



Perspectives on Security, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation

Views from the United States and South Africa

Dr. Jessica Piombo
Naval Postgraduate School

MARCH 2014 | REPORT NUMBER 2014-001



PASCC

PROJECT ON ADVANCED SYSTEMS AND CONCEPTS
FOR COUNTERING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION



Perspectives on Security, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation: Views from the United States and South Africa

Dr. Jessica Piombo
Naval Postgraduate School

March 2014

This report is the product of collaboration between the Naval Postgraduate School Center on Contemporary Conflict and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Naval Postgraduate School, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, the Department of Defense, or the United States Government.

This report is approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**U.S. Naval Postgraduate School (NPS)
Center on Contemporary Conflict (CCC)
Project on Advanced Systems and Concepts for
Countering WMD (PASCC)**

PASCC Report Number 2014 001

The Naval Postgraduate School Center on Contemporary Conflict is the research wing of the Department of National Security Affairs (NSA) and specializes in the study of international relations, security policy, and regional studies. One of the CCC's programs is the Project on Advanced Systems and Concepts for Countering WMD (PASCC). PASCC operates as a program planning and implementation office, research center, and intellectual clearinghouse for the execution of analysis and future-oriented studies and dialogues for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

For further information, please contact:

The Center on Contemporary Conflict

Naval Postgraduate School
1411 Cunningham Road
Monterey, CA 93943

pascc@nps.edu

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Workshop Findings in Brief.....	2
Session Highlights.....	3
Background.....	11
Workshop Session Abstracts.....	16
Session One: Global and Regional Security – Views from South Africa and the United States.....	16
Session Two: Nuclear Deterrence and Disarmament Considerations.....	18
Session Three: Views on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses.....	21
Session Four: U.S. and South African Domestic Political Interests Relating to Nonproliferation, Arms Control, and Disarmament Issues.....	24
Session Five: Identifying Areas of Mutual Interest.....	27
Session Six: Looking to Areas of Misunderstanding and Disagreement.....	29
Session Seven: Defining the Ideal Relationship between South Africa and the United States.....	36
Session Eight: Roundtable Discussion to Shape Future U.S.-South Africa Track Two Dialogues.....	40
Recommendations for Future Dialogues.....	41
Participants.....	43
Acronyms.....	44
Acknowledgements.....	46

INTRODUCTION

This project convened a dialogue between civil societies in the United States and the Republic of South Africa (RSA) to deepen understanding of the ways in which each nation views its most critical strategic security concerns and the domestic debates that shape those views. This project engaged in dialogue through the lens of nuclear disarmament, energy, and proliferation/nonproliferation issues. Despite cooperation on a number of matters in this area, U.S.-South African relations have not always been cordial and the two have come into open disagreements on a number of occasions. South Africa is a key force for regional stability in Africa. It maintains an active and expanding nuclear energy industry, is an influential country within the African Union (AU), has the largest economy on the continent of Africa, and maintains the most well-equipped and trained military in sub-Saharan Africa. In the framework of the narrative “United States-South Africa Relationship: Going Global”¹ the question is how the two countries can improve their cooperation and decrease tension in this area for greater global security.

To promote dialogue on these issues, in September 2013, Drs. Jessica Piombo of the Naval Postgraduate School and Joelian Pretorius of the University of the Western Cape facilitated a two-day workshop, entitled *Perspectives on Security, Disarmament, and Nonproliferation: Views from the United States and South Africa*. The event brought together sixteen participants to discuss how they perceived each country’s views on a set of issues related to nuclear nonproliferation, disarmament, nuclear energy, and international cooperation on nuclear and nonproliferation issues. Participants included high-level officials from the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) and Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) and South African and American academic institutions and think tanks that focus on nuclear and nonproliferation issues and international relations. Additionally, observers attended from the South African Department of International Relations and International Cooperation (DIRCO) and the U.S. Embassy in Pretoria.

