

# The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (The Tlatelolco Treaty):

## Present Situation and Future Prospects

---

by Héctor Gros Espiell  
General Secretary of OPANAL  
(Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America)

There has been a growing appreciation in recent years of the historical importance of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (known as the Tlatelolco Treaty) resulting from its contribution to disarmament and consequently to international peace and security.

The ever-increasing realization of this historical importance derives not only from the special attention which has been focussed on it by published information Ref. [1] It stems also from repeated resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly which have praised and promoted this Latin American example Ref. [2] and from the growing attention which governments have given the Tlatelolco Treaty, especially Latin American governments Ref. [3].

The significance of the Treaty for regional disarmament and consequently for the economic and social development of the Latin American countries is obvious and need not be analysed here Ref. [5]. By preventing the diversion Ref. [4] of economic resources to the nuclear arms race, the Treaty enables these funds to be spent on economic growth and social and cultural progress.

The importance of the Treaty (which was opened for signature on 14 February 1967) in relation to general disarmament and universal peace is also well understood.

In creating the first and indeed still the only nuclear-weapons-free zone Ref. [6] in a populated region of the globe Ref. [7], the Tlatelolco Treaty has made a fundamental contribution to both the universal and the regional aspects of disarmament and peace.

The Treaty represents a contribution of special relevance to international security. As resolutions 2734(XXV) and 32/154 of the United Nations General Assembly have recognized, this security requires an efficient, realistic and effective disarmament policy, especially in relation to nuclear weapons Ref. [8].

The SALT talks, the bilateral USSR-USA agreements, the 1963 Treaty banning certain nuclear explosions, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Treaty prohibiting the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the seabed outside territorial limits — all these, despite the reservations which we may have about them Ref. [9], are measures which should be thought of as

contributing to international security. This does not mean, however, that we should take an optimistic view of the results so far obtained from the efforts towards disarmament, especially in the nuclear field. On the contrary, we believe that when the history of the interminable conferences on this subject, of the treaties concluded and the bilateral agreements reached, is re-examined and when the results are compared with reality, it is impossible to avoid a feeling of sadness and frustration. In the cold light of day, little or nothing has been achieved. The enormous amount of legal and diplomatic work which has been carried out, the numerous official and regulatory provisions that have been made, have resulted in almost nothing. We are witnessing today the greatest and most sophisticated concentration of weapons by the superpowers, the middle powers and the developing countries that could ever be imagined

Against this discouraging background, the Tlatelolco Treaty alone stands out as the one efficient, realistic, positive and effective example of nuclear disarmament which has been transformed into the reality of a whole continent withdrawing from the nuclear arms race. The Treaty thus forms an essential part of international security.

The current revision of the OAS (Organization of American States) Charter has recognized this relationship between the objectives of the Tlatelolco Treaty and the fundamental idea of international security, and it is proposed to include in paragraph 9 of Article 2 of the new Charter a provision which lays down as one of the aims of the OAS "to assist in the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America as a contribution towards the strengthening of international peace and security" Ref [10].

### **Signatories to the Treaty**

Twenty-two States Ref. [11] are now party to the Tlatelolco Treaty and Members of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL); the Treaty has been ratified by 24 countries Ref. [12] and signed by 25 Ref. [13]. There is reason to believe that Argentina will soon join the ratifying States Ref. [14].

It is now agreed that States which are not party but which have ratified or signed the Treaty may not carry out any act which would frustrate its objectives or purposes. This means that they may not construct, receive or use nuclear weapons Ref [15]. Finally, there are two States which have not yet in any way become part of the Tlatelolco system. These are Cuba and Guyana. Until these two States sign and ratify the Treaty — and there is reason to hope that the problem which has prevented Guyana from signing will shortly be resolved — it will not properly and effectively cover the whole of Latin America Ref. [16].

As regards Cuba, since the last statement by its Government in May 1978 that it would not sign until the United States returned Guantánamo, the question has remained in abeyance pending further negotiations Ref. [17].

