

April 17, 1993

**Cable from Brazilian Ambassador Ricupero to the
Brazilian Foreign Ministry, 'Brazil-USA. Sensitive
technologies. Non-proliferation. Meeting with the
DAS for non-proliferation.'**

Citation:

"Cable from Brazilian Ambassador Ricupero to the Brazilian Foreign Ministry, 'Brazil-USA. Sensitive technologies. Non-proliferation. Meeting with the DAS for non-proliferation.'", April 17, 1993, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Folha Transparência/Itamaraty Historical Archive <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/121370>

Summary:

On April 1993, Brazilian diplomats met once more with Robert Einhorn, now Deputy Assistant Secretary for Chemical Weapons and Proliferation. Einhorn was mainly concerned with the delay in the approval of the export control legislation in Brazil and wondered if the issue was not losing priority in the Brazilian government's agenda. He also tried to discourage the development of Brazilian SLV by arguing that it would not be economically advantageous for the country.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY)

Original Language:

Portuguese

Contents:

Translation - English

From: Embassy in Washington

To: Exteriores

CONFIDENTIAL

Cable no. 764

Date: 17/4/93

Classification: PARD

DFTS/DNU/DCS/DMAE

Brazil-USA. Sensitive technologies.
Non-proliferation. Meeting with the
DAS for non-proliferation.

764 72200 - Transmission: "At the request of Phil Maclean and B. Aronson, I saw today, 15/4/93, Robert Einhorn, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Chemical Weapons and Proliferation of the Department of State. The Director and the Deputy Director of the Division of Politico-military Affairs Vahn Van Drepen and Evangeline Monroe, besides Philip Maclean, DAS for Inter-American Affairs and officers from the Brazil Desk were present. On our side Minister Sergio Amaral and Counsellor Roberto Jaguaribe attended the meeting.

2. Einhorn looked for more information on the evolution of the Brazilian initiatives on non-proliferation and export controls, obviously concerned about the delays for Congressional approval. We apprised the American side of the efforts exerted by the government to speed up the examination of these draft bills, especially the contacts maintained by Your Excellency with party leaders and parliamentarians who have a responsibility or are interested in the matter. We indicated the absence of positions against the project of export controls and that the amendments to the Treaty of Tlatelolco were also well received. We also mentioned the remaining resistances to the quadripartite safeguards agreement. Although a minority, the group has some influence over the Rapporteur of the draft bill at the Foreign Affairs Committee. In answer to a question from Einhorn I mentioned that the objections to the agreement stem from perceptions that it introduces discriminatory and intrusive elements. I denied that members of the Armed Forces might be working in the Congress to prevent its approval. On the other hand, we reaffirmed that the commitment of the Executive for the approval of the agreement permitted to foresee a positive conclusion still during the first semester.

3. Einhorn made clear that the Brazilian delay in implementing those initiatives was encouraging the perception that the government had lost interest in the issue or had ceased to consider it a priority. He made a point to compare unfavorably the Brazilian delay with the additional steps taken by Argentina in this field. On our part, we corrected Einhorn's impression that that there had not been positive recent evolution from Brazil recalling the implementation and start of effective operation of ABAGCC and the understanding with the IAEA for the negotiation of subsidiary arrangements. We also corrected the perception that the issue had been put in the backburner or that there had been a change in the basic guidelines of government action. I informed him that the inter-ministerial consultations regarding our stand on the MTCR were in an advanced stage, and the same applied to the Australia Group. We were only awaiting the course of the export control draft bill in the House in order to adopt a position. I argued that this did not prevent the evolution of the necessary technical detailing, including the elaboration of lists for the full implementation of the controls. Einhorn seemed very interested in this evolution and suggested that when the issue was ripe to become public we could consult again with a view to utilizing the political benefits that might derive from our declaration.

4. Maclean also mentioned to the evolution of the bilateral understandings and especially to the exchange of notes on strategic trade and the eventual reaping of the benefits from 5k. He asked whether progress in this area also depended only on the evolution of the draft export control bill in the Congress. We said that such evolution was indispensable but that there were also some points to be adjusted in the letters, which, however, should not raise major difficulties.

5. Einhorn demonstrated special interest in the Brazilian space program and did not

conceal his effort to discourage it. He used the classic argument of its economic and commercial lack of viability and suggested that several countries similar to Brazil had abandoned the idea of having a program of launchers. He showed great interest in learning more details about the program, especially the complete spatial mission. We clarified that the Brazilian space program was not a short term objective but a long term commitment already set, with full support of the society. We also mentioned the special situation of Alcântara, the commercial prospects of a less ambitious program, the offers already received in this connection, corroborated by the interest of Lockheed itself and the legitimacy of our aspiration in this sector. To this we added our priority interest in providing evidence of our commitment to peaceful use and to the non-proliferation of this technology. We recalled our meeting with the MTCR mission, when the space program was explained in detail and declared out availability and interest in providing to Einhorn more detailed explanations. Finally, we recalled the project of creation of the Brazilian space agency which will receive a new push after the launching witnessed by President Itamar from the base at Alcântara in the last few days. Web sounded out our interlocutors about the receptiveness of the United States to broader cooperation with Brazil in the spatial field, mentioning especially the triangular project with the participation of Lockheed. Einhorn reiterated that the accession to MTCR and the creation of the space agency were very positive and welcome measures but that they did not warrant access to the technology of launchers. He recalled that the legislation of the United States led it to apply sanctions against countries that transferred or received certain technologies related to the space field.

7. The conversation was positive and permitted a very important first contact with Einhorn and the ensuing clarification of some doubts about the intentions of the Itamar government on export controls and non-proliferation. It also showed the relevance that the new American administration attaches to these questions, to a higher degree than its predecessor. It also allowed us to make clear during the meeting that the most relevant issue to Brazil in this dialogue with the United States is possibly the process of growing mutual confidence already established. In this sense, it is important to continue the understandings achieved with previous high level missions as well as contacts in the technical level. It is not necessary to reiterate the importance of constant follow-up at the Congress with regard to the draft bills under examination with a view to its swift approval. RUBENS BARBOSA".

RICUPERO