Despite perceptions that the United States and South Africa are far apart in terms of international engagement on nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament issues, the workshop discussion illuminated that cooperation exists on multiple issues along several dimensions, and highlighted that the two countries tend to be in agreement on the same general goals. Areas of cooperation include mutual dedication to nonproliferation and bilateral support for the associated nonproliferation and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) security treaties and conventions. There are, nonetheless, significant areas in which there are differences in basic outlook and orientation, as well as ways of engaging in international fora that affect the extent of collaboration and the development of a closer relationship. Basic principle disagreements included: conditionality about which countries can acquire nuclear energy and weapons and which cannot; fissile material – cutoff of future production versus elimination of existing stocks; the prioritization and weighting of the

¹ Hillary Clinton, Speech presented at the University of the Western Cape, August, 8 2012, <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/08/196184.htm>.

three pillars of nonproliferation; and country-specific differences in the means to achieve similar ends. Disagreement also existed on the lexicon used during the discussion; differing definitions associated with words can impede cooperation. For example, “nuclear fissile material cutoff” is interpreted by some as prohibition of future production and by others as elimination of existing stock. Additionally, at times, issues of human and stretched resources mean that South Africa does not have the ability to respond to all of the issues on which United States counterparts seek input and action.

Broad consensus exists that the time is ripe to pursue greater engagement and cooperation on many nonproliferation and disarmament fronts. Participants at the workshop revealed a sense that the right team is in place under the Obama administration to make progress across the nonproliferation agenda. Also, many noted that the shift to a more pragmatic orientation under the administration of President Zuma has improved relations and collaboration between the countries. Pursuing a closer relationship therefore becomes a matter of political will at the Principals level—including the administrations in both countries. Care will have to be taken, however, as the United States and South Africa have very distinct international constituencies that they keep in mind when engaging on nonproliferation and disarmament issues.

Trust and mistrust, on both sides, is an additional issue that can curtail increased cooperation and engagement. More public diplomacy may be necessary to reverse the negative perceptions stemming from the establishment of United States Africa Command (AFRICOM), military intervention in Libya, and the perceived securitization of U.S.-Africa policy. Within RSA, there is also sensitivity to the language used when the United States describes its international position.

Across the board, attendees felt that the Track 2 venue is a productive form of engagement. The unofficial environment is important for sharing information and perspectives, and airing differences in a non-charged environment. Furthermore, the process itself is valuable to building communities of interest since discussions takes place at the academic level, not at the level of a basic briefing or statement of policy position. It also allows discussion of principles, philosophical issues, and differences while promoting advanced dialogue and higher-level analysis more useful than basic discussion.

WORKSHOP FINDINGS IN BRIEF

1. Despite perceptions that the United States and South Africa are far apart in terms of international engagement on nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament issues, the two countries actually cooperate on many issues, along multiple dimensions, and agree on the same general goals.
2. The time is ripe to pursue greater engagement and cooperation on many nonproliferation and disarmament fronts.

3. There are, nonetheless, significant areas in which there are differences in basic outlook and orientation, as well as ways of engaging in international fora, that will affect the extent of collaboration and the development of a closer relationship.
 4. The U.S.-South African “trust deficit” is a result of both historical and current drivers.
 5. There is a strong need for additional capacity building within South Africa on nuclear issues, nonproliferation, and disarmament.
 6. Across the board, the participants agreed that the dialogue/workshop venue can be a productive form of engagement.
-

SESSION HIGHLIGHTS

Session One: Global and Regional Security – Views from South Africa and the United States

Presenters were asked to focus on both countries’ global and regional strategic perspectives, including the contexts in which these have developed since 1994, perceived security challenges, global relations, foreign and defense policies, relations with regional institutions such as the AU, and future directions including South Africa within the Brazil-India-China-South Africa (BRICS) grouping and Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) contexts. The session presentations and discussion highlighted the following issues.

- U.S. foreign policy in Africa is based on five pillars: 1) democracy and democratization; 2) support of economic growth; 3) conflict prevention and resolution; 4) support for presidential initiatives; 5) working with Africans on transnational issues.
- U.S. strategic concerns often override its rhetorical commitments, evidenced by support for security allies such as Nigeria, Rwanda, and Ethiopia, even when their actions contravene U.S. stated support for democracy and democratization. The tensions between rhetorical principles and strategic interests characteristic post-Cold War U.S. policy in Africa and continue to create trust issues among South African and other continental leaders. If South Africa is to be a true partner of the United States, then it should be treated as an equal, rather than a client state.
- South Africa is geostrategically important to U.S. foreign policy and is recognized as a capable partner, anchor state, and regional hegemon. However, the lack of direct threats places sub-Saharan Africa as a relatively low priority overall. African issues have risen in importance since the initiation of the Global War on Terror in 2001, which has created a perception that U.S. policy towards Africa has become “securitized.” Continental leaders point out the armed intervention in Libya, threat of military force in Syria, continued high levels of assistance provided to Egypt, and the provision of military support to Uganda as examples. This, in turn, has somewhat soured the U.S.-South Africa relationship.
- South Africa has used the last decade to redefine its foreign policy aspirations of global and regional leadership. South Africa views itself as a middle power that uses international law to pursue its national interests within the continent and globally. It also positions itself as a leader

within Africa and participation in BRICS, the Group of Twenty (G20), and as a United Nations Security Council (UNSC) non-permanent member has strengthened South Africa's continental leadership role. This frequently brings RSA national interests in conflict with those of the rest of the continent. South Africa considers negotiation and compromise, rather than direct military action, as the best methods to solve deep seated problems. This, at times, brings it into disagreement with the United States over ways to manage conflict and other international issues.

