

Brazil and the nuclear issues in the years of the Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva government (2003-2010)

O Brasil e as questões nucleares nos anos do governo de Luís Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010)

CARLO PATTI*

Rev. Bras. Polít. Int. 53 (2): 178-197 [2010]

Introduction

Since the Brazilian participation in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission in 1946, Brazilian foreign policy has given special consideration to nuclear issues. In the last sixty years, with democratic and military governments, one of the country's goals was the development of an autonomous nuclear industry through the acquisition of technology for enriching the uranium found in the country. Brazil was a persistent opponent of the unequal non-proliferation agreement that divided the world into two groups of countries – those with and those without a nuclear military capability, and which reflected the order established by the two Cold War superpowers. The end of the bipolar system marked an important change in the Brazilian attitude.

With the process of democratization and the change in the international system, Brazil gradually adhered to the regimes of nuclear non-proliferation, eventually signing the Non-Treaty in 1998, and becoming one of the most significant supporters of global disarmament and denuclearization.

During the presidency of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010), the nuclear questions continued to have crucial importance for an emerging country such as Brazil. Brazilian diplomacy in fact had played a prominent role in the international negotiations involving atomic issues. Indeed Itamaraty (the Brazilian Ministry for Foreign Affairs) participated not only in the initiatives for strengthening the NPT, with the 2005 and 2010 review conferences, but recently brokered a nuclear deal between the nuclear weapon states (NWS), as well trying to revive the talks with Iran, which has been accused of developing a clandestine nuclear military program.

Thus nuclear diplomacy has represented a fundamental part of President Luiz Inácio Lula Da Silva's strategy to make Brazil a central player in the

* PhD Candidate in History of International Relations at the University of Firenze, Italy (carlo.patti@unifi.it).

international system, in addition to the long-standing ambition of obtaining a permanent seat in the United Nations Security Council. Functioning as a *bridge* between the North and the South of the world, Brazil has maintained cordial relations with Washington, both under the George W. Bush and the Barack Obama administrations, even if the Brazilian President and his Foreign Minister Celso Amorim expressed national autonomy in terms of US actions. Furthermore the President has implemented forms of strong South-South cooperation through new forums search as the BRIC countries (Brazil-Russia-India-China), the IBS countries (India-Brazil-South Africa) and other instruments of bilateral and multilateral diplomacy in the global and regional context.

The object of the present article is to analyze the Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva's position on nuclear issues through the analysis of the major actions of Brazilian diplomacy during the last eight years and the implementation of a national nuclear program.

Aspects of continuity in the Brazilian nuclear diplomacy from Cardoso to da Silva

In the years before his election the President expressed a strong criticism of ex-President Fernando Henrique Cardoso's decision of adhering to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. As Presidential candidate of the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT – Workers' Party) in 1998 and 2002 Luiz Inácio Lula Da Silva considered that policy to represent adhesion to an alignment with the United States and with an unequal international order represented by the treaty¹. The action that the current President has taken during his administration has, however, revealed a substantial weakness in those statements that represented more electoral rhetoric than an actual plan for his international agenda, even if prominent members of his cabinet and in Brazilian diplomacy released controversial declarations.

In fact the Minister of Science and Technology, Roberto Amaral, resigned in 2004 after implying that Brazil should not forgo the possibility of obtaining nuclear weapon technology². Some years later, in 2006, the Ministry of Foreign Relations issued a note in order to deny any possible withdrawal from the NPT after the presumed statement of Ambassador Samuel Pinheiro Guimarães, then Secretary-General of Itamaraty, about the future permanence of Brazil within the international agreement³. Finally, recent personal declarations of the Vice-

1 Considered particularly controversial was Lula's speech before a military audience in 2002 when he underlined the Brazilian acceptance of an unfair international order. See Hall, Kevin G. (2002). "Leftist Lula would shift Brazil's tack with U.S.: Presidential candidate warms to Cuba. Mass support comes from citizens who feel jilted by a decade of Washington-style economics". *The Montreal Gazette*

2 In CDI (May 2004), "Brazil's Nuclear Ambitions", Available at The Center for Defense Information [<http://www.cdi.org/friendlyversion/printversion.cfm?documentID=2200>].

3 See Ministério das Relações Exteriores (November 2006). *Posição do Brasil sobre Desarmamento e Não Proliferação Nuclear*, Note No. 625, Available at Sala de Imprensa do MRE [www.mre.gov.br].

President of Brazil, José Alencar, about the necessity of having an atomic bomb in order to join the club of the great powers caused much international controversy that forced the Government to distance itself from Alencar's position⁴. Notwithstanding these personal positions the President has confirmed the Brazilian commitment to the idea of nuclear non-proliferation.

After a long process following the end of the Cold War and the establishment of a mutual trust with Argentina, Brazil adhered to the main international nuclear non-proliferation agreements. Between 1991 and 1994 Brazil created a bilateral nuclear non-proliferation agreement with Argentina through the creation of a bi-national agency for accounting for and controlling nuclear materials (ABACC-Agência Brasileiro-Argentina de Contabilidade e Controle de Materiais Nucleares). It became a model for other regions and the 1994 IAEA-ABACC-Argentina-Brazil agreement imposed inspections and a full system of safeguards on every nuclear activity in both countries. It created an regime equivalent to the NPT for the two countries in a period when they still opposed the global treaty.

The move toward inclusion in international agreements continued in 1994 when Brazil became a full member of the Latin American Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone, modifying the reservations posed in 1967 to its participation. Brazil reiterated its formal renunciation to its right to cause peaceful nuclear explosions and above all implemented the Tlatelolco agreement⁵.

Brazil was the last major country to adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), when it ratified the treaty in 1998. This marked the end of the so-called “*golden decade*” of the NPT that began in 1986 with the US-USSR Reykjavik agreements and ended in 1998 with the Brazilian decision⁶. In those twelve years many nuclear powers became parties to the treaty or adhered to it, renouncing all nuclear ambitions. France and China, the other two official NWS (Nuclear Weapon States) recognized by the NPT, entered the agreement in 1991 and 1992, respectively. The end of the Cold War and the removal of any nuclear external threat, along with the process of full democratization, led South

4 On the latest declaration by Alencar on the nuclear weapons see Sibaja, Marco (September 25, 2009) *José Alencar, Brazil VP, says country should build nuclear arms*. Available at Huffington Post at [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/09/25/jose-alencar-brazil-vp-sa_n_300187.html] and Monteiro, Tânia (April 14, 2010). “Bomba iraniana pode ser para defesa” diz Alencar”. *Estado de São Paulo*. Nelson Jobim, current Brazilian Minister of Defense took a different position from the Vice-President stating that Brazil opposes any kind of nuclear proliferation, above all in the Middle East. (April 14 2010), “Jobim discorda de Alencar e contesta arma nuclear no Irã”. *Estado de São Paulo*.

