

JETIR.ORG

ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue



**JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND  
INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)**

An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

# “ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS): VIABILITY AS A DEVELOPING ORGANIZATION THROUGH DECADES.”



# OAS

More rights  
for more people



BY SAUPTICK CHAKRABORTY;

MASTERS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS; JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY,  
DEPT. OF IR & STRATEGIC STUDIES; KOLKATA; INDIA.

EMAIL ID: [tuklu9891@gmail.com](mailto:tuklu9891@gmail.com) reviewer email: [souravdipta@gmail.com](mailto:souravdipta@gmail.com)

# 1.ABSTRACT:-

This paper concerns to “**Importance of Organization of American States (OAS) in Third world perspective**”. Organization of American States (OAS) is a regional multilateral organization that includes all 35 independent countries of the Western Hemisphere (though Cuba currently does not participate). It was established in 1948 as a forum in which the nations of the hemisphere could engage one another and address issues of mutual concern. Today, the OAS concentrates on four broad objectives: ‘democracy promotion’, ‘human rights protection’, ‘economic and social development’, and ‘regional security cooperation’. It carries out a variety of activities to advance these goals, often providing policy guidance and technical assistance to member states. The United States is the largest financial contributor to the OAS, providing an estimated \$68 million in FY2017 equivalent to 44% of the organization’s total budget. The United States historically has sought to use the OAS to advance economic, political, and security objectives in the Western Hemisphere. Although OAS actions frequently reflected U.S. policy during the 20th century, this has changed to a certain extent over the past 15 years. The organization’s goals and day to day activities are still generally consistent with U.S. policy toward the region, but the U.S. government has struggled to obtain support from other member states on some high profile issues, such as efforts to address the political crisis in Venezuela. As OAS’s decisions have begun to reflect the increasing independence of its member states, U.S. policymakers occasionally have expressed concerns about the direction of the organization. In recent years, some Members of Congress have criticized the OAS for failing to address the erosion of democratic institutions in Venezuela and other nations and have questioned whether the United States should continue to fund the organization. Others argue that the OAS remains an important forum for advancing U.S. relations with the other nations of the hemisphere and that U.S. policy should seek to strengthen the organization and make it more effective. The 115th Congress has continued to shape U.S. policy toward the OAS through its legislative and oversight activities through several acts like- 2017 consolidated appropriation acts.

## 2.KEYWORDS:-

‘Organization’, ‘American States’, ‘Perspectives’, ‘Regional’, ‘Objectives’ etc.

## 3.INTRODUCTION:-

The 115th Congress has continued to debate the role of the Organization of American States (OAS) in the Western Hemisphere and its utility for advancing U.S. objectives in the region. The United States helped found the OAS in 1948 to establish a multilateral forum in which the nations of the hemisphere could engage one another and address issues of mutual concern. In subsequent decades, OAS decisions often reflected U.S. policy as other member states sought to maintain close relations with the dominant economic and political power in the hemisphere. This was especially true during the early Cold War period, when the United States was able to secure OAS support for initiatives that were controversial in the region, such as a 1962 resolution to exclude Cuba from active participation as a result of its association with the communist bloc. OAS actions again aligned closely with U.S. policy in the 1990s following the end of the Cold War as a result of strong consensus among member states in support of initiatives designed to liberalize markets and strengthen democratic governance. According to many foreign policy analysts, the ability of the United States to exert authority and shape outcomes in the Western Hemisphere has declined over the past 15 years. This is the result of a number of trends. Citizens throughout Latin America and the Caribbean have elected ideologically diverse leaders, bringing an end to the post-Cold War policy consensus. At the same time, many countries in the region have enjoyed considerable economic growth, grown more confident in addressing their challenges, and diversified their commercial and diplomatic relations. These developments

have enabled countries in the region to pursue more independent foreign policies that are less deferential to the United States.