- Taking into consideration economic concerns and the African National Congress (ANC's) stain of corruption, South Africa needs to shift its focus from foreign policy to domestic issues in order for South Africa to sustain its global and regional leadership role.

Session Two: Nuclear Deterrence and Disarmament Considerations

Presenters were asked to reflect on how the United States and South Africa each prioritize weapons of mass destruction (WMD), nuclear weapons proliferation and disarmament, nuclear security, and deterrence concerns in their respective strategic outlook; how U.S. nuclear has posture changed; what each country's sensitivities are related to nuclear disarmament; and how each country views Nuclear Weapons Free Zones (NWFZs) and a Nuclear Weapons Convention (NWC). The session presentations and discussion focused on the following points.

- South Africa and the United States maintain fundamentally different perceptions on matters of national security that influence their positions on nuclear disarmament, nonproliferation, and the peaceful use of nuclear technology.
- South Africans tend to adopt a regional and multilateral interest in and attitude to international issues. This approach contrasts many of the methods of the United States: the global reach, tendency towards unilateral action, and focus on bilateral relations with individual countries rather than working through international institutions.
- The U.S. government is concerned with nuclear proliferation by outlier radical states and violent extremist organization that have access or prospective access to nuclear material and could threaten global security. This informs its stance on several states that seek to acquire nuclear energy technology, such as Iran. In contrast, South Africa is focused on the right to have nuclear technology for all countries that seek it, and is concerned that the United States is using its stated concern with radical states to prevent others from accessing nuclear technology.
- While both countries pursue goals of nonproliferation and disarmament, the United States prioritizes preventing an increase in nuclear weapons-possessing states while South Africa emphasizes promoting a nuclear weapons-free world (i.e., disarming the current nuclear weapons possessing countries).
- South Africa sees the existence of nuclear weapons as the main problem, and draws few distinctions among possessor states. For the United States, the principal concern is who has the weapons and the security challenges stemming from possession by states viewed as irresponsible, dangerous, or hostile. South Africa objects to what it sees as this U.S. rejection of

“universality” in nonproliferation and disarmament. In particular, South Africa is highly troubled that the United States openly accepts Israeli and Indian possession of nuclear weapons but actively seeks to limit the ability of other states to acquire civil nuclear energy. This is a critical difference between states, and can prevent movement on joint initiatives. To the South Africans, a world of peace requires no nuclear weapons.

Session Three: Views on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses

In this session, we asked the presenters to assess how each country perceives the nonproliferation regime, expansion of nuclear energy, the nuclear export regime and counter-proliferation measures, e.g., the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). Remarks were centered on nonproliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as the relationship among the three pillars of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). The session presentations and discussion focused on the issues below.

- U.S. policy is viewed as focused disproportionately on nonproliferation compared to disarmament and energy issues. South Africans see evidence of changing U.S. rhetoric towards some of the goals of the Global Zero movement, but actions are seen as falling far short of meaningful progress and are therefore viewed with disappointment.
- RSA maintains that it has not been recognized in the international arena for its significant progress in implementing nonproliferation agreements and restoring trust. South Africa has made its intentions clear by dismantling of the nuclear weapons program and joining the international binding obligations: it has been to the dark side and now it is ready to reap the benefits.
- South Africa supports Article IV of the NPT as ensuring the inalienable right to a peaceful nuclear energy program. While South Africa calls on NAM countries to exercise this right, it simultaneously calls on North Korea and Iran to dismantle nuclear weapons or weapons-related activities and adhere fully to the NPT and International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA) inspection requirements.
- There was agreement that the permanent five members (P5) of the UNSC and NAM states both want the same ends. There is less distance between the respective American and South African interpretations of the “peaceful use” provisions of NPT Article IV than is often assumed. Both interpret the right to “peaceful use of nuclear energy” as conditioned upon compliance with NPT Articles I, II, and III. Other countries place more emphasis on the “inalienable right” clause in Article IV to argue that this right pertains irrespective of other compliance concerns (eg, Iran). This close U.S.-South Africa agreement is reflected in voting. South Africa votes with the United States in favor of sanctions against Iran even when this places South Africa at odds with its NAM allies.

