

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Honorable Zbigniew Brzezinski  
Assistant to the President for  
National Security Affairs

11 MAY 1977

The attached memorandum, "Impact of the US Stand on Human Rights," is in response to your request, conveyed to us by Ms. Tuchman.

*/s/* Stansfield Turner

STANSFIELD TURNER  
Admiral, U.S. Navy  
Director, Central Intelligence Agency

Attachment:  
RP-M-77-10107

Date

DDI # 2003-77/1

Executive Registry

77-6908/12

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

11 May 1977

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
DIRECTORATE OF INTELLIGENCE

MEMORANDUM

IMPACT OF THE US STAND ON HUMAN RIGHTS

*Initial international skepticism about the seriousness of the Carter administration's commitment to the fostering of human rights has been dispelled by presidential statements and US initiatives in bilateral relations and international forums. Considerable confusion and suspicion over US motives persist, however, and despite recent statements by Secretary Vance and other officials there still is apprehension over the lengths to which the US may be prepared to go in pursuit of human rights objectives. This memorandum surveys reaction to the US stand. A regional listing of significant developments is provided at annex.*

\* \* \* \* \*

Introduction

The US stand on human rights has prompted a number of governments to move toward bettering their human rights performance. This has occurred principally where the regime has been anxious to preserve cooperative relations with the US, has not felt publicly challenged or specifically prodded by Washington, and is relatively confident about its internal security situation.

Even in these cases, however, there has been a notable reluctance to accept the US stand at face value. Public expressions of understanding about US concerns have been

*This memorandum was prepared by the Office of Regional and Political Analysis. Inquiries may be directed to*

3.5(c)

[Redacted]

*the International Issues Division,*

RP-M-77-10107

3.5(c)

[Redacted]

WARNING NOTICE  
SENSITIVE INTELLIGENCE SOURCES  
AND METHODS INVOLVED

~~SECRET~~

[Redacted]

3.5(c)

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

matched by private assessments of Washington's emphasis on human rights as a ploy designed to pressure other countries into comporting themselves in accordance with US policies generally.

Attribution of such ulterior motivation, the connection of human rights to other issues, and a marked propensity to interpret US pronouncements and actions in egocentric terms have been characteristic reactions of countries with the most cause for unease over the US stand. Repressive practices have intensified in some cases, and bilateral relations have suffered in a number of instances.

There is strong public endorsement of the principles that underlie the US stand in some countries, but in many cases it is coupled with considerable worry over the potential for adverse international political consequences. Applause for Washington's espousal of human rights principles, therefore, is not always accompanied by approval of specific US initiatives. A broad range of political relationships important to the US thus has been complicated by the addition of what many foreign observers view as a new element of uncertainty in international affairs.

NR

- 2 -

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

NR



Latin America

US human rights initiatives have aroused considerable resentment in several Central and South American countries ruled by military regimes that have felt directly challenged. They have denounced US statements and actions as unwarranted and unacceptable interference in strictly internal affairs.

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

Argentina and Uruguay rejected all US military assistance after Washington linked aid cuts to human rights violations in those countries. Brazil, already angered by US pressure to modify its nuclear deal with West Germany, condemned the State Department's preparation of a report on its human rights practices as an affront to its sovereignty and renounced the 1952 military assistance agreement. Guatemala and El Salvador have also rejected military assistance conditioned on US judgment of their human rights situations.

The Latins are angered by what they regard as US failure to understand and make allowances for their political and internal security problems. The Southern Cone military regimes, especially, are convinced that their countries' experiences with political disintegration, insurgency, and terrorism fully warrant tough internal security measures. The Argentines, for example, insist that they will not deviate from the practices they deem indispensable in their continuing war with leftist terrorists no matter what outside criticism they incur.

The Latins are also resentful over the fact that they were not considered important enough to US interests to be treated specially (like South Korea). They have questioned US qualifications for making international moral judgments and have voiced suspicion that the US has ulterior motives for its human rights stand. The latter view is particularly strong in Brazil, where the human rights issue is viewed as an adjunct to US pressure on nuclear matters.

The Southern Cone regimes have been commiserating with each other, and they reportedly are considering joint moves to convince the US that it has seriously underestimated the costs of alienating them. The Latins undoubtedly would prefer to forgo polemics and halt any deterioration in their relations with Washington. But the military regimes are determined not to take any action that could be construed as caving in to US pressure.