Great Britain and the Netherlands are already party to Additional Protocol I, by which States which have *de jure* or *de facto* jurisdiction over territories within the limits of the Treaty zone undertake to apply to these territories the established status of denuclearization. The United States signed this Protocol in May 1977 and France will do so shortly as a result of the decision announced by President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly on 25 May 1978. When France signs and ratifies the Protocol, French Guiana, Martinique and Guadeloupe will become militarily denuclearized

Ref. [18]. After the ratification by the United States — and we hope that this will shortly be achieved seeing that President Carter signed in May 1977 and submitted the matter to the Senate on 24 May 1978 — the Panama Canal Zone, Guantánamo, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico will be free of nuclear weapons. It should be noted, apart from this, that the Panama Canal Zone will be militarily denuclearized as a result of the entry into force of the Panama Canal Treaty (Article II, paragraph 1), already ratified by Panama and the United States. In the Annex, entitled “Agreement for Carrying Out Article IV of the Panama Canal Treaty”, it is expressly stated in Article IV, paragraph 6, that “by virtue of the fact that the Republic of Panama is a party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Tlatelolco), the United States shall not install any type of nuclear weapon on Panamanian territory” Ref. [19].

Thus, since Great Britain and the Netherlands are already party to this Protocol, all the territories held by non-Latin-American States in Latin America will be necessarily free of nuclear weapons.

Additional Protocol II, by which nuclear-weapon States undertake to respect the status of denuclearization in Latin America in respect of warlike purposes, has already been signed and ratified by the People’s Republic of China, the United States Ref. [20], France and Great Britain. Only ratification by the Soviet Union is still lacking Ref. [21]. On 16 April 1978, President Brezhnev announced the Soviet decision to sign this Protocol, and this was carried out by Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister, in Moscow on 18 May 1978. When ratification occurs, it will mark the end of long years of arduous negotiations — the full details of which we hope to describe later — and Latin America will have the guarantee of all the nuclear-weapon States to ensure the effectiveness of the nuclear-weapons-free zone created by the Tlatelolco Treaty.

When all these problems associated with the status of the Treaty and of its two Additional Protocols are resolved, the whole of Latin America will truly be a completely nuclear-weapons-free zone guaranteed by both the United Nations and the nuclear-weapon States.

### **Implementation of the Treaty**

The Tlatelolco Treaty provides, under the direction of the international agency which it establishes (OPANAL), a complete control system to monitor compliance with the obligations imposed on the contracting States. We do not intend to analyse the details of this system here because we have already done so on another occasion Ref. [22], but we only wish to point out that the procedures laid down in Articles 13, 14 and 23 are already being effectively put into practice.

The semi-annual reports by the governments stating that no activity prohibited under the Treaty has occurred in their territories (Article 14) are now regularly submitted and every 60 days the OPANAL Council analyses these reports and the compliance with this provision of the Treaty.

The safeguards agreements which signatories of the Tlatelolco Treaty must, in accordance with Article 13, negotiate and conclude with the IAEA have in recent months been prepared and signed at an ever increasing rate and it seems likely that all the Latin American States which are party to the Treaty will have completed this task in the near future.

When the State which is negotiating the agreement is a party to NPT and the Tlatelolco Treaty, the safeguards agreement is based on both these instruments. If, at the time of the negotiations, the State is party only to the Tlatelolco Treaty Ref. [23], the agreement is based on this Treaty alone.

The Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL) is actively involved in the negotiation of these safeguards agreements between the Latin American countries and the IAEA, giving assistance and advice where necessary Ref. [24]

The Council of the Agency monitors the observance of Article 13 and keeps a close watch on its application.

The following States which are party to the Tlatelolco Treaty have so far negotiated safeguards agreements with the IAEA: Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela. The Bahamas, Colombia and Grenada, are in the process of negotiating and it is hoped that Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago will shortly start negotiations.

There has been regular and satisfactory compliance with Article 23, which states "the Secretariat shall be notified immediately of any international agreement concluded by any of the Contracting Parties on matters with which this Treaty is concerned; the Secretariat shall register it and notify the other Contracting Parties".

The remaining Articles of the Tlatelolco Treaty referring to the control system [Special Reports (Article 15) and Special Inspections (Article 16)], have not yet been applied. However, they do exist and the relevant legal instruments are ready to be used should the occasion arise.

Similarly, the provisions relating to measures which may be taken in the event of Treaty violations (Article 20) have not yet been put into effect since no violations of the specified type have occurred.