Session Four: U.S. and South African Domestic Political Interests Relating to Nonproliferation, Arms Control, and Disarmament Issues

In this session, we asked the speakers to discuss a range of domestic considerations that inform public policy on nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament issues, including the input and role of civil society, and domestic politics and legislative processes. The session presentations and discussion raised the following issues.

- Our speakers presented a set of themes that were common to both the U.S. and South Africa:
 - The publics in both countries are relatively disengaged from nuclear, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy.
 - Active lobby groups, sponsored by the nuclear industry in each country, are the most engaged non-governmental groups in the policy process.
 - In both countries there exists a small, engaged set of civil society groups that oppose both nuclear weapons and energy. These constitute the public voice of opposition in the place of general information, knowledge, and interest in nuclear issues.
- In both countries, policy related to nuclear nonproliferation, disarmament, and peaceful energy tends to be formulated at the executive/administrative level, with little input from society at large, significant input from industry lobby groups, and moderate (USA) to minimal constructive input (RSA) from civil society.
- South African policies are guided by a sense of principles (particularly related to nuclear disarmament and the unequivocal right to nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes), while U.S. policies tend to drive from a sense of pragmatism and national security interests. This can be a source of divergence in the policy stances and international outlooks of each country.
- A key difference in the domestic politics of nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament across the two countries related to how internal politics within the national legislatures affects nuclear policy in each country. The U.S. Congress is somewhat independent and engages with the administration, while in South Africa the Parliament is relatively quiet on these issues. The dominance of the ANC in the South African Parliament makes for a relatively unified approach to nuclear, nonproliferation, and disarmament issues, which eases the passage of key legislation and treaty ratification. In contrast, the divisions between Democrats and Republicans, and more importantly, *within* the Republican Party, mean that the U.S. Congress tends towards gridlock on the ratification of international treaties and other nonproliferation initiatives. The extent to which divisions between and within the two parties in the United States affect legislation and international policies is a point that the Americans in the group felt that South Africans often do not understand.

Session Five: Identifying Areas of Mutual Interest

Here, we posed a set of questions that asked the speakers and participants to consider what issues the United States and South Africa generally agree are short and long-term opportunities and

challenges in nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament. What competing priorities affect the range of issues in which the countries agree? How can the United States and South Africa further promote and enhance the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1540 in line with the January 2013 AU Assembly Decision (Assembly/AU/Dec.472)? The session presentations and discussion highlighted the following points.

- Both states want a nuclear weapons-free world, but disagree on the means to the end. Both sides agreed that there is a shared interest in working to obtain positive outcome at the 2015 NPT Review Conference (RevCon).
- The United States recognizes that South Africa is the most important and able actor in Africa in the nuclear arena and has demonstrated its nonproliferation commitment and leadership in numerous ways over the past two decades. Non-participation by members of the Global South, including South Africa, is frequently due to a lack of capacity rather than non-compliance.
- Despite a perception that the countries tend to be far apart on these issues, the presentations and discussion both noted that extensive multilateral and bilateral collaboration does exist on a variety of issues, especially safety and security, nonproliferation proofing measures, and capacity building. Multilateral examples include the IAEA safeguards, NPT (including the Additional Protocol [AP]), Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Chemical Warfare Convention (CWC), Biological Warfare Convention (BWC), and the African Nuclear Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Pelindaba). Bilateral efforts to combat global terrorism and the spread of WMD were highlighted including the investigations and prosecutions of specific cases related to South Africans, the conversion of SAFARI-1 to low enriched uranium (LEU) fuel operations (and U.S. repatriation of 6.3 kgs highly enriched uranium [HEU]), security awareness and physical security improvements at nuclear facilities, health and safety, UNSCR 1540 implementation, and cooperation with other AU state reporting. Better communication and socialization of this record could also help reduce the U.S.-South Africa “trust deficit”
- The presenters and participants felt that there has been a significant shift within the American administration on these issues. The change in tone from the Bush to the Obama administrations, as well as a committed team to work on nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation, represents a significant shift and has improved the U.S.-RSA nuclear relationship. For example, South African participants called the current administration a “dream team” on nonproliferation and disarmament issues and highlighted the signaling of presidential declarations such as President Obama’s Prague speech, May 2009.