5 Brazil announced the change to its traditional defense of the right to carry out peaceful nuclear explosions (PNE) in September 1990 at the UN General Assembly. It is important to consider that in the same year the great superpowers agreed to suspend their PNEs indefinitely. On the Brazilian position in 1990 see Caixeta Arraes, Virgílio [2005]. “O Brasil e o Conselho de Segurança da Organização das Nações Unidas: dos anos 90 a 2002”. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 48 (2): 152-168. The Brazilian negotiator for full membership of the Tlatelolco Treaty was Ambassador José Viegas Filho. Interview with the author, Rome: February 10, 2010.

6 At the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting in Reykjavik the leaders of the two superpowers agreed informally to reduce substantially their nuclear arsenals revitalizing the talks on global disarmament interrupted in 1979. See Fisher, Beth A. (2010). “US foreign policy under Reagan and Bush”. *Cambridge History of the Cold War*, Vol 3., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 288.

Africa, with an undeclared military nuclear program, to dismantle its military arsenal and join the NPT in 1993⁷. President Menem of Argentina, took a similar decision in 1995 some months before the beginning of the NPT Review and Extension Conference. The decision to extend the treaty indefinitely, along with the US and Russian commitment toward general nuclear disarmament, created a situation that in 1995 relegated Brazil to a small club of opponents to the NPT whose main participants were India, Pakistan and Israel, countries with a nuclear military capability not recognized as atomic powers by the treaty.

Although its criticism concerning the unequal nature of the NPT remained valid, Brazil had to enter it because both of the changed international context and the growing international consensus around the treaty. As President Cardoso's Foreign Minister Lampreia stated, adherence to the treaty was a matter of concern for Brazil because it represented, in a period when a possible reform of the Security Council appeared close and Brazil was a possible candidate for permanent membership, a strong lack of international credibility for a democratic government. The decision taken by the couple Cardoso-Lampreia was shared by the majority of the Brazilian diplomacy. As a consequence, in 1997 the Brazilian Government signed the Treaty and ratified it in 1998.

The new Brazilian attitude towards non-proliferation appeared clear when the international regime was seriously threatened, that is to say when the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan took place in May 1998. Brazil joined a coalition of non-nuclear states from the North and the South of the planet calling for an end of Indian and Pakistani nuclear activities and for the full accordance with NPT objectives, such as renouncing nuclear weapons and the immediate adherence to the agreement. The NAC (New Agenda Coalition) composed predominantly of medium-sized powers, became the origin of many proposals for global denuclearization. The centrality of Brazil in that context was evident by its active participation in discussions about a world free from nuclear weapons, with a commitment that remained constant in the passage between the administrations of Presidents Cardoso and da Silva. Brazil, as an NAC member, was one of the main proponents of the 13-step grading progress toward nuclear disarmament. The proposal represented the core of the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference and permitted the main nuclear powers to escape political deadlock.

Continuing President Cardoso's policy, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva and his new Foreign Minister, Celso Amorim, maintained nuclear non-proliferation as a central goal of Brazilian foreign policy. In 2003, some days before the inauguration, Brasilia criticized the North Korean decision of withdrawing from the NPT and requested its immediate re-integration in the agreement⁸.

7 On the South African nuclear program see van Wyk, Martha (2010). "Sunset over Apartheid: United States-South African nuclear relations, 1981-93". *Cold War History*, 10:1, pp-51-79.

8 See Ministério das Relações Exteriores, *Tratado para a Não-Proliferação Nuclear (TNP)*. Nota nº 14. January 12, 2003. [www.mre.gov.br]. (Accessed on February 15, 2010).

The necessary conservation of the agreement in all its aspects became a strong commitment on the part of Itamaraty and it was confirmed by the election of Ambassador Sergio de Queiroz Duarte as President of the 2005 NPT conference review. Despite Brazilian activism for reaching a consensus as had happened in 2000, and despite several months of preparatory works, the conference ended without a final document because of an impasse connected to North Korean and Iranian issues, and to the negative attitude of the United States and Russian governments towards effective disarmament⁹.

The efforts in this field of the da Silva administration were recognized in 2007 when the United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon announced the appointment of Ambassador Duarte as the High Representative for Disarmament at the level of Under-Secretary-General. The second term of the Brazilian President's administration coincided with more incisive action on nuclear issues, as we will see later in the case of the Iran, with the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

The goal of global disarmament represented another point of agreement between Cardoso's and da Silva's diplomatic action. Brazilian foreign policy was guided not only by Article 21 of the 1988 Brazilian Constitution, which bans any nuclear weapon from the country, but above all by a demand from by the National Congress in 1998. At the moment of the NPT ratification the Brazilian congress expressed to the government a precise condition: the fulfillment of Article VI of the NPT that determines the obligation for the nuclear states to dismantle their nuclear arsenals. Although it could appear irrelevant to an understanding of the Brazilian foreign policy over the last 12 years, the demand by Congress represents a point of convergence between the different sides of the Brazilian political spectrum. If adherence to the NPT was a crucial question for the liberal elements in Brazilian politics, the need to overcome the inequalities between Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) and the Non-Nuclear Weapon States (NNWS) was the main matter of concern for a good part of the nationalist and leftist wing of the Parliament¹⁰.

In recent years both administrations in Brazil have taken a critical attitude towards the failed commitment of the United States of adhering to the CTBT

9 According to Wrobel the 2005 NPT Review Conference failed because of three factors. The first was the unilateralism promoted by the G.W. Bush administration that led a coalition of states to a war against Iraq because of the supposed possession of weapons of mass destruction by Saddam Hussein's regime. The second reason was the North Korean withdrawal from the NPT in 2003 after having announced its status as a country with nuclear weapons. It caused a three-year impasse in the negotiations in the Korean peninsula and saw the end of the diplomatic efforts conducted by the governments of Pyongyang, Seoul, Beijing, Washington, Tokyo and Moscow. The third factor was the Iranian nuclear program that was suspected of developing the clandestine construction of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the tension present in the Middle East did not allow, in 2005 or in 2010, the achievement of the goal of establishing a nuclear weapon free zone in the area. On the 2005 NPT Review see Wrobel, Paulo (2005). "Falhanço inevitável ou oportunidade perdida?" *O Mundo em Português*. N° 29. August-September 2005. Available at IEEI.pt [<http://www.ieei.pt/publicacoes/artigo.php?artigo=14>].