### **Resolutions by OPANAL's General Conference**

The peaceful use of nuclear energy is a right of the States party to the Tlatelolco Treaty (Articles 18 and 19) and an indispensable factor in the future economic and social development of its peoples, to which the General Conference of OPANAL has devoted particular attention, stressing its great importance and significance on various occasions Ref. [25].

In the declaration approved by the General Conference at the Special Session held to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Treaty (February 1977) it was stated:

"(The General Conference) declares its desire that the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America should be the instrument charged with this function, thereby combining the responsibility it bears for matters of disarmament with the functions and powers necessary for it to become the international organization which, at the regional level, will plan, systematize, arrange and co-ordinate Latin American efforts in the direction of full and effective peaceful utilization of this form of energy."

At the Fifth Regular Session (Caracas, April 1977), the General Conference also adopted the following resolution on this question (Resolution 94(V)).

“Recalling that Article 17 of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America stresses the importance of the peaceful use of nuclear energy for the economic development and social progress of our peoples,

“Reaffirming that the full operation of the Tlatelolco Treaty is the proper basis whereon our countries may benefit to the full from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy,

“Noting also that the Declaration of the second Special Session of the General Conference, approved on 14 February 1977, proclaimed its resolution to ‘promote the use of nuclear energy in Latin America by co-ordinating the efforts of Member countries in this direction and undertaking the regional planning of the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy’,

“Resolves‘

“To request the General Secretary to prepare, in consultation with the IAEA, the Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission (CIEN) and other organizations, a report in which specific measures are proposed for initiating a programme of co-operation on the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy.”

This report, which will be compiled on the basis of the replies received from Latin American Governments to the questionnaire sent out by the General Secretary of OPANAL, in consultation with the IAEA and the Latin American Energy Organization (OLADE), is in the course of preparation. It will be submitted to the General Conference at its Sixth Regular Session (April 1979) and should pave the way for the adoption of decisions which will make possible the co-ordinated planning and realization of the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy in Latin America.

### **Structure and Operation of OPANAL**

OPANAL, the organization set up under the Tlatelolco Treaty, has now been functioning regularly and efficiently for several years.

The General Conference, which meets in regular session every two years, has had five such sessions (1969–70, 1971, 1973, 1975 and 1977). Two Special Sessions have been held (in 1972 and 1977), to elect the present General Secretary and to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Treaty

The Council, which is made up of five States elected by the General Conference and which is reconstituted in part every two years, meets every sixty days in regular session. Its principal function is to operate the control system set up under the Treaty.

The General Secretary is not only the chief administrative officer of the Agency but also the person responsible for the implementation of the Treaty in general and the control system in particular. The first General Secretary was Dr. Leopoldo Benites Vinuesa from Ecuador and the present one, elected in 1972 and re-elected in 1975, is Dr. Héctor Gros Espiell from Uruguay. There have been two interim General Secretaries, Ambassador Carlos Peón del Valle (1970) from Mexico and Ambassador Antonio González de León (1972), also from Mexico.

OPANAL and the IAEA are linked by a wide-ranging co-operation agreement which was signed on 3 October 1972.

## The Future

The brief references which we have given serve to indicate the present status of the Tlatelolco Treaty, not only as regards the number of States which have signed and ratified the Treaty proper and its two Additional Protocols up to now, but also as regards the effective application of its provisions. The outlook is encouraging and the prospects magnificent. There is every reason to believe that in a relatively short period of time the process of bringing the whole Latin American continent under the Treaty will be completed. In this way the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America, which happily is already a reality, will become a firm and irrefutable fact in the whole of the region, guaranteed by a multilateral international instrument and a complete and efficient control system making any violation of the obligations imposed by the Treaty practically impossible.

This successful example of the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America should serve as a model for establishing other nuclear-weapons-free zones Ref. [26] It is to be hoped that Latin America will soon cease to have the privilege of being the only inhabited nuclear-weapons-free zone in the world.

The Treaty could also serve as a basis for a similar experiment aimed at the control and limitation of conventional armaments in Latin America, an idea which has gained strength in particular through the proposals of Venezuela and Mexico at the recent Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (May-June 1978) and at the General Conference of the Organization of American States (June 1978)

The move to assign the Tlatelolco Treaty an important role in promoting the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy in Latin America and to make OPANAL the centre for regional planning and co-ordination opens up very interesting prospects.