Session Six: Looking to Areas of Misunderstanding and Disagreement

In this session, the speakers and general discussion focused on the issues that South Africa and the United States view differently. The speakers were asked to consider topics ranging from Iran, sanctions, the IAEA Additional Protocol, minimizing stocks and the civil use of HEU in lieu of LEU, or competing economic interests in nuclear technology, trade and the uranium market. They tailored

their remarks based on the discussions held up to this point in the workshop. The session presentations and discussion highlighted the following issues.

- The United States and South Africa each frame and define their nuclear postures through their role in international politics and their national interests. Each country has a different international constituency that it keeps in mind when engaging in international fora, and this can lead to differences in approach, policy stance, and prioritization of various issues. As their nuclear relations are impacted by general foreign policy orientations, this can facilitate agreement. When these orientations are not properly appreciated, it more often leads to misunderstandings and disagreements.
- Many felt that the United States and South Africa interpret the NPT differently, and that this causes resentment from the South African side. The South Africans place equal weight on all three pillars of the NPT (nonproliferation, disarmament, and access to nuclear technology), while the United States focuses principally on nonproliferation. The South Africans felt that the United States undermines the NPT when it supports additional measures to prevent non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS) from obtaining nuclear weapons (e.g., the AP), but does not pressure U.S. allies who already possess them to disarm. For the United States, both sides agreed that disarmament seems optional and aspirational (rather than a genuinely pursued goal), and the United States seems to pursue it through a series of bilateral relationships that are conducted outside the context of the NPT. This last part is a significant issue to the South Africans, as they feel it undermines the multilateralism of the NPT, circumvents international law (as the NPT is legally binding), and leads to an issue of what they perceived as double-standards on the part of the United States.
 - Related to this, there was sensitivity to the U.S. tendency to consider some countries “good” and “bad” proliferators. Several South Africans noted that just using these terms was offensive and paternalistic, while also serving as an additional example of how the U.S. has double standards. To the South Africans, all countries should disarm, and there is no such thing as a “good” or “bad” proliferator. The notion that some countries could be trusted with nuclear weapons and others not comes across as paternalistic and politicized, in the South African view.
- Although some disagreements are intractable policy orientations, there was a sense that other differences and misunderstandings also boil down to distrust between the two based on history and current international politics.
 - For example, the United States has at times labeled South Africa as a “proliferation concern” and maintains some suspicion about RSA’s remaining HEU stock, its ability to safeguard its nuclear facilities and material, and the potential that South Africa may seek to acquire the full fuel cycle again. On their side, the South Africans noted that they feel their disarmament and nonproliferation credentials should place the country’s intentions above suspicion.
 - Confidence-building mechanisms, including more Track 1.5 and 2 initiatives, and U.S. support for capacity building in South Africa can improve nuclear relations.

Session Seven: Defining the Ideal Relationship Between the Two Countries

In this panel, we sought to identify specific areas in which cooperation on disarmament, nonproliferation, counter-proliferation, and nuclear energy could be enhanced. The speakers were asked: in an ideal world, how would South Africa and the United States relate to one another? The discussion raised the following issues.

- When assessing the relationship based on shared values and ideals, the U.S.-South Africa bilateral relationship should be as close as that between the United States and Australia or New Zealand. This is because the commonalities between the two countries far outweigh the differences, and therefore should frame the official relationship. In reality, however, the speaker argued that the current official relationship lacks warmth and is often “edgy.” On both sides the relationship is distorted by suspicion and disappointments, each with historical roots. As a result, the partnership remains underdeveloped. Nuclear issues could provide an avenue to generate closer relations, due to South Africa’s unique credibility on disarmament.
- Additionally, misunderstandings impede the establishment of a closer relationship, so more efforts should be made by both sides to communicate more clearly about their capacity to respond to issues that the other prioritizes. For example, some of the South Africans mentioned that the U.S. policy community often perceives a lack of movement on U.S. initiatives as resistance to them, when in reality this often stems from a critical lack of capacity in the South African government. They felt that their U.S. counterparts did not sufficiently appreciate that the South African government simply does not have the personnel within DIRCO to prioritize all of the initiatives that the U.S. pressures South Africa to sign into, such as PSI. The South African policy representatives were very firm on this point, as were the U.S. embassy representatives: both felt that counterparts based in Washington do not sufficiently appreciate the human capacity constraints of the South African government.
- Both sides felt that there is a confluence between the U.S. and South African positions on nuclear energy and nonproliferation issues (as well as important differences) that could be better leveraged, pending an honest assessment of the areas of miscommunication and disagreement. Working these commonalities holds potential for improving the quality of the broader relationship between the countries.
- There could be great potential for unofficial efforts to complement official mechanisms and provide a conduit for bringing the two countries into a more cordial relationship.