10 The necessity of following the Congressional demand was recently brought to mind by Foreign Minister Amorim. In MINISTÉRIO DAS RELAÇÕES EXTERIORES [2010] Chanceler Amorim no Canal Livre. Available online at Sala de Imprensa – MRE [<http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/videos/chanceler-amorim-no-canal-livre/?searchterm=nuclear>] (Accessed on May 20, 2010)

(Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty). Even though it was strongly supported by Washington during the Clinton administration that signed it in 1996, the US Senate refused to ratify it in 1999 because of the perceived weakness of the agreement for non-nuclear proliferation after the 1998 Indo-Pakistani crisis. Brazilian disappointment, throughout the George W. Bush administration, was caused by the resumption of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and the consequent lack of consensus between the United States and the Russian Federation concerning the signing of the START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) III for a substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals.

If all the nuclear powers were criticized for the paralysis in their commitment to NPT article VI, a turning point can be considered, also from the Itamaraty perspective, as being President Obama's 2009 speech in Prague. The new American President demonstrated a substantial change of the US position in the nuclear field with a three-part strategy: a) to propose measures to reduce and eventually eliminate existing nuclear arsenals; b) to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional states; c) to prevent non-nuclear states from acquiring nuclear weapons or materials¹¹.

President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva and his Foreign Minister welcomed the new American attitude, hoping for a positive development of this strategy. Although the Iranian and North Korean cases increased US disillusion, and despite strong internal opposition towards the full renunciation of the first nuclear strike capability and of nuclear weapons in general, a concrete step toward the Prague objectives was the signature of the new START in April 2010 between the two former superpowers. This treaty, after the difficulties of the Clinton and Bush administrations, marked the decisive resumption of the path towards the global nuclear disarmament¹². The new course of US nuclear policy has been generally supported by the current Brazilian administration. Notwithstanding some recent disagreements over the Iranian nuclear program, that will be discussed later, a cordial and frank dialogue has marked the US-Brazil relationship in the nuclear field.

Since 1996, however, a controversial point has characterized Brazilian participation in the nuclear non-proliferation regime. Although the 1994 Quadripartite Agreement imposes a full range of safeguards concerning nuclear activities, Brazil refuses to participate in an additional measure to the NPT, namely the IAEA Additional Protocol to the Safeguards Agreement. The Additional Protocol is a legal document granting the IAEA complementary inspection authority to that provided in underlying safeguards agreements. One

11 For a full reference to the speech delivered by the US President Barack Obama in Prague on April 5, 2009 see [<http://prague.usembassy.gov/obama.html>](Accessed on May 20, 2010).

12 It is worth mentioning that the whole path toward global disarmament follows specific steps. After the agreement between Russia and the United States, the negotiations will be opened up to the rest of the states that own nuclear weapons for a broader agreement over the effective dismantling of the nuclear arsenals. This action is to be implemented along with the full admission of the unofficial nuclear states in the NPT after their renunciation of their atomic devices.

of its main aims is to enable the IAEA inspectorate to provide assurance about both declared and possible undeclared activities. Under the Protocol, the IAEA is granted expanded rights of access to information and sites¹³. Intense negotiations for stricter safeguard measures took place between 1996 and 1998.

Even if the Brazilian opposition began during the Cardoso presidency, it became a matter of international concern during the years of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. A relevant part of the international community, especially the United States, insisted on including the Additional Protocol as a part of the NPT¹⁴. With an advanced nuclear program, the Brazilian position was deeply criticized in 2004 after the inauguration of the enriching uranium plant in the nuclear fuel factory of the INB (Brazilian Nuclear Industries) in Resende, in the state of Rio de Janeiro. Between March and November 2004 negotiations took place between the IAEA and Brazil about adjusting the international inspections to suit the need of preserving national technology. Through an agreement with the IAEA the Brazilian government agreed to protect the centrifuges from visual inspections using panels, without prejudicing the verification of the nuclear material. Notwithstanding this subsidiary agreement, the issue still remains central today in the IAEA-Brazil relations, not only with regard to activities related to the Resende plant, but also to the similar Navy plant in Aramar and the nuclear reactor plant developing a submarine engine¹⁵.

Besides the IAEA negotiations, the Brazilian refusal to adhere to the Additional Protocol was a source of tensions between the Bush administration and the Brazilian government. In June 2004 Brent Scowcroft, then chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, deeply Criticized The Brazilian Nuclear Program In An Article In *The Washington Post*¹⁶. Comparing

13 The need for more incisive inspections emerged when the IAEA discovered that Iraq, a signatory to the NPT and with a safeguard agreement with IAEA, had developed a clandestine nuclear program between 1981 and 1991. The goal of the program, initiated after the Israeli bombing of an Iraqi reactor in 1980, was to build atomic weapons. The revelations about this project shocked the international agency since the research buildings had been built near an official and declared research reactor.

14 It is important to underline that a growing number of States are ratifying the Additional Protocol. In 2003 Iran signed the Additional Protocol but did not ratify it. See Flemes, Daniel [2006]. "Brazil's Nuclear Policy From Technological Dependence to Civil Nuclear Power". Hamburg: GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies. p. 7. Although the nuclear powers are not obliged to adhere to full range of safeguards, one of the last decisions of President G.W. Bush was to ratify the Additional Protocol on December 30, 2008. This decision may be considered a confidence-building measure by the US government. See "The US ratifies the IAEA Additional Protocol", (January 6, 2009). Available at Arms Control. [<http://www.armscontrol.org/node/3489>]. (Accessed on May 15, 2010). A total of 101 states have ratified additional protocols and another 29 have signed them. For details see the IAEA Web site at: [http://www.iaea.org/OurWork/SV/Safeguards/sg_protocol.html]. (Accessed on May 18, 2010).

15 After his last visit to Brazil, on March 2010, the IAEA director Yukija Amano renewed his criticisms concerning the impossibility of inspecting the centrifuges. Nougayrède, Natalie (May 30, 2010), "Le programme nucléaire du Brésil suscite des doutes". *Le Monde*.

16 It is important to state that the State Department did not oppose the Brazilian nuclear program. There was a division within the former US administration. One faction constituted by the non-proliferation specialists, who elaborated the G.W. Bush nuclear doctrine, considered Brazil a threat to the nuclear agreement because

Brazil to Iran, in a period when the latter state had already ambitions in the area of uranium enrichment, he wrote: “acquiescing in the Brazilian enrichment program would have the effect of dividing nuclear power aspirants into good guys and bad”. In this context he did not see a legitimate ambition justified by the NPT and guaranteed by IAEA inspections, but a threat for the whole nuclear proliferation regime coming from an opponent to the Additional Protocol¹⁷. The Scowcroft position was confirmed during the works of the Independent Panel on a More Secure World and Strengthened United Nations, convoked in 2004 by the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan in order to strengthen the international organization on its 60th anniversary. As reported by the Brazilian delegate, Ambassador Baena Soares, Scowcroft proposed in the draft report of the panel a moratorium on the construction of enrichment facilities because of the risk connected to a possible proliferation of nuclear weapons. This proposal, opposed by Baena Soares in a letter to Annan, directly involved the Brazilian plant¹⁸. Although a report by the panel to the UN General Assembly was planned to be delivered in 2005, the idea of moratorium was softened and all the negotiations about non-proliferation failed after the unsuccessful 2005 NPT review¹⁹.

