

2006 SHAREHOLDER RESOLUTION TO CHEVRON CORPORATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Submitted by the Society of Jesus-Wisconsin Province. Co-filed by 16 ICCR members.

WHEREAS:

We believe transnational corporations operating in countries with repressive governments, ethnic conflict, weak rule of law, endemic corruption, or poor labor and environmental standards face serious risks to their reputation and share value if they are seen as responsible for, or complicit in, human rights violations;

Our company has business operations in more than 180 nations, many of which have consistently been noted by the U.S. Department of State as violating basic human rights; (February 27, 2005, www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2004).

At least 78 companies have already adopted human rights policies referencing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

The persistent allegations of human rights abuses leveled at our company creates an urgent situation that requires our company to allocate maximum resources to address this human rights crisis.

“The families in the vicinity of the Ecuadorian oil-drilling operations have had to drink from contaminated rivers and streams because they had such limited access to running water. And any pollution-related illnesses they may contract pose an even greater danger than normal because of their abject poverty and the absence of adequate health care.” (“Rain Forest Jekyll and Hyde?” Bob Herbert, New York Times, October 20, 2005)

We believe significant commercial advantages may accrue to our company by adopting a comprehensive human rights policy based on the above mentioned Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Labor Organization’s Core Labor Standards which would serve to enhance corporate reputation, improve employee recruitment and retention, improve community and stakeholder relations, and reduce the risk of adverse publicity, consumer boycotts, divestment campaigns and law suits.

A comprehensive human rights policy would include, but not be limited to, the right to equal opportunity and non-discriminatory treatment; right to security of persons; rights of workers, including the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining and a safe and healthy workplace; the rights of indigenous peoples; economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development, adequate food and drinking water; the right to health and environmental protection.

On June 30, 2004 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Alien Tort Statute of 1789 which permits foreigners to file suit in U.S. courts for violations of international law that have “definite content and acceptance among civilized nations”.

“In the post-Enron environment, every global company’s board of directors, needs to oversee its assessment and management of these risks. Given the magnitude of potential claims, liability may even extend to individual directors, if they are not seen as exercising proper oversight.”
(*Harvard Business Review*, August 2003)

RESOLVED:

Shareholders request the Board to adopt a comprehensive, transparent, verifiable human rights policy and report to shareholders on the plan for implementation by October, 2006.
This report to be prepared at reasonable expense, omitting proprietary information.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT:

We believe such a policy will benefit our company by helping to ensure that it is not associated with violations of human rights *and* the associated reputation and liability risks to shareholder value.

We urge you to vote FOR this proposal.