In accordance with the Department's instructions, the reporting officer called on Lic. Jorge Palacios Treviño, Deputy Director of International Organization Affairs at the Foreign Secretariat, on September 5, 1974 and discussed with him US interests in the current human rights situation. Subsequent conversation also touched upon current movement within the OAS with regard to Cuba and the results of the recent Law of the Seas conference in Caracas.

Enclosed is a memorandum of conversation reporting the exchange with Palacios.

Enclosure:

1. Memorandum of Conversation
UNCLASSIFIED

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

PARTICIPANTS: Lic. Jorge Palacios Treviño, Deputy Director of International Organization Affairs, Foreign Secretariat
T. Frank Crigler, First Secretary, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F.

SUBJECT: Conversation with Lic. Jorge Palacios Treviño

DATE & PLACE: September 5, 1974, Foreign Secretariat

Human Rights

As instructed by the Department in State 184879, I raised with Lic. Palacios Treviño the subject of our Government's interest in the current human rights situation worldwide. I told him that the State Department was currently surveying friendly governments around the world to learn their views (a) with respect to the state of progress toward achieving human rights objectives and (b) with regard to cooperative measures that might be taken to stimulate further progress.

I added that the Department's interest in this matter was stimulated by the declaration of "the sense of Congress" in the most recent Foreign Aid Authorization bill, to the effect that the President should not extend economic or military assistance to countries which incarcerate their citizens for political reasons.

Palacios perked up immediately at my mention of the Congressional declaration and said he assumed what the Embassy wanted was a statement of the current human rights situation within Mexico. I insisted that this was not at all what we wanted, that there was no intention on our part whatever to meddle in Mexico's internal affairs, but that we simply wished to cooperate and consult with the Mexican Government on means by which other nations might be encouraged to pay greater attention to human rights values. I said he was no doubt aware that certain flagrant situations in other countries had attracted the attention of the US Congress and prompted its declaration.
Palacios said he would consult the line to see whether the Mexican Government had any particular views on the human rights question that it wished to convey to us. I said we would be very grateful.

Cuba and the OAS

By way of changing the subject, I mentioned to Palacios that I had no recent news of OAS developments on Cuba and wondered if he had any. He said he had heard nothing that was not published in the newspapers, but added he was very interested in newspaper reports of softening of the US position on Cuba and asked me my opinion of their accuracy. I told him they certainly did not coincide with our official position as I understood it, and I recited that position: any action with respect to the sanctions against Cuba should be taken by the OAS as a whole, not unilaterally by individual members, and should be preceded by thorough consultation among all OAS members.

No change, then, Palacios said. Not substantially, I replied, adding however that I personally saw some greater flexibility now than earlier and a great emphasis upon consultation. Palacios recited Mexico's well-known position, based on its juridical objections to the 9th MFM resolutions, and added Mexico would support any move which would have the effect juridically of undoing those resolutions.

IOM Conference

In the light of what I knew to be Mexico's very active and constructive role at Caracas, I told Palacios that we had been somewhat surprised at President Echeverria's strong statement that the conference had been a fracaso. I added that we did not share that conclusion and that our delegation felt that substantial progress had been made toward a definitive agreement. I asked him why he thought the President had taken such a negative view.

Palacios said he thought the President's remark should be considered in relative terms, that it was a matter of disappointment to him personally and that no definitive
agreements had been signed despite many months of preparatory work. Moreover, he noted, the President's extemporaneous remark had been made only a day or so after the close of the conference, perhaps before the President had had a chance to reflect at greater length on its several achievements. Palacios noted, for example, that indeed a consensus had clearly developed re a 200-mile patrimonial sea, effectively sandbagging the "extremists" who had unilaterally adopted a 200-mile territorial boundary. He said he thought that many other items had reached the point of agreement but could not be nailed down until a few closely related topics had been finally ironed out.
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