Thus the Tlatelolco Treaty, which Latin America has offered to the world as a contribution to peace, security and development, is likely to have a very great impact in the future, not only from the point of view of disarmament, but also from the point of view of ensuring that nuclear energy plays a key role in the economic and social development of the Latin American peoples.

## References

- [1] By way of example, the following publications may be cited in which a complete bibliography on the Tlatelolco Treaty is to be found Alfonso García Robles *La desnuclearización de América Latina* (The denuclearization of Latin America), Mexico 1965, *La desnuclearización de América Latina* (The denuclearization of Latin America), Mexico, 1966, *The denuclearization of Latin America* (in Spanish), *Foro Internacional*, Vol. VI, Nos 2 and 3 (22–23), Mexico, 1966, *The United Nations and disarmament* (in Spanish), *Foro Internacional*, Vol. XV, No. 2 (42), Mexico, *El Tratado de Tlatelolco* (The Tlatelolco Treaty), Mexico, 1967, *The denuclearization of Latin America*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, 1967, *The Treaty of Tlatelolco, origin, purposes and scope of the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America*, *Disarmament in the Western World*, Latin American Institute, Rutgers University, Occasional Publications, No. 1, New Jersey, June, 1969, *México en las Naciones Unidas* (Mexico in the United Nations), 2 volumes, Mexico, 1970, *La Proscripción de las Armas Nucleares en la América Latina* (The Prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America), *El Colegio Nacional*, Mexico, 1975, *Disarmament measures in particular zones The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America* (in French), *Académie de Droit International, Recueil des Cours*, vol. I, 1971 Héctor Gros Espiell *En torno al Tratado de Tlatelolco y la proscripción de las armas nucleares en la América Latina* (Concerning the Tlatelolco Treaty and the prohibition of nuclear weapons in

- Latin America), Mexico, 1973, *The Tlatelolco Treaty, an innovational text* (in French), *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Paris, July 1973, *El Derecho de los Tratados y el Tratado de Tlatelolco* (Treaty Law and the Tlatelolco Treaty), Mexico 1974, *Disarmament and the denuclearization zones* (in Spanish), *Revista de Occidente*, Terc Epoca (third series), Nos 5–6, March–April 1976, Madrid, *The United States and denuclearization in Latin America* (in Italian), *Rivista di Studi Politici Internazionali*, Florence, 1977, *The signature of the Tlatelolco Treaty by China and France* (in French), *Annuaire Français de Droit International*, 1973, *El Tratado de Tlatelolco Algunas consideraciones sobre aspectos específicos* (The Tlatelolco Treaty some considerations on specific aspects), OPANAL, Mexico, 1976, *The military denuclearization of Latin America and the succession of States in regard to treaties* (in Spanish), Humanitas, Universidad de Nuevo León, 1977, pp 595–603
- [2] Resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly 1911 (XVIII), 2826 (XXII), 2456D (XXIII), 2666 (XXV), 2830 (XXVI), 2935 (XXVII), 3079 (XXVIII), 3258 (XXIX), 3467 (XXX) and 31/67 and the study by the United Nations entitled “Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects” (United Nations Publications, No. E 76 1 7)
  - [3] Joint communiqués Mexico-Canada, April 1973, Mexico-Ecuador, January 1974, Mexico-Jamaica, July 1975, Mexico-United States, February 1977, Mexico-Brazil, January 1978, Mexico-Cuba, January 1978 It is particularly significant in this respect to compare the repeated, highly favourable and almost unanimous references which were made to the Tlatelolco Treaty at the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament in May–June 1978
  - [4] Expression used in Article 26 of the United Nations Charter See Resolution 2602E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969 of the General Assembly and, for the relation between disarmament and development, Resolutions 2626 (XXV), 2685 (XXV), 2831 (XXVI) and 3261 (XXIX).
  - [5] Héctor Gros Espiell, *El desarme y la desnuclearización militar por zonas Sus efectos sociales* (Disarmament and military denuclearization by zones Its social effects), International Institute for Labour Studies, Geneva, September 1975
  - [6] Actions contributing to the creation of denuclearized zones Rapacki plan, put forward by the Polish Minister of External Affairs, Mr Rapacki, on 2 October 1957 with the aim of creating a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Central Europe. Kekkonen plan, resulting from various initiatives by the President of Finland since 1963, aimed at creating a nuclear-weapons-free zone in Northern Europe The creation of a denuclearized zone in Africa, which has been the subject of attention and repeated support from the United Nations General Assembly (Resolutions 1652 (XVI), 2033 (XX) and 32/81) The declaration of the India Ocean “as a zone of peace” by the United Nations General Assembly in its Resolutions 2832 (XXVI) and 32/86 The United Nations has also supported the creation of nuclear-weapons-free zones in the Middle East (32/82), South Asia (32/83) and the South Pacific (3477 (XXX)) At the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva in 1972, on 16 March, 25 April and 3 August, the representative of Romania launched an initiative to create a militarily denuclearized zone in the Balkans
  - [7] Various agreements exist on the denuclearization of uninhabited zones, namely the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, the Antarctic Treaty, The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water The texts of these treaties as well as the resolutions cited in the previous reference can be consulted for example in “Arms Control, A Survey and Appraisal of Multilateral Agreements,” SIPRI, Stockholm, 1978.
  - [8] Declaration on the strengthening of international security, Resolution 2734 (XXV), paragraphs 19–20, and Resolution 32/154 of 19 December 1977, paragraph 6.
  - [9] Héctor Gros Espiell, *Disarmament and denuclearized zones* (in Spanish), *Revista de Occidente*, Terc Epoca (third series) Nos 5–6, March–April 1976, Madrid
  - [10] OEA/Ser G/CP/CG-557/75 Rev 20, 6 November 1975
  - [11] Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Granada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela
  - [12] The 22 States mentioned above plus Brazil and Chile. See the statement by the General Secretary of OPANAL, Dr. Héctor Gros Espiell, Doc S/Inf. 123 of 19 April 1977, paragraph 19
  - [13] The 24 States mentioned above plus Argentina
  - [14] Joint communiqué by Messrs Montes and Vance of 21 November 1977 and the announcement by Chancellor Montes on 19 May 1978 at the United Nations General Assembly See