Any doubt on the part of the US government concerning the Brazilian position on the nuclear proliferation agreement was made definitively clear in a bilateral meeting between Celso Amorim and Secretary of State Colin Powell. In October 2004, during an official visit to Brazil, Powell stated: “Brazil is not a potential proliferator... In fact, it reportedly has agreed to allow the UN atomic watchdog agency to see parts of the centrifuges. Having renounced plans for nuclear weapons in 1990, Brazil wants to keep its reputation as a peace advocate²⁰”.

the Latin American country could represent a model for some ‘proliferating’ states such as Iran or North Korea. As a matter of fact, immediately after the Brazilian announcement of the inauguration of the Resende plant a State Department official called on Brazil to implement all IAEA safeguards at its nuclear plants and to adopt an additional protocol on non-proliferation. On the other side, the US position was modified by the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere when he told reporters: “We believe they (Brazil) are committed to meeting their international obligations and this is a matter that is best handled by the IAEA in a multilateral way. We do not want to make this a bilateral issue, because quite frankly the US has confidence that Brazil is a responsible actor. See US quite confident about Brazil’s intentions over nuclear technology”. *Agence France Presse – English version*. Wednesday April 14, 2004. (Accessed on May 15, 2010).

17 See Scowcroft, Brent (June 24, 2004), “A Critical Nuclear Moment”, *The Washington Post*, Thursday page A25. Available at *The Washington Post* website [<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A1027-2004Jun23.html>] (Accessed on May 13, 2010). It is interesting to notice the similarity between the US strategy to ‘freeze’ the Brazilian nuclear program in the 1970s, with the Carter administration, and under the G. W. Bush administration. In both cases the United States had the aim of establishing an international ‘bank’ for nuclear fuel under IAEA supervision limiting any national ambition of enriching uranium.

18 For the portuguese translation of the letter sent to the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, and to the IAEA Director Mohammed El Baradei see Baena Soares, João Clemente (2005), “Nossa responsabilidade comum”, in *Política Externa*, Vol. 14, N. 12, p. 52-54.

19 United Nations. (2005). In “Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All: Report of the Secretary-General”. New York: United Nations, Dept. of Public Information.

20 On the Powell’s declaration see “Brazil’s Mantle of Leadership”. *Christian Science Monitor*, October 10, 2004.

Even if an open crisis between Brasília and Washington was avoided on subject of the Additional Protocol and its application to the Brazilian plants, the matter continued to represent an important issue at the nuclear non-proliferation discussions. A constant and growing number of signatories of this non-compulsory agreement are giving more credibility to this agreement. In a recent interview Minister Amorim, on the contrary, affirmed that the issue was not central to the reform of the NPT and underlined the Brazilian right to preserve its industrial secrets.²¹ In the future, however, it is possible that this position, which has remained the same since the years of the Cardoso presidency, might be modified in the face of stronger international pressure over the inclusion of the Additional Protocol in the Non-Proliferation Treaty²².

The central role of Celso Amorim

Despite all the ideological differences and the different ideas that have emerged in the Brazilian foreign policy, there is a central element that constantly marked Brazilian diplomacy: the presence of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva's Foreign Minister Celso Amorim. Amorim held this post between 1993 and 1995, during the Itamar Franco administration, was Brazilian permanent representative at the United Nations in New York in the Cardoso years, and played a central role in the whole process of insertion of Brazil in the nuclear non-proliferation agreements. It is worth recalling that he headed Itamaraty when the Tlatelolco treaty and the Quadripartite Agreement were implemented and ratified. In 1995 he was an observer of the quasi-universal consensus on the Non-Proliferation Treaty after the review and extension conference that took place in New York that year. He contributed to shaping Brazilian foreign policy in the form of renewing a strong position in relation to denuclearization and disarmament.

The work he has done from 1993 until 2010 can be compared to the Brazilian commitment to the independent foreign policy of the years that preceded the military dictatorship. This appears clear not only from the 1997 signature of the NPT, but above all by the Brazilian participation in a coalition of middle-level and neutral powers that, as in the 1960s, promoted the goal of full disarmament

21 For the declaration by the Brazilian foreign minister see Ministério das Relações Exteriores (March 2010) Chanceler Amorim no Canal Livre Available online at Sala da Imprensa do MRE [<http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/videos/chanceler-amorim-no-canal-livre/?searchterm=nuclear>]. (Accessed on April 28, 2010).

22 The encouragement of the universalization of the Additional Protocol was one of the realistic outcomes expected by the 2010 NPT conference review. This goal was constantly underlined during the preceding meetings in preparation for the 2010 conference. See Chouby, Deepty (2009). "Restoring the NPT. Essential Steps for 2010". Washington DC, United States: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, p.27. Joseph Nye, one of the main US experts on nuclear strategy and author of the concept of 'soft power', recently requested the immediate Brazilian adhesion to the IAEA Additional Protocol. See Simon, Roberto. "Brasil deve assinar o protocolo adicional do TNP". *Estado de São Paulo*. April 11, 2010. Furthermore the Brazilian debate was enriched before the conference by the positions expressed by Rubens Ricupero, former UN deputy secretary-General, and Samuel Pinheiro Guimarães respectively in favor and in opposition to Brazilian adhesion to the Additional Protocol. *Folha de São Paulo*. April 10, 2010.

and denuclearization or carried out the role of negotiators in the nuclear crisis, as was the case of Brazil in Cuba in 1962²³.

The clearest evidence of this continuation and of the new course of the Brazilian policy may be identified in the Amorim's participation in the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Established as an independent commission in November 1995 by the Australian Government, led by the then Prime Minister John Keating, its report was issued in August 1996 and presented to the UNGA at the end of September. The *Canberra Report*, after having highlighted the main points of the nuclear debate, proposed the necessary steps to eliminate nuclear weapons²⁴. The Canberra Commission was composed of key actors of both governmental and non-governmental origin and became the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation discussions of the following years. Hence all the requests for disarmament from the middle-level powers relied on this report that, for the first time after the end of the Cold War, represented a new position, overcoming the traditional rivalry between the NWS and the NNWS. Former opponents to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, such as South Africa and Brazil, neither their traditional attitude in favour of proposing a new agenda. The importance of that experience, and the need for accomplishing the still unfulfilled Canberra goals, was recalled by Foreign Minister Amorim in February 2010 in Paris during the summit meeting of the 'Global Zero' organization²⁵. His action and, in general, the Brazilian attitude, continued to follow the pro-disarmament spirit that Amorim had showed during his participation in the UN meetings, in the Disarmament Commission, in the General Assembly, and above all in the Security Council where Brazil has had a seat several times during the last years.

