

**June 13, 1967**  
**Telegram from Ambassador Trivedi, 'Non-Aligned Meeting'**

**Citation:**

"Telegram from Ambassador Trivedi, 'Non-Aligned Meeting'", June 13, 1967, Wilson Center Digital Archive, File No. HI/1012(48)/67. Obtained by Ryan Musto.  
<https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/133988>

**Summary:**

Different points of Mexico and Brazil on the denuclearization treaty of Latin America

**Credits:**

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

**Original Language:**

English

**Contents:**

Transcript - English

Non-Aligned Meeting - June 7th

Sent by Trivedi on June 13

No: AMB/DIS/67

...4th meeting of the non-aligned group of this session was held on the 7th of June, with Osman of the UAR in the chair...

...Silveira said that Brazil knew that we could not hope to have an "exact" balance in the treaty. The basic question was: Are we ready to sign a non-proliferation treaty without any obligations on the nuclear-weapon powers? Certain obligations inevitably fell on the nuclear-weapon powers, for example, a halt in the nuclear arms race, guarantees of security, an assurance regarding the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy by non-nuclear-weapon powers. While the non-nuclear powers could agree to the nuclear-weapon powers having a monopoly of nuclear weapons, it would be completely wrong to let the nuclear-weapon powers enjoy a monopoly of nuclear research as well, as then we would be surrendering ourselves to the will of the nuclear-weapon powers.

Castaneda of Mexico remarked that while he agreed that there were certain essential elements in a balance of obligations, he would stress the fact that a non-proliferation treaty was a valuable objective worth seeking for its own sake. Again, it was a limited objective, because we could not hope to achieve nuclear disarmament under a non-proliferation treaty. He would also like to stress that there was no question of "compensation" in a non-proliferation treaty. As an example, there was the question of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, for which the nuclear-weapon powers had to assume obligations. In the Mexican view, the assumption of such obligations by the nuclear-weapon powers should not be looked on as a compensatory measure but as a valid objective in itself...

...Silveira of Brazil said that a non-proliferation treaty should not become dogma, nor should the non-aligned accept semantic interpretations. It was obvious that the balance of obligations could not be a mechanical one and that the obligations to be undertaken should be valid themselves.