(#16)

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Memo For McMyler

Attached for your final review / approval is a Q&A on United America Security Assistance Programs (a Miss Beason Q&A)

Col White

Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Humphery Subcommittee
Hearing Transcript, 21 March 1977

LATIN AMERICAN SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Question #23. It is the Committee's understanding that five Latin American countries--Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Uruguay -- have either been denied security assistance or have rejected it in connection with the new United States position on human rights. Please provide the Committee with pertinent details of the diplomatic notes received from these countries. What is the Administration's recommendation concerning authorization of FMS credits for these countries in 1978? The Administration has also requested special authorization for MAAG groups for Brazil and Argentina in 1978. Why are these groups necessary if all security assistance has been rejected?

Mrs Benson: The specific implications of the various announcements made by the countries are not entirely clear. Therefore, we have entered discussions with each of the governments in order to gain clarification on how they intend their public statements to affect details of the security assistance relationships with the United States. We do not intend to take any actions concerning recommendations on FMS credit authorizations which will foreclose possibilities for maintaining our historically close and mutually beneficial relationship. When it is clearly established that the intent of any foreign government is to refuse security assistance which we have programmed in the Fiscal Year 1978 budget, we will make appropriate program adjustments.

Since we do not have a clear understanding of the implications of the announcements made by Argentina and Brazil we are unable to ascertain the resultant impact on our Military Groups in these countries. Certainly, complete rejection of all FMS credit, International Military Education and Training Program and FMS Cash Sales would require review and revalidation of projected personnel requirements in the Military Groups.

However, as you are aware, our Military Groups in Latin America have traditionally functioned primarily in a representational role, emphasizing the maintenance of friendly and cooperative relations with the armed forces of the hemisphere. Most were established by Military Mission agreements predating the enactment of security assistance legislation, and their continued value to us is based more on defense and hemispheric military cooperation than on security assistance per se. Apart from this of course, there will be a near-term need for continuing the operation of some security assistance management elements. Personnel will be required to meet residual responsibilities evolving from prior year programs. They will be responsible for performing such functions as administrative details on arrangements for previously funded training, equipment delivery schedules, problems over prices on bills, and inquiries about shipments as well as requirements for observation of end use of MAP and FMS equipment.

Office of Origin: OASD/ISA(SA)
Action Officer: COL RL White
Date Prepared: 14Apr77
Coordination: I-A Reg - Mr. Quant
DSAA OPS - Mr. Rudd

Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Humphery Subcommittee
Hearing Transcript, 21 March 1977

LATIN AMERICAN SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Question #23. It is the Committee's understanding that five Latin American countries--Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Uruguay -- have either been denied security assistance or have rejected it in connection with the new United States position on human rights. Please provide the Committee with pertinent details of the diplomatic notes received from these countries. What is the Administration's recommendation concerning authorization of FMS credits for these countries in 1978? The Administration has also requested special authorization for MAAG groups for Brazil and Argentina in 1978. Why are these groups necessary if all security assistance has been rejected?

Mrs Benson: The specific implications of the various announcements made by the countries are not entirely clear. Therefore, we have entered discussions with each of the governments in order to gain clarification on how they intend their public statements to affect details of the security assistance relationships with the United States. We do not intend to take any actions concerning recommendations on FMS credit authorizations which will foreclose possibilities for maintaining our historically close and mutually beneficial relationship. When it is clearly established that the intent of any foreign government is to refuse security assistance which we have programmed in the Fiscal Year 1978 budget, we will make appropriate program adjustments.

Since we do not have a clear understanding of the implications of the announcements made by Argentina and Brazil we are unable to ascertain the resultant impact on our Military Groups in these countries. Certainly, complete rejection of all FMS credit, International Military Education and Training Program and FMS Cash Sales would require review and revalidation of projected personnel requirements in the Military Groups.

However, as you are aware, our Military Groups in Latin America have traditionally functioned primarily in a representational role, emphasizing the maintenance of friendly and cooperative relations with the armed forces of the hemisphere. Most were established by Military Mission agreements predating the enactment of security assistance legislation, and their continued value to us is based more on defense and hemispheric military cooperation than on security assistance per se. Apart from this of course, there will be a near-term need for continuing the operation of some security assistance management elements. Personnel will be required to meet residual responsibilities evolving from prior year programs. They will be responsible for performing such functions as administrative details on arrangements for previously funded training, equipment delivery schedules, problems over prices on bills, and inquiries about shipments as well as requirements for observation of end use of MAP and FMS equipment.

Office of Origin: OASD/ISA(SA)
Action Officer: COL RL White
Date Prepared: 14Apr77
Coordination: I-A Reg - Mr. Quant
DSAA OPS - Mr. Rudd

Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Humphery Subcommittee
Hearing Transcript, 21 March 1977

LATIN AMERICAN SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Question #23. It is the Committee's understanding that five Latin American countries--Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Uruguay -- have either been denied security assistance or have rejected it in connection with the new United States position on human rights. Please provide the Committee with pertinent details of the diplomatic notes received from these countries. What is the Administration's recommendation concerning authorization of FMS credits for these countries in 1978? The Administration has also requested special authorization for MAAG groups for Brazil and Argentina in 1978. Why are these groups necessary if all security assistance has been rejected?

Mrs Benson: The specific implications of the various announcements made by the countries are not entirely clear. Therefore, we have entered discussions with each of the governments in order to gain clarification on how they intend their public statements to affect details of the security assistance relationships with the United States. We do not intend to take any actions concerning recommendations on FMS credit authorizations which will foreclose possibilities for maintaining our historically close and mutually beneficial relationship. When it is clearly established that the intent of any foreign government is to refuse security assistance which we have programmed in the Fiscal Year 1978 budget, we will make appropriate program adjustments.