The General Assembly of the Organization of American States will hold its thirty-third regular session in Chile, June 8 through 10, 2003. Since its origin, the OAS has coped with enormous challenges. Even back then, the job of building and holding together a regional organization composed of world's greatest superpower, the United States, and its neighbors was not a simple one, given the enormous disparity in size and might. Compounding the problem was the ideological conflict, as the world that emerged from the Second World War was divided between two mutually exclusive agendas. At one time or another in their countries' history, many governments of the region opted for the socialist agenda, which challenged United States supremacy. Yet, while these two competing agendas were a factor for long periods of the Organization's history, they never managed to disable it or render it superfluous. To the contrary, the OAS was often the stage for memorable confrontations, as happened on the occasion of the Cuban missile crisis (1962), the invasion of Santo Domingo (1965) and later the invasion of Grenada (1983). In all those decades—starting in 1948 and continuing through to the end of the Cold War—the one setback for the Organization's membership was the exclusion of the present government of Cuba. Although Cuba is still a member country, it has been suspended since 1962. Since then, the OAS has been inaccurately portrayed as an asymmetrical international organization dominated by the United States. Nothing could be further from the truth. The OAS has been the architect of countless measures at the hemispheric level, especially since the early 1990s, when Canada, Belize, and Guyana became full members. Although these measures may not be widely known, they have in many ways changed the face of the Americas for the better. With the next regular session of the General Assembly fast approaching, the Permanent Mission of Chile to the OAS thought this would be a good opportunity to provide all circles of opinion interested in these issues with up-to-date information about the principal sources shaping the OAS' work.

## 4. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS:-

To analyze and evaluate importance of OAS we need to discuss its background, purpose structures and roles in policy formulation decades long.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The OAS charter was adopted on April 30, 1948, in Bogotá, Colombia, though multilateral relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere go back much further. The International Conference of American States, held in Washington, DC, from October 1889 to April 1890, was the first in a series of periodic meetings among the nations of the Americas to establish norms and institutions to govern hemispheric relations and promote cooperation. The participating nations agreed to establish the International Union of American Republics, which was renamed the Pan American Union in 1910. In 1933, following the launch of **President Franklin Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy<sup>1</sup>**, **the United States and other nations in the hemisphere signed the Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, which formally recognized the equality of states and the principle of nonintervention in one another's internal affairs.** Close cooperation during World War II considerably strengthened hemispheric ties, which were reinforced in the post war period with the adoption of the Inter American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty) in 1947.<sup>5</sup> The OAS Charter and American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man were signed a year later by the United States and 20 other countries in the region to legally codify the institutions and principles that had come to form the inter-American system.

## PURPOSES:

Although the OAS initially sought to address border disputes and collective security issues, it has expanded its activities into other areas over time. In 1959, the Inter American Commission on Human Rights was created to carry out the provisions of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. During the 1960s, the OAS greatly expanded its economic, social, cultural, scientific, and technological programs, placing a strong emphasis on development following the 1961 launch of President Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress." Abuses by authoritarian governments prompted the creation of the Inter American Court of Human Rights in 1979, and growing concern over narcotics trafficking led to the establishment of the Inter American Drug Abuse Control Commission in 1986. The OAS acknowledged the challenges posed by regional and international terrorism by creating the Inter American Committee against Terrorism in 1999, and recognized the near universal commitment to democracy in the region through the adoption of the Inter American Democratic Charter in 2001.

Following amended OAS charter main purposes are; strengthening the peace and security of the continent; to promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention; to prevent possible causes of difficulties and ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among member states; to provide for common action on the part of those states in the event of aggression; to seek the solution of political, juridical, and economic problems that may arise among them; to promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development; to eradicate extreme poverty, which constitutes an obstacle to the full democratic development of the peoples of the hemisphere; and to achieve an effective limitation of conventional weapons that will make it possible to devote the largest amount of resources to the economic and social development of member states.<sup>1</sup>

## INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES:

The OAS is composed of a variety of councils, committees, and other institutional organs, some of which are autonomous. There are three primary bodies, however, that are responsible for setting and carrying out the agenda of the OAS: the General Assembly, the Permanent Council, and the General Secretariat. **General Assembly** is the principal policymaking organ of the OAS. It meets annually to debate current issues, approve the organization's budget, and set policies to govern the other OAS bodies.<sup>9</sup> The General Assembly is composed of the delegations of each of the 34 participating member states, with each state having a single vote. It is empowered to adopt most decisions with the affirmative votes of an absolute majority of the member states; however, some decisions, including the adoption of the agenda and the approval of budgetary matters, require the affirmative votes of two thirds of the member states. In practice, the General Assembly tends to operate by consensus. Day to day governance of the OAS is conducted by the **Permanent Council**, which meets regularly throughout the year at the organization's headquarters in Washington, DC. Among other activities, the Permanent Council works to maintain friendly relations among member states, assists in the peaceful settlement of disputes, carries out decisions assigned to it by the General Assembly, regulates the General Secretariat when the General Assembly is not in session, receives reports from the

---

## FOOTNOTE CITATION

1. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office determined to improve relations with the nations of Central and South America. Under his leadership the United States **emphasized cooperation and trade rather than** military force to maintain stability in the hemisphere.

