complicated problems of poverty and illiteracy. To what extent are they human rights violations? If I am the dic^rator of Country X presumably I can stop torture in 48 hours. How do I eliminate poverty? And there are many other threatening issues, such as the population explosion, environmental crises, etc. We have made much progress, ~~but~~ but we still have a long, long way to go.

On^e human rights problem we should keep in mind is the obvious fact that not all areas of the world receive the same attention. For example, in the past one of the most neglected regions of the world has been so-called Black Africa, where White^s oppressed Blacks. But the media devoted far less

attention to Black Africa, where Blacks oppressed Blacks, although our Human Rights Reports on that area have been quite good. In recent years, however, Black Africa has been on the front pages frequently, with all the tragedy of Rwanda, Congo, etc.

There are also a number of issues and factors which deserve special mention in the history of our human rights policy.

One important factor in the development of our policy was the so-called Movement, the human rights NGOs (such as Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, etc.) For a good many years the Department's relations with the Movement were difficult and strained, especially as some NGOs were traditionally hostile to the USG.

In that connection I vividly recall attending a Movement human rights program in a local theater, some ten or fifteen years ago. There was a large turnout, several hundred, and much enthusiasm. As usual there was frequent criticism of the USG as supporting right-wing dictatorship. At one point there was a young woman on the stage, discussing a recent OAS meeting which had attempted to address ^{some} of ^{America's} Latin ~~americ~~ difficult economic and social problems. Of course she criticized the OAS as falling ^{FAR} ~~well~~ short of the needs of the poor and exploited. But suddenly she stopped ~~short~~, opened her eyes in ^{ostentatiously} ~~ostentatiously~~ total innocence, and remarked, "I wonder why they didn't invite Fidel. He might have had something interesting to say"! At that about two-thirds of the audience arose for prolonged applause, and ^A ~~the~~ Movement friend leaned over to ask for my comment. I remarked "Excuse me. I'm about to vomit"

However, over the years, I feel that things have improved significantly. The Department is doing much better, and so is the Movement. And USG-Movement relations are more ~~friendly and~~ cooperative ^z and productive.

Finally, I have attached some pages from past Department telephone directories, showing the growth of personnel in HA/DRL, starting with the 1976 Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs, followed by 1978, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1991, 1994/5, and 1998 (attachment ~~20~~ ⁽²⁰⁾). Of course there has been a great increase in the total number of personnel working for human rights, but thus far I have been unable to obtain any useful statistics from the Department.

Perhaps we can give this report a "Happy American Ending" by attaching a copy of my ^tOctober, 1988 Miami speech, published by the Department, along with comment from Jim Montgomery, former HA DAS (attachments 21-22).

And just to provide a perspective on how far we have come over all these years I have pulled from my files one ^{more} ~~final~~ attachment (no. 23), a 1966 or 1967 Washington Star column by Jeremiah O'Leary, noting the USG's close working relationship with the Somoza dictatorship. When I first read the column back then I saved it because I knew it reflected a major defect in our foreign policy. As you may know, for many years one of our ~~foreign~~ policy problems was something we in the Department called "clientitis", a diplomatic disease. That is, if I am the U.S. Ambassador and you are the local dictator I see you as my client. And if you like me, and you say I am doing a good job, then I can tell Washington everything is fine between our two countries. I believe our human rights policy has eliminated most of that problem. Now we realize that our relations with the people of a country are more important than with the government.

last of all, I have added attachment ²⁴/₂₂, a copy of your excellent December 7 address on "The Role of Corporate Social Responsibility in Global Human Rights Policy". I feel ^{his} ~~your~~ comments provide a comprehensive and insightful roundup of the development of our human rights policy.