- Héctor Gros Espiell, "Argentina and the Tlatelolco Treaty" (in Spanish) *Revista Internacional y Diplomática*, Mexico, No. 325, 10 December 1977
- [15] Reports and statements of the General Secretaries at the first, second, third and fourth sessions, 1969–1975. *El Programa Nuclear Brasileño*, paragraph 26, Brasilia 1977. Joint communiqué by Messrs. López Portillo and Geisel of 18 January 1978
  - [16] The Good Offices Commission of OPANAL recently made some proposals which could serve as a basis for solving the Guyana question. Guyana wishes to sign the Treaty but has not been able to do so in view of Article 25.
  - [17] Héctor Gros Espiell, *En torno al Tratado de Tlatelolco y la proscripción de las armas nucleares en la América Latina*, (Concerning the Tlatelolco Treaty and the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America), Mexico 1973, pp.34–40
  - [18] Héctor Gros Espiell, France and the United States and Additional Protocol I of the Tlatelolco Treaty (in Spanish), *El Tratado de Tlatelolco. Algunas consideraciones sobre aspectos específicos*, (The Tlatelolco Treaty some considerations on specific aspects), OPANAL 1976, page 7, Héctor Gros Espiell, *the United States and denuclearization in Latin America* (in Italian), *Rivista di Studi Politici Internazionali*, 1977, The United States and Additional Protocol I of the Tlatelolco Treaty (in Spanish), *El Tratado de Tlatelolco. Diez años de aplicación*, (The Tlatelolco Treaty, Ten Years of Application), OPANAL 1978.
  - [19] Héctor Gros Espiell, *The Treaties on the Panama Canal and the nuclear-weapons-free zone in Latin America* (in Spanish), *Cuadernos de Derecho Público*, No. 4, 1978, Mérida, Venezuela
  - [20] David R. Robinson, *The Treaty of Tlatelolco and the United States. A Latin American Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zone*, *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 66, No. 2, April 1970
  - [21] For information on the refusal of the Soviet Union to sign up to 1978, see Héctor Gros Espiell, *Commentary on the reasons put forward by the Soviet Union for its refusal to sign Protocol II* (in Spanish), *El Tratado de Tlatelolco. Algunas consideraciones sobre aspectos específicos*, (The Tlatelolco Treaty some considerations on specific aspects), OPANAL, Mexico 1976
  - [22] Héctor Gros Espiell, *En torno al Tratado de Tlatelolco y la proscripción de las armas nucleares en la América Latina* (Concerning the Tlatelolco Treaty and the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America), OPANAL
  - [23] For example the cases of Panama and Colombia
  - [24] Resolutions 19 (I), 31 (II), 51 (III), 81 (IV) and 99 (V) of the General Conference, and Resolutions C 1, C 2, C 4, C.5, C 9, C 10 and C 11 of the Council of OPANAL
  - [25] Resolution 5 (II-E) of the General Conference, Second Special Session, paragraph 3; Statement by the General Secretary of OPANAL, Dr. Héctor Gros Espiell, Doc S/Inf 123 of 19 April 1977, paragraphs 30–31. The same ideas and criteria have been generally affirmed by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 32/50 of 8 December 1977 (Peaceful use of nuclear energy for economic and social development), which systematizes, completes and codifies concepts which are already to be found in the Tlatelolco Treaty, the Statute of the IAEA, a number of different instruments and, in particular, the OPANAL documents cited above
  - [26] Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapons-free zones in all its aspects, United Nations Publications, No. E.76.1.7), see also the final document of the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (June 1978), for information on the contribution of the Tlatelolco Treaty to Treaty Law relating to disarmament, see Héctor Gros Espiell, *El Tratado de Tlatelolco y el Derecho de los Tratados*, (The Tlatelolco Treaty and Treaty Law), Mexico 1974.