2. **Inter-American Court of Human Rights. 2004. Annual Report of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights 2004. Inter-American Court of Human Rights. OEA/Ser.L/V/III.65. (JOURNAL ARTICLE)**

various bodies of the inter- American system, and submits recommendations to the General Assembly. Additionally, the Permanent Council is empowered by the Inter American Democratic Charter to undertake necessary diplomatic initiatives in the event of an unconstitutional alteration of government in a member state. **General Secretariat**, directed by the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General, is the permanent bureaucracy charged with implementing the policies set by the General Assembly and the Permanent Council. The Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General are elected by the General Assembly and serve five year terms with the possibility of one reelection. According to the OAS Charter, the Secretary General serves as the legal representative of the organization and is allowed to participate in all OAS meetings but does not have a vote. The Secretary General is also empowered to establish offices and hire personnel to implement OAS mandates. Some analysts have argued that given the virtual paralysis of the organization that can result from differences among member states and the need for consensus— —“the effectiveness of the OAS critically depends on the consistent, vigorous, and sometimes risk taking leadership of the Secretary General”. The current Secretary General of the OAS is Luis Almagro, a former foreign minister of Uruguay.

### FINANCIAL BUDGET:-

The OAS budget is expected to total \$151 million in 2018. Largest portion of the budget is the Regular Fund, which covers the day to day operating expenses of the organization. The Regular Fund is financed through the assessed contributions, or membership dues, of OAS member states. Quota assessments are calculated based on each member state’s gross national income, with adjustments for debt burden and low per capita income. Since 1997, the OAS has sought to supplement the Regular Fund by collecting Specific Funds voluntary contributions from member states and other international donors that are directed to specific projects or programs. Despite the addition of Specific Funds, the OAS has faced persistent strains on its budget. The Administration’s FY2019 budget request includes \$41.9 million for the U.S. assessed contribution to the OAS. Like the Administration’s FY2018 budget request, it does not propose any voluntary contributions to the organization.

Following current priorities of OAS helps us to evaluate its relevance in third world regional politics. Some of relevant steps are:-

### PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS:

The inter-American system for the promotion and protection of human rights is one of the Organization’s most successful mechanisms and traces its origins to a number of resolutions adopted at the Eighth International Conference of American States (Lima, Peru, 1938). These include the resolution titled **“Freedom of Association and Freedom of Expression for Workers,” “The Lima Declaration in favor of Women’s Rights,” resolution XXXVI wherein the American Republics stated that “any persecution on account of racial or religious motives ... is contrary to the political and juridical systems of America” and, most especially, the resolution titled “Defense of Human Rights.”**<sup>2</sup> The inter-American human rights system was formally instituted in 1948. That year, the Ninth International Conference of American States, held in Bogotá, adopted the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. At that same Conference, the OAS Charter was adopted, based on the principle of respect for the fundamental rights of the human person. The system’s legal framework are the provisions embodied in the American Convention on Human Rights or **“Pact of San José,”** signed in November 1969. This, the system’s foremost instrument, has two additional protocols: the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights **“Protocol of San Salvador”** (signed in 1988) and the Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights to Abolish the Death Penalty, signed in Asuncion on June 8, 1990. Four more treaties have also been added: - the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, signed in

Cartagena de Indias on December 9, 1985; - the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons and the Inter- American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and **Eradication of Violence Against Women “Convention of Belém do Pará,”** both signed on June 9, 1994, in the Brazilian city of that same name, and - the Inter-American Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities signed in Guatemala City on July 7, 1999. Of the 25 countries that have ratified or acceded to **the “Pact of San José,”**<sup>i</sup> 22 countries have accepted the binding jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. They are: Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Trinidad and Tobago, however, denounced the Convention in 1998. The system has two oversight bodies with distinct but mutually reinforcing functions, authorities, and roles: the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. With these two bodies functioning in tandem, the system processes individual cases, conducts on-site visits, prepares country reports, has special rapporteurs for certain issues, adopts precautionary and provisional measures, shepherds friendly settlement proceedings, and so on. The presence of a mechanism for individual complaints, also featuring precautionary measures, has saved human lives, has restored justice in many cases and has provided redress to countless victims of human rights violations in a significant percentage in friendly environment.