Session Eight: Roundtable Discussion to Shape Future U.S.-South Africa Workshops

In this open floor discussion, the conveners of the workshop invited participants to raise and isolate key points discussed during the panels or consider areas of contention or agreement. We opened the floor for all participants to raise topics for future dialogues as well as propose ideas or issues not explored.

- Across the board, participants valued the high level of academic interaction between nuclear subject matter experts, and between those experts and generalists in South African and international politics. The discussion began at the debate level with significant academic analysis and an increase in collective knowledge.
- There was agreement that the government and private sector practitioners tangibly involved in policy formulation and implementation should be stakeholders to guide future track two processes. This is especially important to share their perspectives, but also so that the next generation of policy personnel can benefit from the process of discussion and debate. It would be possible to turn the track two dialogue into an educational event for both countries' personnel.
- Participants also agreed that a lack of funding and resources is a genuine issue for South Africans that limits network formulation and travel interactions, especially outside of South Africa. To cultivate the relationships and network established at the dialogue, a low-cost solution recommended was a mailing list or regular forum through e-mail or the internet to disseminate scholarship.
- Students could be utilized as emerging representatives of the new generation to cultivate knowledge through participation. In both the United States and South Africa, the community of interest in nuclear weapons, disarmament, and nonproliferation issues is relatively homogenous. Therefore, efforts need to be made to diversify the communities in each country. Track two initiatives can help stimulate interest in these issues because the student can observe the debates and learn the language, terms, and process surrounding nuclear policy. Historically, South African students are not interested in pursuing a career in international relations or security studies, and these initiatives could generate interest. Additionally, the community of interest within both countries is not gender or racially diverse. Efforts to incorporate new groups into initiatives like unofficial dialogues could stimulate interest and help broaden the community of interest.

BACKGROUND

Africa has been rising in importance in U.S. security interests for over a decade. The U.S. government and international affairs and security experts have become increasingly concerned with a range of security issues in Africa, which include illicit trafficking, piracy and maritime security, the exploitation of sensitive minerals like uranium, and the future of the nonproliferation regime within Africa. While the United States has a broad system of educational, cultural, and other exchanges with African countries in the realms of development and governance, and strong diplomatic links in these areas, security-focused exchanges are considerably more limited.

The need for a civil society/academic driven U.S.-South Africa dialogue is compelling. South Africa is a regional leader within Africa and the AU; it is an increasingly powerful global force (having recently entered into the Global South economic bloc arrangement between BRICS), and has served as a powerful exemplar of responsible handling of nuclear weapons and energy industries.

South Africa is a leader in global nonproliferation as well as a state that has achieved significant mastery of nuclear technology, including most aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle and the successful de-commissioning of a nuclear weapons program. At the same time, the abundance of (unemployed) nuclear experts in South Africa has made it a target country for those seeking to employ these engineers and scientists (for both licit and illicit purposes), and the increased demand for nuclear energy in South Africa maintains the country as a critically important partner in the global nuclear posture.

After decades of tension during the Cold War and apartheid eras, relations between the United States and the ruling ANC have not always been smooth. Most notably, the South Africans have been critical of the U.S. Global War on Terror. The two countries clashed over the creation and powers of the International Criminal Court and they have disagreed over methods to deal with crises in Zimbabwe, Côte d'Ivoire, and Libya. The tensions are not only diplomatic, but also affect strategic and military cooperation. Examples include military bases in Africa and the creation of AFRICOM.

Given the critical, strategic importance of South Africa, the conveners of this workshop felt that it is important that the two countries seek to build understanding of each other's strategic perspectives to promote a more stable, resilient, and transparent strategic relationship. The United States and South Africa have successfully worked together in the past to help achieve nonproliferation goals.² What we aimed to accomplish through this dialogue workshop was to help

² For example, within the Nuclear Suppliers Group, South Africa had initially objected to making the Additional Protocol a condition of supply of sensitive nuclear material because of its NAM membership and to prevent restrictions to its own commercial interests. However, the two countries cooperated to draft language on this issue that met South Africa's concerns and satisfied one of the main goals of US nonproliferation policy.

the two countries continue to build on their common interests and to recommend a way around the issues that divide them.