Since we do not have a clear understanding of the implications of the announcements made by Argentina and Brazil we are unable to ascertain the resultant impact on our Military Groups in these countries. Certainly, complete rejection of all FMS credit, International Military Education and Training Program and FMS Cash Sales would require review and revalidation of projected personnel requirements in the Military Groups.

However, as you are aware, our Military Groups in Latin America have traditionally functioned primarily in a representational role, emphasizing the maintenance of friendly and cooperative relations with the armed forces of the hemisphere. Most were established by Military Mission agreements predating the enactment of security assistance legislation, and their continued value to us is based more on defense and hemispheric military cooperation than on security assistance per se. Apart from this of course, there will be a near-term need for continuing the operation of some security assistance management elements. Personnel will be required to meet residual responsibilities evolving from prior year programs. They will be responsible for performing such functions as administrative details on arrangements for previously funded training, equipment delivery schedules, problems over prices on bills, and inquiries about shipments as well as requirements for observation of end use of MAP and FMS equipment.

Office of Origin: OASD/ISA(SA)
Action Officer: COL RL White
Date Prepared: 14Apr77
Coordination: I-A Reg - Mr. Quant
DSAA OPS - Mr. Rudd

Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Humphery Subcommittee
Hearing Transcript, 21 March 1977

LATIN AMERICAN SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Question #23. It is the Committee's understanding that five Latin American countries--Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Uruguay -- have either been denied security assistance or have rejected it in connection with the new United States position on human rights. Please provide the Committee with pertinent details of the diplomatic notes received from these countries. What is the Administration's recommendation concerning authorization of FMS credits for these countries in 1978? The Administration has also requested special authorization for MAAG groups for Brazil and Argentina in 1978. Why are these groups necessary if all security assistance has been rejected?

Mrs Benson: The specific implications of the various announcements made by the countries are not entirely clear. Therefore, we have entered discussions with each of the governments in order to gain clarification on how they intend their public statements to affect details of the security assistance relationships with the United States. We do not intend to take any actions concerning recommendations on FMS credit authorizations which will foreclose possibilities for maintaining our historically close and mutually beneficial relationship. When it is clearly established that the intent of any foreign government is to refuse security assistance which we have programmed in the Fiscal Year 1978 budget, we will make appropriate program adjustments.

Since we do not have a clear understanding of the implications of the announcements made by Argentina and Brazil we are unable to ascertain the resultant impact on our Military Groups in these countries. Certainly, complete rejection of all FMS credit, International Military Education and Training Program and FMS Cash Sales would require review and revalidation of projected personnel requirements in the Military Groups.

However, as you are aware, our Military Groups in Latin America have traditionally functioned primarily in a representational role, emphasizing the maintenance of friendly and cooperative relations with the armed forces of the hemisphere. Most were established by Military Mission agreements predating the enactment of security assistance legislation, and their continued value to us is based more on defense and hemispheric military cooperation than on security assistance per se. Apart from this of course, there will be a near-term need for continuing the operation of some security assistance management elements. Personnel will be required to meet residual responsibilities evolving from prior year programs. They will be responsible for performing such functions as administrative details on arrangements for previously funded training, equipment delivery schedules, problems over prices on bills, and inquiries about shipments as well as requirements for observation of end use of MAP and FMS equipment.

Office of Origin: OASD/ISA(SA)
Action Officer: COL RL White
Date Prepared: 14Apr77
Coordination: I-A Reg - Mr. Quant
DSAA OPS - Mr. Rudd

Senate Foreign Relations Committee
Humphery Subcommittee
Hearing Transcript, 21 March 1977

LATIN AMERICAN SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Question #23. It is the Committee's understanding that five Latin American countries--Argentina, Brazil, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Uruguay -- have either been denied security assistance or have rejected it in connection with the new United States position on human rights. Please provide the Committee with pertinent details of the diplomatic notes received from these countries. What is the Administration's recommendation concerning authorization of FMS credits for these countries in 1978? The Administration has also requested special authorization for MAAG groups for Brazil and Argentina in 1978. Why are these groups necessary if all security assistance has been rejected?

Mrs Benson: The specific implications of the various announcements made by the countries are not entirely clear. Therefore, we have entered discussions with each of the governments in order to gain clarification on how they intend their public statements to affect details of the security assistance relationships with the United States. We do not intend to take any actions concerning recommendations on FMS credit authorizations which will foreclose possibilities for maintaining our historically close and mutually beneficial relationship. When it is clearly established that the intent of any foreign government is to refuse security assistance which we have programmed in the Fiscal Year 1978 budget, we will make appropriate program adjustments.

Since we do not have a clear understanding of the implications of the announcements made by Argentina and Brazil we are unable to ascertain the resultant impact on our Military Groups in these countries. Certainly, complete rejection of all FMS credit, International Military Education and Training Program and FMS Cash Sales would require review and revalidation of projected personnel requirements in the Military Groups.

However, as you are aware, our Military Groups in Latin America have traditionally functioned primarily in a representational role, emphasizing the maintenance of friendly and cooperative relations with the armed forces of the hemisphere. Most were established by Military Mission agreements predating the enactment of security assistance legislation, and their continued value to us is based more on defense and hemispheric military cooperation than on security assistance per se. Apart from this of course, there will be a near-term need for continuing the operation of some security assistance management elements. Personnel will be required to meet residual responsibilities evolving from prior year programs. They will be responsible for performing such functions as administrative details on arrangements for previously funded training, equipment delivery schedules, problems over prices on bills, and inquiries about shipments as well as requirements for observation of end use of MAP and FMS equipment.

Office of Origin: OASD/ISA(SA)
Action Officer: COL RL White
Date Prepared: 14Apr77
Coordination: I-A Reg - Mr. Quant
DSAA OPS - Mr. Rudd