#### DEFENSE & DEMOCRACY PROMOTION:

Over the years, the OAS has taken on an active role in defending democracy in the member countries, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention upheld in its Charter. In 1991, at the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the Organization of American States, held in Chile’s capital, the member states signed the **“Santiago Commitment to Peace and the Renewal of the Inter-American System.”**<sup>3</sup> They also approved resolution AG/RES. 1080 (XXI-O/91) titled “Representative Democracy.” The latter created a mechanism to effectively respond to an irregular interruption of the democratic political institutional process in any member state of the Organization. Approval of these resolutions was a turning point -pre- and post-1991- in the history of multilateral politics in this Hemisphere. Democracy began to move out of the realm of moral prescript to become an international juridical imperative accepted by all OAS member states (with the exception of Cuba, which has been suspended since 1992). Nonetheless, it would be a serious mistake to believe that the OAS reinvented itself in 1991. From the time the American nations won their independence, democratic government has been a constant objective of the Pan American movement. It began as a driving ideal, gradually evolved into moral principle, and eventually became a binding provision set forth in the Charter of the OAS. The road to the OAS member states’ recognition of representative democracy as the paradigm for government has been long and hard. History has demonstrated that the instruments created were not up to the task and that their ambiguous interpretation allowed anti-democratic regimes to become entrenched. One of the Inter-American Democratic Charter’s greatest contributions to the progressive development of international law is that it expressly upholds the peoples’ right to democracy and their governments’ obligation to promote and defend it. The adoption of the Inter-American Democratic Charter bespeaks the considerable progress that collective support for the emerging right to democracy has made within the inter-American system. Within the Organization, however, the defense and promotion of democracy stretches far beyond the preparation of legal texts. The OAS has a Unit for the Promotion of Democracy (UPD), perhaps best known for its election observation missions in the region. However, the work of the Unit is on a much larger scale and involves a commitment to improving the institutions of democratic government and cultivating a culture of democracy in the member states of the Organization. UPD’s present role in regulating administrative functions in state and national level along with municipal level with decentralization and citizen participation is quite impressive.

**SUMMITS & HEMISPHERIC AGENDA:**

For the last ten years, a general consensus on political and economic principles—based on democracy and market economics—enabled unprecedented cooperation and integration throughout the Hemisphere. In this context, the heads of state and government of the Americas decided to meet to decide what the fundamental precepts of the new hemispheric agenda would be. The First Summit of the Americas was held in 1994 and from it came a new way of tackling the priorities and objectives for the region's political, economic, social, and cultural development. The decision to institutionalize these meetings resulted in what is known as the "Summit Process," an intergovernmental dialogue at the highest level where ideas are shared, a common language is being cultivated and mandates for collective action are planned. Three Summits have been held thus far: the first in Miami in 1994, the second in Santiago in 1998, and the third in Quebec in 2001. While the OAS did not have a central role in preparing the documents for the Miami Summit, the Secretary General attended and explained his idea of the OAS' role in relation to the new agenda and the priorities established by the dignitaries in the Declaration and Plan of Action of the First Summit of the Americas. At that Miami Summit, the heads of state and government decided to assign the OAS a number of mandates, which then became priorities on the Organization's own agenda. The OAS was instrumental in implementing 13 of the 23 initiatives agreed upon in Miami.

**BATTLE AGAINST CORRUPTION:**

The battle against corruption has been a constant concern in the Americas. In the OAS framework, the anti-corruption issue first came to the fore in 1992, was carried forward with General Assembly resolutions in 1994, was reiterated at the Miami Summit and then took permanent hold with the process that led to the adoption of the Inter-American Convention against Corruption in 1996. This convention broke new ground. Not only was it the first international juridical instrument on the subject, but still is the only one in which the fight against corruption is regarded as an unremitting effort in which the states undertake commitments to both punish and prevent corruption and recognize the necessity of involvement from every quarter: the state, the private sector, civil society, and the international community.