# TREATY FOR THE PROHIBITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN LATIN AMERICA (Tlatelolco Treaty)

Status: June 1978

Names of all eligible States	Date of Signature	Date of Ratification
Argentina	27 September 1967	
* Bahamas	29 November 1976	26 April 1977
* Barbados	18 October 1968	25 April 1969
* Bolivia	14 February 1967	18 February 1969
** Brazil	9 May 1967	29 January 1968
** Chile	14 February 1967	9 October 1974
* Colombia	14 February 1967	6 September 1972
* Costa Rica	14 February 1967	25 August 1969
Cuba		
* Dominican Republic	28 July 1967	14 June 1968
* Ecuador	14 February 1967	11 February 1969
* El Salvador	14 February 1967	22 April 1968
* Grenada	29 April 1975	20 June 1975
* Guatemala	14 February 1967	6 February 1970
Guyana		
* Haiti	14 February 1967	23 May 1969
* Honduras	14 February 1967	23 September 1968
* Jamaica	26 October 1967	26 June 1969
* Mexico	14 February 1967	20 September 1967
* Nicaragua	15 February 1967	24 October 1968
* Panama	14 February 1967	11 June 1971
* Paraguay	26 April 1967	19 March 1969
* Peru	14 February 1967	4 March 1969
* Suriname	13 February 1976	10 June 1977
*** Trinidad and Tobago	27 June 1967	3 December 1970
* Uruguay	14 February 1967	20 August 1968
* Venezuela	14 February 1967	23 March 1970

\* States which deposited at the same time as their respective instruments of ratification a declaration by which, in exercise of the option given them under article 28, paragraph 2 of the Treaty, they waived all of the requirements laid down in paragraph 1 of that article, consequently, as far as they are concerned, the Treaty has already entered into force

\*\* States which have ratified the Treaty but have not waived the requirements referred to. Hence the Treaty is **not** in force for these States.

\*\*\* The Treaty did not enter into force for Trinidad and Tobago until 27 June 1975 on which date this State waived the requirements laid down in article 28 of the Treaty.

— Argentina has signed, but not ratified

— Two States in the region have not yet signed Cuba, Guyana.

### Additional Protocol I

States to which the Protocol is open	Signature	Ratification
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	20 December 1967	11 December 1969
Kingdom of the Netherlands	15 March 1968	26 July 1971
United States of America	26 May 1977	
France		

### Additional Protocol II

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	20 December 1967	11 December 1969
United States of America	1 April 1968	12 May 1971
France	18 July 1973	22 March 1974
People's Republic of China	21 August 1973	12 June 1974
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	18 May 1978	