Latin reaction to the US stand has not, of course, been entirely negative. Venezuela and Costa Rica, two of Latin America's few remaining democracies, have strongly

-6-

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

~~SECRET~~

endorsed US initiatives, and expressions of support for the US stand have also been received from Mexico and Bolivia. Prisoner releases in Paraguay and Peru were directly responsive to US concerns.

NR



- 7 -

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)



**Page Denied**

~~SECRET~~  


3.5(c)

and Gambia. Senegal, the Central African Empire, Zambia, and--in a recent shift--Ghana have also endorsed the US stand. Togo recently released some political prisoners partly out of a desire to improve relations with the US, but another group of persons was arrested for political reasons shortly thereafter.


#### Middle East

The Arab states tend to define human rights strictly in terms of concern over Israel's settlement policy in occupied territories, the fate of Arab prisoners in Israeli jails, and recognition of the "legitimate rights of the Palestinian people." They will react positively to the US stand so long as its principal effect in the Middle East is the focusing of US attention on such issues, rather than on human rights practices (especially the treatment of minorities) in Arab countries.

The Israelis, of course, are concerned over the possible implications of increased US interest in their treatment of Arabs in the occupied territories. On the other hand, the Israelis apparently believe the US will be inclined to support initiatives they may take to focus international attention on Soviet harassment of Jews who have asked to leave the USSR.


#### Prospects

The impact that US human rights initiatives will have over the next several months will depend in large part on how the US chooses to press the issue. Repeated protestations as to the universality of US concerns are in any case unlikely to dissuade most of the vulnerable governments from continuing to interpret even general US actions or pronouncements as being directed particularly at them.



NR

- 9 -

~~SECRET~~  


3.5(c)

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

NR

Other countries that have reacted most negatively to US human rights initiatives seem to be hoping for a "cooling off" period that would permit a resumption of less antagonistic bilateral relations and allow them to develop strategies for coping with the new situation. This is especially the case in Latin America, where recent congressional testimony by State Department officials and Secretary Vance's Law Day Speech have been interpreted as signaling that the US is in the process of moderating its tactics for pursuing human rights objectives. Disappointment of such expectations would give added impetus to discussions among the Southern Cone countries about convincing the US that they are vitally important to its interest.

Criticism of alleged US disinterest in the world wide advancement of social and economic justice is likely to increase if the less developed countries conclude that the US plans to link human rights to international economic issues by seeking to further its human rights objectives in international financial institutions whose charters call for loan decisions to be made strictly on the basis of economic considerations. The "North-South" dialogue, moreover, could become considerably more contentious generally if controversy over human rights were to severely damage US relations with nations (like Brazil) that have played significant moderating roles in the articulation of LDC demands.

-10-

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**



**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO THE US STAND ON HUMAN RIGHTS

LATIN AMERICA

NR

[Redacted]

FEBRUARY

NR

[Redacted]

NR

28 Argentina and Uruguay reject US military assistance tied to their human rights performance.

[Redacted]

NR

[Redacted]

~~SECRET~~

Annex to  
RP-M-77-10107

3.5(c)

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**



**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : Sayre Stevens  
Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT : Memorandum on "Impact of the US Stand on Human Rights" Prepared at Request of NSC Staff

1. Action Requested: You transmit the attached ORPA report directly to Dr. Brzezinski, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

2. Background: Ms. Tuchman telephoned Cord Meyer, Special Assistant to the DDCI, on 3 May to request a wrap-up of significant responses to President Carter's Human Rights policy since the Inaugural. She indicated that Mr. Brzezinski wished to use such a paper to brief the President upon his return from Europe. *The paper was requested for Thursday, 12 May.*

Brzezinski's interest was apparently stimulated by the DCI's "Watching Brief" on "Significant Developments Related to the US Stand on Human Rights," delivered to Ms. Tuchman on 29 April. The memorandum which ORPA has prepared is mainly a compilation of information that has been used in previous briefings.

Sayre Stevens

Attachment:  
RP-M-77-10107

Regraded Unclassified When  
Separated from SECRET  
Attachment

3.5(c)

~~SECRET~~

3.5(c)

1037  
Executive Registry  
77-6908/12  
REF # 2003-77

SIGNIFICANT NEGATIVE DEVELOPMENTS RELATED TO  
THE US STAND ON HUMAN RIGHTS

20 JANUARY - 10 MAY 1977

(Alphabetically by Country)

ARGENTINA  
(President Jorge Rafael Videla)

28 February      Rejects US military assistance.



NR

RP-M-77-10111

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**



**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**

**Page Denied**