**OAS AGAINST DRUG:**

The Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD), created in 1986 by a resolution of the OAS General Assembly, is the Hemisphere's most important regional political forum in the fight to combat the drug problem. One of CICAD's most important initiatives is the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM), created by the Second Summit of the Americas, held in Santiago in 1998. There, the heads of state and of government pledged to develop a single, objective, multilateral evaluation mechanism that would track the individual and collective progress achieved in the efforts made by the countries of the Hemisphere to deal with the drug problem. By creating the MEM—based on the principles of respect for the states' sovereignty, territorial integrity, and their domestic legal systems—the countries of the Hemisphere were acknowledging that drugs were a complex, transnational problem that necessitated an integral, balanced approach on the part of the states. Accordingly, the only viable and effective tool for combating the drug problem is international cooperation within a framework of shared responsibility. The MEM is a peer evaluation process, wherein all the countries evaluate and are evaluated. The MEM does not impose penalties; it is a collaborative process. By sharing information and strategies, the countries are able to get a clear picture of what their needs and weaknesses are. Working together, they can identify areas where the law needs to be improved or where greater cooperation, research, or resources are required. The first evaluations were presented to the Third Summit of the Americas, held in Quebec in April 2001. On a visit to the OAS that same month, the President of the United States, George W. Bush, described the MEM as a "major achievement" and said that "Our Hemisphere is more united in addressing this problem, both in supply and demand, than

it has ever been before." This is an important point, because the MEM is being viewed as an alternative to the U.S.' unilateral certification procedure.

2

### **HEMISPHERIC SECURITY:**

With the end of the Cold War, the emergence of new players in international relations, and the phenomenon of globalization, the old threats to security have been compounded by other risks emerging within the Hemisphere. The heads of state and government identified these threats at the Third Summit of the Americas, April 2001, as the following: the illicit traffic drugs and firearms; the growing danger posed by organized crime and corruption; environmental vulnerability exacerbated by the susceptibility to natural disasters; the transport of nuclear waste; economic vulnerability, particularly vis-à-vis trade; new health threats like the global pandemic of acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) and the rising levels of poverty. It is patently evident that these new threats do not respect borders and that individually the states do not have the means to successfully conquer them. Greater cooperation among the OAS' 34 member states is, therefore, *vita*. For that reason, at the Second Summit of the Americas, the heads of state and government decided to hold a Special Conference on Security, a decision that the Third Summit reaffirmed. The Conference is slated for Mexico during the month of October 2003, at a date to be yet determined. Regional conferences were held on this subject in Santiago (1995) and San Salvador (1998), as was a meeting of experts in Miami (2003). As a result, a significant increase has been achieved in the number of OAS member states that have signed and ratified various international legal instruments, such as: Protocol II, as amended, of the United Nations Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects; the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and Their Destruction; the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction; the Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions, and the participation of all Latin American and Caribbean states in the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Cuba's accession to this last Treaty has strengthened the first inhabited nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world.

### **FREE TRADE:**

At the first Summit of the Americas, held in Miami in 1994, the heads of state and government of thirty-four of the thirty-five nations of the Western Hemisphere agreed to launch a process to create the "Free Trade Area of the Americas," an initiative whose purpose is to eliminate, among the countries of the region by no later than 2005, the barriers obstructing their goods' and services' access to markets. There, the democratically elected heads of state and government of the Western Hemisphere signed a declaration of principles titled "Partnership for Development and Prosperity: Democracy, Free Trade and Sustainable Development in the Americas" and a Plan of Action. The objectives of the partnership were as follows: To preserve and strengthen the community of democracies of the Americas; To promote prosperity through economic integration and free trade; To eradicate poverty and discrimination in our Hemisphere; To guarantee sustainable development and conserve our natural environment for future generations. To achieve these four basic objectives, the heads of state and government approved a plan of action containing

---

3. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation of the member countries of the Organization of American States, assembled in Santiago, Chile, on the occasion of the thirty-third regular session of the OAS General Assembly, RECALLING that, 12 years ago, the OAS adopted the Santiago Commitment to Democracy and the Renewal of the Inter-American System and resolution AG/RES. 1080 (XXI-O/91), "Representative Democracy"; BEARING IN MIND that the course charted by the Heads of State and Government at the Third Summit of the Americas entrusts us with tasks that require the ongoing strengthening of democracy;

23 initiatives, one of which—indeed the most important—was the creation of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA).