Increasing U.S.-South African Goodwill, Understanding, and Cooperation

The United States and South Africa share important interests. These include:

- Creating and enhancing the diplomatic and military capacity to respond to civil conflicts in Africa by strengthening the security architecture of the AU, particularly the African Standby Force;
- Facilitating the responsible generation and use of nuclear energy while avoiding the dangers of dual-use technologies;
- Combating terrorism; and
- Ensuring freedom of navigation in the Indian Ocean region.

All of these issues share a common characteristic: they can influence the potential for the proliferation and use of nuclear weapons in sub-Saharan African and indirectly impact the likelihood of civil conflicts in mineral-rich regions (such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, Mali, and others) that might exploit uranium and other minerals. In January 2013, the AU formally recognized the importance of these issues as an element of their peace and security agenda, with special reference to implementing UNSCR 1540 (2004) and finalizing negotiations with South Africa on the establishment of the headquarters of the African Commission on Nuclear Energy (AFCON) and related matters.

This dialogue between intergovernmental, academic and civil society representatives from the U.S.-South Africa aimed to deepen understanding of the ways in which each nation views its most critical security concerns and the domestic debates that shape those views. In 2012, the U.S. Consul General in Cape Town, Erica Barks-Ruggles, emphasized the importance of U.S.-South African relations for the achievement of U.S. foreign policy goals in Africa. She noted that the countries face similar challenges and seek common goals, yet often disagree on the *tactics* to achieve these goals.³

Why South Africa?

Among sub-Saharan African countries, South Africa has the largest economy in all of Africa, with a 2011 GDP of \$524 billion and a real growth rate of 3.4%.⁴ It is the most industrially developed country in Africa; maintains one of the most capable militaries and the only blue-water navy; and is a leader in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and one of the primary creators

³ Erica Barks-Ruggles, "South Africa and the United States of America: Common Challenges and Common Goals," Presentation to the South African Institute of International Affairs, Centre for the Book, Cape Town, South Africa (January 24, 2012). Full text available at: http://southafrica.usembassy.gov/news_cpt_20120124_remarks2.html (accessed January 30, 2012).

⁴ Measured by purchasing power parity, reported by the CIA World Factbook: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sf.html>.

of the AU. It also maintains an active nuclear energy sector, with the only commercial nuclear power plant on the entire continent, and plans to develop at least three more by 2030 (with ultimate plans to build between six and nine additional reactors, though this is under debate at present).

While it is a strategically important country for the United States, public opinion polling reveals that among Africans, South Africans tend to be the most critical of both the United States and its policies. The negative evaluations delivered by South Africans are unusual, inasmuch as sub-Saharan Africans taken as a whole consistently record some of the most positive evaluations of the United States, its leaders, and its role in the world. A 2008 Gallup Poll revealed that in a worldwide sample, 62% of the sub-Saharan Africans surveyed approved of the performance of U.S. government leadership, more than double the approval rating from any other world region.⁵ This trend was continued in a series of Gallup polls in 2009, as well as in a series of world opinion surveys conducted by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC).⁶ In contrast to these positive assessments, often, fewer than 40% of South Africans polled expressed positive evaluations of the United States. In the 2008 Gallup Poll, for example, only 32% of South African respondents approved of U.S. performance, compared to 92% in the Central African Republic.⁷ A dialogue such as this one could help to engage with opinion leaders, such as academics, to help to improve the public perception of the United States and its initiatives.

There is also a direct nonproliferation dynamic that opinion leaders from the two countries could fruitfully address within the context of this dialogue. South Africa has been significantly affected by the sanctions against Iran that the United States and the European Union supported in early 2012, as the country was forced to shift where it sources crude petroleum.⁸ Within South Africa, the sanctions caused skyrocketing oil, because upwards of 25% of the country's oil had been sourced from Iran. The precise figure fluctuates monthly, but is down from the 1970s, when South Africa obtained over 75% of its oil from Iran.⁹ Against a backdrop of steadily rising global oil prices,

⁵ Julie Ray, "U.S. Leadership Approval Highest in Sub-Saharan Africa," Gallup World (April 8, 2008); <http://www.gallup.com/poll/106306/US-Leadership-Approval-Highest-SubSaharan-Africa.aspx> (March 15, 2012). These results were based on telephone and face-to-face interviews conducted throughout 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008.

