

Trebilcock: 1996: 62; Charnovitz: 1995: 178) stated that part of the American culture is constituted of a reluctance to see American policies reviewed by an international organization. As said Polmeroy (1996: 776), the business community argued that ILO Conventions should not be indirectly applied to U.S. through an international labor agreement, because the U.S. have not ratified most of the ILO Conventions. Moreover, the U.S. human rights approach centered on competition side effects has been reinforced for nearly 80 years. The fear for "social dumping" has been transmitted from generation to generation of U.S. administrators⁹, so that it was not surprising to see the U.S. administration trying to raise labor rights issues in GATT (Charnovitz: 1995: 169-171, 180).

Moreover, the fact that some developing countries will have a GSP status only if they conform themselves to some basic human rights don't prevent developed countries which don't respect some basic human rights to increase their trade with the U.S. In 1987 and 1990, the U.S. tried to introduce in the GATT the linkage between international trade and labor rights. The Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, finalized in Marrakesh (Morocco) (April 15, 1994) adopted the "World Trade Organization" (WTO), replacing GATT, without any labor rights protection, without any social clause, although the U.S. tried to include labor standards in the negotiations issues. The "Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 granted authority to President to negotiate trade agreements in the context of the Uruguay Round and authorizes the Congress to review such agreements on a non-amendable basis (fast-track procedures). The OECD has confirmed that the linkage of trade and labor standards in the WTO would strengthen the multilateral system and would be in the interest of both industrial and developing countries¹⁰. The enforcement of core labour rights through an eventual "social clause" adopted by the WTO would ensure that the motives behind the social clause are actually not

⁹ U.S. WAR LABOR POLICIES BOARD, *Report on International Labor Standards*, Washington, GPO, 1919, p. 7.

¹⁰ ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, *Trade and Labour Standards*, Directorate for Education, Employment, Labour and Social Affairs, January 16, 1996.