### COOPERATION VIA OAS:

Under its Charter, one of the Organization's essential purposes is to promote, by cooperative action, the economic, social and cultural development of its member states. From the Organization's establishment in 1948, initiatives in this area were channeled through the Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Cultural Council (and then their successor, the Inter-American Council for Education, Science, and Culture), and through the specialized conferences and organizations. When in 1961 the OAS was designated coordinator of the programs conducted under the "Alliance for Progress"—then the most sweeping technical cooperation initiative ever undertaken in the region—, cooperative action began to figure more prominently within the Organization. Around the mid-1970s, however, factors began to take shape that, twenty years later, would cause a drastic drop-off in the monetary value of the cooperation delivered through the OAS, and the structures, means, and objectives that attended that cooperative action would be reconfigured. In the early 1990s, the OAS' profile in the area of technical cooperation was at a very low level. In fact, the Organization was handling less than 1% of the resources that governments made available for partnership for development in the region. Against this backdrop, the Protocol of Managua was adopted in 1992, and entered into force in 1996. It altered the Organization's approach to cooperation by introducing the concept of "integral development" and adopting a new paradigm whereby "[i]nter-American cooperation for integral development is the common and joint responsibility of the Member States." This change was intended to replace the "vertical" model of technical cooperation, identified with "technical assistance" and the practice of sending in experts most of whom came from donor countries. The new model is one of "horizontal cooperation," where the countries directly exchange assistance between and among themselves, with the OAS functioning as catalyst or facilitator. The Inter-American Council for Integral Development (CIDI) became the organ in charge of formulating, promoting, and steering technical cooperation. An Executive Secretariat was created for CIDI and, in 1997, so was a Special Multilateral Fund (FEMCIDI). Finally, in 1999, the OAS General Assembly created the Inter-American Agency for Cooperation and Development (IACD) as an organ of CIDI, whose purpose is to promote and administer execution of projects, programs, and activities in partnership for development.

Apart from these since its establishment OAS has been helping in development of **Education** through developmental and inter-American community based organizations like CIDI, CIE etc. and currently with modes of Information and Communication Technology (ICT). Also OAS' concern for environmental issues dates back four decades, when efforts got underway to take an inventory of the Hemisphere's natural resources. Today, with the Unit for **Sustainable Development**<sup>4</sup> and Environment as the technical instrument and the Inter-American Committee on Sustainable Development as the policy body, the Organization is working to promote a concept of economic development that is consistent with preservation of the environment, to save it for present and future generations. The framework was established in the mandates emanating from the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992, the Summit of the Americas on Sustainable Development, held in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia, in 1996, and the work ordered by the Summits of the Americas. Featured among the areas of activity in sustainable development are water resources, climate change and coastal zone management, biodiversity, natural hazards, renewable energy, public participation, environmental law and environmental education, all organized under the Inter-American Program for Sustainable Development. In these projects, the OAS works in partnership with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the IDB, and other such entities. Beyond these **Poverty Eradication** is OAS's another integral framework.

Congress plays an important role in determining U.S. policy toward the OAS. As noted previously, the United States provided more than 44% of the organization's funding in FY2017. Congress appropriates

funds for the assessed contribution of the United States, as well as voluntary contributions to support specific projects in the hemisphere. Congress also is involved in the development of inter American treaties, as any conventions negotiated by the executive branch must be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. Moreover, Congress is charged with providing oversight of how U.S. funds are spent. Members of Congress frequently voice concerns over OAS actions (or lack thereof) and recommend changes in policy. Policy issues that have drawn particular interest from some Members of Congress in recent years include the application of the Inter American Democratic Charter, challenges to the inter-American human rights system, the management and budget of the OAS, and the potential reintegration of Cuba into the inter-American system.