The most relevant point to be considered was Amorim's action in promoting the success of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Brazil, along with the other countries of the New Agenda Coalition, had a central role in elaborating the 13 steps toward nuclear disarmament that formed the core of the final declaration of

23 For an account of the Brazilian position during the Cuban missile crisis see Wrobel, Paulo. 1993. "Diplomacia Nuclear Brasileira: Não Proliferação e o Tratado de Tlatelolco". *Contexto Internacional*, Volume 15, Número 1, Janeiro-Julho 1993, and Hershberg J. G., "The United States, Brazil and the Cuban missile crisis, 1962 (Part 2)", *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol.6 No.3, Summer 2004.

24 First of all the Report requested the nuclear weapon states' commitment to a nuclear weapon-free world and recommended the following immediate steps: Taking nuclear forces off alert; Removing warheads from delivery vehicles; Ending deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons; Ending nuclear testing; Initiating negotiations to further reduce US and Russian nuclear arsenals; Reaching an agreement among the nuclear weapon states of reciprocal no first use undertakings, and of a non-use undertaking by Them in relation to the non-nuclear weapon states. In addition to them the Report stressed the other measures that NWS had to prevent further horizontal proliferation. See Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons (August 1996), "Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. p. 11-12.

25 In February 2010 during the Global Zero meeting Amorim recognized that the policy for abolishing nuclear weapons still relies on the Canberra Report. For Amorim's speech see "Palestra do Ministro Celso Amorim na Reunião de Cúpula da organização *Global Zero: a world without nuclear weapons*" – Paris, 2 de fevereiro de 2010 Available at Política Externa [<http://www.politicaexterna.com/archives/8481#axzz0n3kUDdjB>]. (Accessed on February 10,2010).

the conference. Although the Minister was a strong supporter of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, as were many other key members of the da Silva administration, he did not change his position concerning nuclear non-proliferation. In recent years he has insisted on promoting Brazilian action in the NPT and in assuming an important role in the negotiations concerning the current and future status of the non-proliferation regime. Amorim has defended strenuously the Brazilian attitude in relation to 'soft power' for dealing with the recent crises in the international system. Since the beginning of the da Silva administration he has succeeded in making a synthesis between promoting the PT's traditional values in foreign policy, search as the request for a fairer international and multilateral system, with the position of the former government that was oriented toward full inclusion in the Non Proliferation Treaty. He has consequently provided continuity, conciliating the action of the two governments²⁶.

New elements of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva's diplomacy: mediation between Teheran and the nuclear powers

The continuing presence of Amorim deeply influenced Brazilian foreign policy and allowed Brazil to have a coherent attitude for many years. Nevertheless it is possible to find many elements of discontinuity with the previous administration.

During recent years the Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva's nuclear diplomacy has been dominated by the attempt to play a central role in the negotiations between Teheran and other nuclear powers, above all the United States and Russia, concerning the Iranian nuclear program. The Government of Teheran, full member of the NPT, in fact, is suspected of carrying out a clandestine military project for the enrichment of uranium. Iran presents powerful reasons to justify its right to enrich uranium, but the nuclear powers do not believe this rationale and consider more likely the possibility that Iran is building nuclear weapons in order to deter the threat coming from other countries in the area, particularly Israel. It is important to remember that the belt of states from China to Israel is almost completely equipped with nuclear weapons with the exception of Iran. Security concerns could, consequently, give an explanation for a further proliferation in the area for a state like Iran that is the object of threats from the United States, Arab states, and above all Israel, whose secret service has been warning the international community for more than ten years about possible nuclear devices in Iran. The threat was, furthermore, perceived of an Iranian missile program

26 In order to overcome the unequal distribution of international power and to encourage nuclear disarmament Amorim declared: "This is not only a source of imbalance, but of illegitimacy in the decisions of the council. We have to reform it, make it more representative," he said in defending the inclusion of Brazil, Japan, South Africa and Germany, countries that do not have nuclear weapons. "That could end this imbalance." VIEIRA, Isabela. "Amorim Maintains That Nuclear Disarmament Is Tied To UN Security Council Reform". *Agência Brasil*. April 8, 2010.

directed against the countries in the area and for uranium enrichment facilities undeclared to the IAEA, that were announced only in September 2009²⁷.

On October 1st, 2009 however, the IAEA together with the so-called P5+1 (United States-China-France-United Kingdom-Russia + Germany) reached a compromise with Iran over a possible swap of uranium for low enriched uranium (at the rate of 3.5%) for medical uses. Under the agreement, Iran would send about 1,200 kilograms of its Low Enriched Uranium (LEU), 75% of the enriched uranium owned by Teheran, to Russia for further enrichment. France would then turn that enriched uranium of Russian origin into fuel for the Teheran Research Reactor. That reactor has been operating on Argentine fuel since 1993 and it was expected to run out of fuel “in roughly the next year, year and a half”²⁸. The agreement reached “in principle” between Teheran and the P5+1 appeared a necessary step for creating mutual trust for further negotiations, after the announcement of the secret enrichment facility that isolated Iran also from China and Russia.

After an initial acceptance of the deal, Teheran refused to implement it due to the lack of the necessary guarantees of the delivery of nuclear material and to the opposition of the most conservative sectors of the Iranian regime. The beginning of the Iranian procedure of uranium enrichment until 20% in February opened the path to a new round of economic sanctions issued by the Security Council after a US proposal²⁹.

The resolution of the Iranian nuclear threat dominated the debate in the international community during the whole period from December 2009, when US President Obama stated the possibility of further negotiations with Iran by the end of the year, until the decisions of the Security Council in June 2010.

Brazil played a central role in the whole negotiation of the final six months, coinciding with its presence in the UN Security Council as a non-permanent member. Before analyzing the Brazilian effort in that mediation, Iran-Brazil relations need to be considered.

Despite the geographical distance and the deep difference of the political regimes, bilateral relations between Brazil and Iran have improved significantly over the years. With bilateral trade of more than US\$ 2 billion, the Iranian market has become important for the growing Brazilian economy. Iran, another key-country in the emerging world, fits in with President Luiz Inácio Lula da

27 At the end of September 2009, as well as the first one at Natanz, the IAEA revealed the existence of a second Iranian uranium enrichment facility Crail, Peter (October, 2009). “Secret Iranian Uranium Enrichment Facility revealed”. Published at Arms Control Today [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009_10/Iran]. (Accessed on April 14, 2010).

28 Crail, Peter (November, 2009). “Iranian Response to LEU Fuel Deal Unclear”. Published at Arms Control Today [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009_11/Iran] (Accessed on April 14, 2010).