In spite of all these efforts OAS has faced a lots of difficulties in GUATEMALA, COLUMBIA, MEXICO, EL SALVADOR in controlling violent situations. Along with these controlling mess of political and electoral procedures in HAITI and dealing with current development of political conflict in VENEZUELA centering president Maduro by OAS are quite critical. OAS has to deal with future conflict resolution measures by forming a new design of post conflict situation handling and peace making and building framework with forming consolidated bonds in between international and multilateral organizations specially for cases like HONDURAS, NICARAGUA etc. Also Cuba was one of the founding members of the OAS and, as a signatory to the OAS Charter, remains a member. It has not participated in the organization since 1962, however, as a result of a decision at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs to suspend Cuba for its adherence to Marxism Leninism and alignment with the communist bloc. The resolution to exclude Cuba was controversial when it was adopted, and the reintegration of Cuba into the inter-American system has remained a frequent source of contention among the countries of the hemisphere ever since. In 2015, Cuban President Raúl Castro attended the Seventh Summit of the Americas in Panama. Although the Summits of the Americas are not officially part of the OAS, the OAS serves as the technical secretariat for the summit process, and previous summits only included the participating members of the OAS. Panama invited Cuba to attend the summit after every country in the hemisphere with the exceptions of Canada and the United States voiced support for Cuba's inclusion during the Sixth Summit of the Americas in 2012. So with evolution of political dynamics in inter-American states relations OAS's policy and decision formulation have evolved with exigencies of time making it a relevant regional multilateral organization.

## **5.CONCLUSION:-**

In 1948, Alberto Lleras Camargo, the first Secretary General of the OAS, asserted "the organization ... is what the member governments want it to be and nothing else". This has held true throughout the organization's history with the OAS engaging in activities and adopting new areas of focus in accordance with the decisions of member states. As an organization composed of 35 diverse nations that operates based on consensus, however, the OAS is often slow to arrive at decisions and prone to inaction. This is especially the case when the hemisphere is ideologically polarized or addressing contentious topics. Nevertheless, even when member states are incapable of establishing consensus on a given issue, the OAS continues to carry out a variety of activities to advance the organization's broad objectives: democracy promotion, human rights protection, economic and social development, and regional security cooperation. As the organization's largest financial contributor and the hemisphere's most powerful nation, the United States remains influential within the OAS. The organization's objectives in the region are largely consistent with those of the United States, and many of its activities complement U.S. efforts. At the same time, OAS actions (or the lack thereof) do not always align with the organization's stated objectives, and the U.S. government's ability to advance its policy initiatives in the organization has declined over the past 15 years. These conflicting

tendencies are likely to continue in the coming years, spurring on the congressional debate over the utility of the OAS for advancing U.S. interests in the Western Hemisphere. While the nature of violence and its causes in the current context of Latin America has changed since the OAS supported the peace process in Guatemala, the field methodology and institutional lessons are still quite relevant. The value of a dialogue process is linked to its ability to address issues that are generating tensions in government or society. From the long-standing experience of the OAS, there are some minimum conditions to ensure that a dialogue process is successful and is able to address the issues it has been mandated to negotiate. First, dialogue processes should ensure they are designed against the backdrop of a legal framework that will protect the process. The right of actors to engage in free and equal decision-making processes can be strengthened if a legal framework exists. This framework must facilitate the interaction between the state and the relevant social sectors.