29 Iglese, Simone and Scolese, Eduardo (April 16, 2010). “Amorim diz que Índia e China têm “afinidade” com proposta de diálogo com Irã”. Published at Folha Online. (Accessed on April 20, 2010).

Silva's plan of developing important relations with the main actors in 'the South'. The relationship with Teheran is to be inserted in the South-South cooperation of Brazil with the major countries of other continents as China, India, Russia, and South Africa³⁰.

Friendly relations with the Islamic republic were confirmed by the important visit of the Iranian President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, to Brasilia in November 2009. During bilateral meetings the Brazilian President renewed his support to the negotiations between the parties and opposed the adoption of the sanctions by the UN Security Council or the international community, even though he reaffirmed his full opposition to an Iranian military nuclear project³¹.

In recent years Brazil has respected and defended Iran is right to enrich uranium for the peaceful use of nuclear energy according to the concessions of the NPT. The position Brazil has held was the same as it held concerning the Additional Protocol, and could be considered similar to that of Iran. Pragmatically Brazil defended the possibility for a Third World country acquiring a technology considered important for its national economic development. The Brazilian President's defense of this right appeared in line with traditional Brazilian support for the peaceful use of the nuclear energy as an instrument for overcoming economic underdevelopment. It is important to underline that more than thirty years ago both Brazil and Iran, even if in different historical contexts and with different domestic regimes, suffered analogue pressures from the international community to give up their nuclear ambitions. Their solidarity can be consequently interpreted as the common desire to have full access to this energy source. According to more recent declarations Brazilian diplomacy, furthermore, has shown that it trusts the peaceful intentions of the Iranian nuclear plans³².

The different geographical context, the democratic nature of the Brazilian government, and the absence of security threats make the two cases deeply different, allowing Brazil not to be perceived as a threat by the international community. Recent domestic political problems, the contested election of June 2009 and Ahmadinejad's statements against Israel have made the Islamic republic the object of even stronger international suspicions. However Brazil has taken a favorable position toward Iran since 2006, receiving consequently domestic and

30 On the implementation of the South-South cooperation see Burges, Sean W. (2009). *Brazilian Foreign Policy after the Cold War*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida. p. 161.

31 (April 2010) "«Irã deve poder o mesmo que o Brasil» afirma Lula". Published at Folha On Line in [<http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/folha/videocasts/ult10038u721029.shtml>].

32 In the last four years the Brazilian government has defended the Iranian right to develop a nuclear plan as a right recognized by the NPT. Brazil and other countries of the Non Aligned Movement hold a similar position. On the common pressures suffered in the 1970s, above all during the Carter administration, see the files recently declassified by the National Security Archive about Iran and the recent literature on Brazilian foreign policy during the Seventies. See Burr, William (2009). *National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book No. 268*, "U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations in 1970s Featured Shah's Nationalism and U.S. Weapons Worries". Available at National Security Archive [<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nukevault/ebb268/index.htm>], and Spektor, Matias (2009). *Kissing e o Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

international criticisms for its affinity with a ‘rogue’ state where political and human rights are not respected.

In the last months of 2009 after having supported the swap agreement of October, Brazil continued to sustain the necessity of negotiating a solution to the diplomatic crisis³³. The country’s presence in the highest international forum, along with another emerging non-nuclear country, Turkey, gave the two states the opportunity of becoming the protagonists of the mediation between the nuclear powers and the Iranian government.

The coincidence with the 2010 NPT Review Conference and its preparatory work allowed Brazil to discuss nuclear issues both bilaterally and multilaterally.

Brazilian-US relations were central in the mediation. After the confirmation of the mutual commitment to nuclear non-proliferation in the Amorim-Clinton meeting held in Brasilia in March 2010, the two countries maintained radically different positions towards Iran. If Brazil reiterated the Iranian right to enrich uranium for peaceful uses, the United States proposed new sanctions towards Iran. The Washington government and those of many other countries suspected that any proration of the negotiation with Teheran was part of the Iranian strategy for gaining time and enriching enough uranium to build an atomic weapon.

On April 13, 2010 during the Global Nuclear Security summit called in Washington by the United States, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva and Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan presented to President Obama a Turkish-Brazilian proposal for reviving the failed deal between Teheran and the nuclear powers. Brazil sought to resolve the diplomatic impasse by a preliminary visit of Foreign Minister Amorim to Teheran at the beginning of April, and initiative that was approved by Iran. Even if the United States welcomed the efforts toward the resumption of the negotiations the policy maintained by Washington was to issue sanctions and to begin new talks with Iran. Notwithstanding this situation President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva announced his attempt at negotiating the deal through direct contacts with Ahmadinejad³⁴.

In Washington two positions clearly emerged. There was one side led by Brazil and other emerging countries, which approved favoring negotiation with Iran, and there was another, led by the United States and the rest of the official nuclear powers, that did not trust Teheran’s promises and proposed to

33 “O Governo brasileiro expressa, ainda, sua satisfação com o envolvimento direto dos Estados Unidos nessas conversas e a retomada dos contatos bilaterais de alto nível com o Irã. O Brasil reitera que o fortalecimento do diálogo é a única opção viável para o tratamento da questão nuclear iraniana”. In Ministério das Relações Exteriores (October 2, 2009). *Encontro de Alto Nível sobre o Programa Nuclear Iraniano*. Nota nº 493 Available at Sala de Imprensa do MRE [<http://www.itamaraty.gov.br/sala-de-imprensa/notas-a-imprensa/2009/02/encontro-de-alto-nivel-sobre-o-programa-nuclear>]. (Accessed on February 2, 2010).

34 See “Obama se reúne com Lula e Erdogan para conhecer proposta sobre Irã”. *Estado de São Paulo*. April 13, 2010 and Amorim, Sílvia. “Lula condena posição dos Estados Unidos sobre Irã”. *Estado de São Paulo*. April 15, 2010. A Brazilian representative, Antônio de Spinola Salgado participated in the nuclear summit organized in Teheran in response to the Obama’s initiative. Domingos, João. “Itamaraty manterá discrição em cúpula nuclear de Teerã”. *Estado de São Paulo*. April 16, 2010.

impose economic sanctions through the UN Security Council. The two positions appeared, consequently, irreconcilable. In this context Amorim tried to obtain the Chinese and Indian endorsement for the proposal during the BRIC meeting held in Brasilia. The Chinese President Hu Jintao and the Indian Prime Minister Singh expressed their agreement with the Brazilian position, thus strengthening the possible success of the negotiations³⁵.