Additionally, it is crucial to secure adequate political will and support in different social sectors, as well as in the state, so as to have transparent dialogue and therefore increase possibility of reaching an agreement. From a technical perspective, adequate training and education for the actors engaging in a dialogue process are essential. Finally, the development of dialogue processes and required assistance depends mainly, but not solely, on the availability of sufficient financial resources. An effective dialogue process needs to include all relevant stakeholders and must be well coordinated between all sectors affected by the outcome of the process. Regardless of what kind of dialogue is chosen, the ability to listen and jointly create a broader understanding of the issues, interests and needs of each party, as well as to foster closer interpersonal and inter-institutional relationships, is key. The success or failure of the dialogue process will depend on the quality of the interactions and the communication between actors. Today, OAS member states need the organization to help with a multiplicity of multidimensional and transnational threats that are weakening democratic governance and human security throughout the Americas. Meeting these challenges will require effective dialogue and coordination with subregional organizations, civil society groups and the private sector so that they also assume a greater role in defining the issues, determining options and implementing viable solutions that can help achieve peace and strengthen governance in their respective countries. The OAS can use its comparative advantages, which are not based on coercion but, rather, on its moral authority and its capacity to act as an honest broker of region-wide consensus, to carry out important dialogue processes in support of domestic efforts to strengthen democratic rule in the region. Too often, governments are forced to focus on short-term actions instead of strategic development objectives—the reactive versus preventive policy trade-off that is often at the root of popular discontent. This is the challenge of the present day. Member states, international institutions and civil society organizations have an important role to play in strengthening democratic governance and promoting the peaceful resolution of complex problems. However, the fundamental question remains: how can donors, member states and non-state actors work towards more effective and timely conflict prevention, leaving in place the kind of capacity necessary so that states may find their own solutions to their own problems? Apart from what the OAS can offer through political mediation, shuttle diplomacy and technical cooperation actions, the OAS's comparative advantages lie in its convening power among its member states and its ability to work with all levels of government in forging consensus on important policies, both nationally and regionally. The ability of the OAS to work at both the political and technical levels, along with its commitment to help strengthen state institutions in democratic practices and values, are for many states the best preventive capacity that the organization brings to the multilateral cooperation framework.

The phenomenon of regionalism is today present throughout the international system, and regional organisations are widely considered to play an important role in relation to international security. With the United Nations system increasingly overburdened since the 1990s, such organisations have emerged as one possible solution to problems associated with state fragility and violence perpetrated by non-state actors. Relative to other regional organisations, the OAS has received little attention in the literature and it is not generally considered to have much impact on international relations in the Americas. This paper, however, argues that the OAS does matter and that rules and norms do make a difference in international relations

more generally. The OAS, despite its problems, has played an important role in terms of preventive diplomacy, generating channels for communication and building institutions that have helped avert violent conflict in a number of cases.<sup>3</sup>

## **6. BIBLIOGRAPHY & REFERENCES:-**

### **JOURNALS & ARTICLES**

1. Jorge Garcia-Gonzalez; "The OAS and the fight against corruption in the Americas"; Department of Legal Cooperation and Information; OAS General Secretariat. (ARTICLE)
2. "THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES IN AFFECTED STATES IN AMERICA."; IDEA special journal.
3. Stoetzer, Carlos. 1993. "The Organisation of American States". Westport, Conn.: Praeger. (ONLINE ARTICLE).
4. Gaviria, Cesar. 1995. "A New Vision for the OAS. Washington", DC: OAS. (ONLINE JOURNAL).

### **WORKING REPORTS /RESEARCH BASED PAPER:**

5. Inter-American Court of Human Rights. 2004. Annual Report of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights 2004. Inter-American Court of Human Rights. OEA/Ser.L/V/III.65.
6. Monica Herz; "DOES THE ORGANISATION OF AMERICAN STATES MATTER?" ; Working Paper 34 - Regional and Global Axes of Conflict- Institute of International Relations; PUC-Rio, April 2008; LSE-DESTIN Development Studies Institute.

---

### **FOOTNOTE CITATION**

4. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015, provides a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and into the future. At its heart are the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which are an urgent call for action by all countries - developed and developing - in a global partnership. They recognize that ending poverty and other deprivations must go hand-in-hand with strategies that improve health and education, reduce inequality, and spur economic growth – all while tackling climate change and working to preserve our oceans and forests. The SDGs build on decades of work by countries and the UN, including the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs; **WWW. WILEY 7 FRANCIS ONLINE. (WEB PORTAL)**

**BOOKS:**

7. David W. Dent; ed.; "U.S.-Latin American Policymaking: A Reference Handbook"; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995), p. 27.

8. Boniface, Dexter S. 2002. 'Is there a Democratic Norm in the Americas?:An Analysis of the Organization of American States', *Global Governance* 8(3): 365-381.

9. Cooper, Andrew and Legler, Thomas. 2001. 'The OAS Democratic Solidarity Paradigm: Questions of Collective and National Leadership', *Latin American Politics and Society* 43(1) Spring: 103-126.

**WEBSITES:**

10. WWW. JSTOR.ORG (ONLINE WEBSITE).

11. WWW. WILLEY 7 FRANCIS ONLINE. (WEB PORTAL)

12. [www.idea.int/democracydialog/](http://www.idea.int/democracydialog/) (ONLINE SITE)