A turning point was reached on May 17, colleague some weeks after the beginning of the NPT review conference. After a new series of visits to Teheran, Celso Amorim and his Turkish homologue Davutoglu succeeded in achieving a formal declaration from the heads of state of Turkey, Brazil, and Iran. As with the deal of October 2009, Iran would allow the inspections of its nuclear plants as well the swap of the same amount of 1200 kilograms of LEU to be transferred to Turkey. The Teheran declaration had an impact on the international community because the governments of Ankara and Brasilia seemed to have succeeded where the major powers had previously failed³⁶. At the end of the month Amorim and Davutoglu issued a public call for international support, above all by the members of the Security Council, for the Teheran diplomatic declaration³⁷.

The recent developments of the Iranian nuclear issue do not make it clear whether the Brazilian-Turkish effort was a diplomatic triumph. The United States and other nuclear powers criticized the Brasilia-Ankara action and continued their tough policy towards Iran. In mid-June 2010, in fact, the UN Security Council voted, with the opposition of Brazil and Turkey and the Lebanese abstention, in favor of new sanctions against Teheran.

Besides the fact that it is not possible to assess its success, the Teheran declaration gave a clear message to the international community: it showed Brazil moving closer to the club of major powers. If Turkey, in fact, was moved by regional reasons, Brazil played like a global actor. Notwithstanding many critics of the Luiz Inácio da Silva's foreign policy, even his opponents had to recognize that this action, although played in a theater far from the traditional one, was a confirmation of the Brazil's increasing weight in the international system. Although this action did not meet the favor of the permanent members of the Security Council, Brazil, with the assumption of its global responsibilities, confirmed his status as a full candidate for a permanent seat in the highest UN institution.

35 Iglese, Simone and Scolese, Eduardo. "Amorim diz que Índia e China têm "afinidade" com proposta de diálogo com Irã". *Folha de São Paulo*. April 16, 2010.

36 On the international reaction to the Brazilian-Turkish actions see "Nucléaire iranien : le Sud émergent veut sa place dans la négociation". *Le Monde*. May 19, 2010.

37 Amorim, Celso and Davutoglu, Ahmet. "Giving diplomacy a chance". *New York Times*. May 26, 2010.

Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva's nuclear strategy and its international relevance

The last point to be taken into consideration in assessing the foreign policy of an emerging power in the first decade of the 21st century is the implementation of the historical goal of the national nuclear program that represented an important aspect of the da Silva years.

Even if the Cardoso administration did not completely abandon the nuclear plans, ideological and economic factors prevented the elaboration of a nuclear strategy that might have been developed during the second government of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva.

It is important to remember that the second Brazilian nuclear plant, Angra 2 in the state of Rio de Janeiro came into operation in 2002, representing the first accomplishment of the ambitious 1975 nuclear deal with West Germany³⁸. During the years of Cardoso (1995-2002), and at the beginning of the first da Silva Presidential term (2003-2006), the government and civil society expressed many doubts about the completion of construction of a third nuclear plant, Angra 3, construction of which was suspended for financial and technical reasons although the Brazilian State owned 60% of the material and equipment needed for its operation.

Immediately after the inauguration of the new administration, in January 2003, the new Minister of Science and Technology, Roberto Amaral, announced one of the goals of the new executive: revitalizing the Brazilian nuclear program in both industrial uranium enrichment and in the activation of new plants. His words were guided not only by traditional ambitions of becoming a civil nuclear power but also by Brazil's energy needs. The blackout suffered in 2002 by the main Brazilian cities, São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, demonstrated the low reliability of the hydroelectric plants in periods of droughts. The new rise in oil prices and global warming created an animated debate in Brazil and all around the world about alternative and clean sources of energy. Interest in nuclear energy in the first da Silva government caused the inauguration of the already mentioned INB (Indústrias Nucleares Brasileiras) uranium enrichment facility, based on the autonomous technology developed in the last thirty years.

With the accelerated economic growth of the country in recent years, the second government of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2007-2010) drew up ambitious nuclear plans similar to those of President Ernesto Geisel (1974-1979).

The first point of da Silva nuclear program is the civil and industrial use of low enriched Brazilian uranium. This product of the State-owned Brazilian Nuclear Industries (INB – Indústrias Nucleares Brasileiras) is destined, with the full industrial operability of the facility of Resende, to supply the Brazilian

38 Angra 1, the first Brazilian nuclear plant, inaugurated in 1980s was the fruit of a deal struck in 1972 between Brazil and the United States.

nuclear plants in Angra dos Reis. Besides having acquired national autonomy in the nuclear fuel cycle, the main ambition of the government of Brasília is to join the international market of the nuclear suppliers. A member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) since 1996 and with a prominent role in this organization, Brazil has gained complete international credibility in relation to its nuclear activity³⁹.

In a 'club' dominated by Northern countries, in September 2008 Brazil and Argentina signed an agreement to establish a South American consortium following the model of the Anglo-Dutch-German URENCO (Uranium Energy Consortium). The Binational Nuclear Energy Committee will enrich uranium, produce radiological medical supplies, develop new applications for agriculture, and design and construct research reactors. As Azambuja has noted, after the construction of mutual nuclear trust "the new projects are geared to respond to the present and future nuclear needs of South America where new plants will be built over the next few years in Chile, Uruguay, Peru, and Venezuela"⁴⁰.

Another point of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva's nuclear strategy has consisted in the construction of new nuclear plants. In June 2007 the National Energy Policy Council (CNPE – Conselho Nacional de Política Energética) approved the National Energy Plan 2030 (PNE 2030) proposed by the Energy Research Enterprise (EPE – Empresa de Pesquisa Energética). PNE 2030 has among its goals the project of setting up new nuclear plants to satisfy the energy needs of the country. In the next twenty years the Brazilian government will not only complete Angra 3 but will build new plants in the Northeast of the country. In its civil aspects, consequently, the da Silva administration has the ambition of becoming a future protagonist in the global nuclear industry. This plan, above all in terms of the future conclusion of the construction of Angra 3, has been implemented in close partnership between French and Brazilian industries⁴¹.

The importance of nuclear energy has also been noted by the National Defense Strategy (END – Estratégia Nacional de Defesa)⁴². This document, issued in 2008, besides underlining the necessity of achieving the national nuclear autonomy for economic development, includes another of the nation's ambitions: the construction of Brazilian nuclear submarines. The goal of acquiring these

39 Nevertheless, experts do not ignore the possibility that Brazil could engage in a sort of special agreement including provisions of the IAEA Additional Protocol. Qualified sources remark that some members of the NSG have encouraged Brazil to accept such an agreement, which could be finalized through government-to-government negotiations. See Argüello, Irma (January 8, 2009). *Brazil and Argentina Nuclear Cooperation – Proliferation Analysis*. Available at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace [<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&cid=22597>] and Hibbs, Marck (November 3, 2008). "NSG states engaging Brazil on Additional Protocol". *Nuclear Fuel*.

40 Azambuja Marcos C. de. "A Brazilian Perspective on Nuclear Disarmament" in Berchtel, Barry M. (September 2009). *Brazil, Japan, and Turkey*. Washington: Henry L. Stimson Center p. 12.

41 Ministério de Minas e Energia (2007). Plano Nacional de Energia – 2030. Brasília: MME.

42 PRESIDÊNCIA DA REPÚBLICA (2008). Estratégia Nacional de Defesa. Brasília: Presidência da República.

new instruments of defense is justified, in the Brazilian plan, with the need to preserve the country's immense marine and under-sea resources above all after the discovery of great oil reserves under the sea off the states of Rio de Janeiro and Minas Gerais⁴³.

The technologies, the fuel cycle of enrichment of uranium, and the reactor for the propulsion have to be completely managed by the Brazilian State. In the END it is explicitly mentioned how necessary foreign cooperation is for the acquisition of knowledge to achieve national autonomy.

After 35 years since the Brazilian-German cooperation agreement, Brazil has started looking for new partners to obtain the technology from the countries belonging to the closed circle of the nations owning nuclear submarines. The first attempt was made with Russia. Despite the positive relations between the two countries, BRIC solidarity did not allow Brazil to receive the Russian cooperation in developing this national instrument of defense. The only option offered by the government of Moscow was the sale of ships, without the transfer of technology⁴⁴.

In December 2008 within a broader scheme of bilateral strategic cooperation, and after the negotiations of the Minister of Defense Nelson Jobim, President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva signed a historic agreement with his French colleague Sarkozy for the joint construction of nuclear submarines. The deal foresaw the export of the French technology to Brazil in order to make the country completely autonomous within twelve years (i.e. by 2020). This result represented an important success for Brasilia for the possible fulfillment of a long-standing goal of the Brazilian Navy.

Conclusion

The analysis of Brazil's nuclear diplomacy during the Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva years leads us to make some final considerations about the growing importance of the country in the international system. The progress of the efforts in non-proliferation issues is a factor of important continuity in the foreign policy of the last sixteen years. The passage from Cardoso to da Silva did not modify the position of the country. As has been emphasized, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva did not implement a new policy in defending Brazilian nuclear technology but continued along the path marked out by previous governments. Da Silva

43 In November 2007 Petrobras, the Brazilian state-owned oil company, announced the discovery of the Tupi Field, a giant oil reserve 155 miles off the coast of Rio de Janeiro in the South Atlantic, estimated to contain 5-8 billion barrels of light oil. In January the Tupi discovery was followed by the announcement of the discovery of a second field, Jupiter, estimated to be of a similar in size to Tupi. According to current Brazilian Defense Minister Nelson Jobim, the discoveries increased the country's need for a Brazilian nuclear-powered submarine to help discourage possible terrorist attacks against the offshore oil platforms to be built there.

44 See DALY, John K.C.(2008). "Moscow loses Brazil submarine deal to Paris". *Eurasia Daily Monitor* Volume: 5 Issue: 27. Available at the Jamestown Foundation [[http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews\[tt_news\]=33372](http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=33372)].

continued or strengthened the role of Brazil as a major player in the discussions on nuclear proliferation.

He continued the defense of national nuclear technology begun by his predecessor with persistent opposition to the IAEA Additional Protocol. Although the Additional Protocol represented one of the central subjects for the reform of the nuclear non-proliferation agreement, the Brazilian position did not suffer from any loss of credibility.

The nuclear disarmament of the NWS and global denuclearization represented a guideline for the country's overseas actions. The traditional opposition towards the NPT was transformed into an action to achieve the modification of an unequal international system by working inside the regime. The da Silva Government, many of whose members criticized the country's remaining in the NPT, worked towards the accomplishment of the three pillars of the treaty: disarmament, non proliferation, denuclearization. From the 2008 National Defense Strategy, it was in fact clear that the acceptance of stricter rules from the treaty could derive only from the renunciation of the nuclear arsenals by the nuclear powers⁴⁵.

One great difference from the previous administration is seen in the strong cooperation with other countries from the countries of the so-called 'South'. Brazil, as in other periods of its diplomatic history, particularly the 1970s, played the role of negotiator between the North and the South. Its participation in the summits of the major powers, such as the G-20, in those of the emerging powers, such as the BRIC, and its strong multilateral and bilateral activities with other developing countries, make Brazil a central actor in the changing international system.

The joint Brazilian-Turkish effort for the resolution of the international crisis concerning the Iranian nuclear program showed the capability of Brazil, and of its President, of becoming a credible conciliator thanks to the good relations with both the United States and Iran. Successful or not in that action, the Brazilian diplomacy showed that it was able to mediate in areas far from its traditional region.

It's entrance into the club of the nuclear civil states completed the picture of Brazil as a rising power. The country is on the way to achieving two traditional goals: the national industrial enrichment of uranium and the construction of a nuclear submarine. Differently from the past, Brazil now has a democratic government with a nuclear strategy compatible with its domestic, regional and international commitments for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this

45 "O Brasil zelará por manter abertas as vias de acesso ao desenvolvimento de suas tecnologias de energia nuclear. Não aderirá a acréscimos ao Tratado de Não-Proliferação de Armas Nucleares destinados a ampliar as restrições do Tratado sem que as potências nucleares tenham avançado na premissa central do Tratado: seu próprio desarmamento nuclear". In PRESIDÊNCIA DA REPÚBLICA (2008). *Estratégia Nacional de Defesa*. Brasília: Presidência da República. p. 18.

case its role as an emerging country, and an enlarging market, has allowed the country to build a strategic partnership with a country in the 'North'. France, like Germany 30 years ago, could help Brazil to join an elite club of the nuclear powers with advanced industries on its territory and a fleet of nuclear submarines under its seas.

The open question for Brazil is whether, with the characteristics of global negotiator and with full dominion of the nuclear technology, its new role in the international system will be recognized by means of permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council.

Received August 16, 2010

Accepted November 18, 2010

Abstract

The present article is an analysis of Brazilian nuclear diplomacy and of the international relevance of the national nuclear program adopted during the two Presidential terms of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva. Particular attention will be given to the Brazilian position in the agreement on nuclear non-proliferation, to the role of mediation between Iran and the nuclear powers, and finally to the national ambitions concerning the industrial and military uses of the nuclear technologies.

Resumo

Este artigo analisa a diplomacia nuclear brasileira e a relevância internacional do programa nuclear adotado durante os dois mandatos presidenciais de Luís Inácio Lula da Silva. Atenção particular é dada à posição brasileira no acordo sobre não-proliferação nuclear, ao papel de mediação entre o Irã e as potências nucleares e, finalmente, às ambições nacionais concernentes aos usos militares e industriais das tecnologias nucleares.

Keywords: Brazilian Foreign Policy, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva Government, Nuclear issues

Palavras-chave: Política Externa Brasileira, Governo de Luís Inácio Lula da Silva, Questões nucleares