⁶ Access the World Opinion Service polls at http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/views_on_countriesregions_bt/index.php?nid=&id=&lb=btvoc. See specifically the 2011 report, "Views of US Continue to Improve in 2011 BBC Country Rating Poll," March 7, 2011; and http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/views_on_countriesregions_bt/680.php?lb=btvoc&pnt=680&nid=&id= (March 15, 2012).

⁷ Ray, "U.S. Leadership Approval."

⁸ See, for example, Devon Maylie, "South Africa, U.S. Discuss Iran Sanctions," *The Wall Street Journal* (March 23, 2012), accessible at <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577299670576241882.html>; and Donwald Pressly, "Squeeze on Iran's Oil Tricky for SA," *Business Report* (March 23, 2012), accessible at <http://www.iol.co.za/business/business-news/squeeze-on-iran-s-oil-tricky-for-sa-1.1262125>.

⁹ Maylie, op cit; Pressly, op cit.

which were made drastically worse in South Africa (and other African countries) after the Libyan intervention, South Africans have blamed the U.S. interventionist and counter-proliferation policies for causing their woes. Whether or not the United States is at fault, this has fed on already relatively anti-American rhetoric and sentiment in the South African press and public opinion. Again, one of the secondary goals of a dialogue such as this one would be to influence the opinion leaders who can help to assuage these reactions and perceptions of U.S. policies and actions.

Many countries in Eastern and Southern Africa had already been experiencing fuel shortages when Libyan producers went offline in 2011. The threat of sanctions for using Iranian oil, coupled with the fuel crises stimulated by the Libyan war, have strengthened the perceived need for energy independence and nuclear power in many African countries. This includes a growing desire to gain the ability to produce nuclear fuel for nuclear power stations. Multiple African governments have expressed their desire to promote policies that would increase the beneficiation of primary products in their countries instead of exporting minerals and re-importing them after value-additions. However, in the case of uranium, acquiring the means to enrich uranium (the nuclear fuel cycle) holds proliferation risks and can result in suspicions if intentions are not understood and confidence building measures are not cultivated, including adhering to reasonable monitoring and verification measures.

South Africa already has plans to increase its reliance on nuclear energy in the future. The country currently has the only nuclear energy plant on the entire continent, the Koeberg station near Cape Town, which houses two nuclear reactors. In operation since 1984, Koeberg has been upgraded and currently uses uranium pressurized water reactors. It provides approximately six percent of South Africa's energy.¹⁰ Given the projected rise in demands for energy in the next 20 – 50 years, the South African government has signaled its intention to build more nuclear capacity. In May 2011, the South African government promulgated an "Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) 2010," which committed the government to create between six and nine new nuclear power units, in three to four locations. Together, this will increase South Africa's production of nuclear energy to 9.6GW.¹¹

The plans to increase the production of nuclear power have not been without controversy, however, especially following the Fukushima crisis in Japan. In 2010, public reactions led the government to pull the plug on a longstanding effort to build a pebble bed modular reactor. The South African nuclear industry had already invested \$1.3 billion in the project, over a period of 16 years. But experiences like the repercussions of the Iran sanctions give more impetus to the proponents of nuclear power, making it more likely that the government will be able to successfully pursue its nuclear energy program despite the strident critics. To justify investment in nuclear

¹⁰ Government of South Africa, "Nuclear Energy," accessed at http://www.energy.gov.za/files/esources/nuclear/nuclear_back.html.

¹¹ See "Nuclear power is a key part of SA's future," *Mail and Guardian* (December 9, 2011), accessed at <http://mg.co.za/article/2011-12-09-nuclear-power-is-a-key-part-of-sas-future>.

power and the fuel cycle, South Africa will try to position itself as a global nuclear industry player. This implies the export of nuclear technology and material. It then becomes important that the South Africans do not see American nonproliferation efforts as a way to hamstring competition for U.S. nuclear industry players.

In terms of the proposed dialogue, the governmental commitment to nuclear energy creates an important point of contention with the United States. South Africa promotes the rights of all states to acquire and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. With respect to a country such as Iran, many South Africans believe that U.S. imposition of sanctions is unjust, constitutes part of an international effort to prevent the increased power of an international rival, and essentially is an attempt to prevent other countries, particularly Muslim ones, from attaining the nuclear power they believe they need to develop. South Africa stands united with the other BRIC countries in this regard and, now that it has joined the economic bloc, this creates an even more powerful voice against the strategic priorities and international diplomatic efforts of the United States. When combined with the domestic pressures placed on the South African government by the energy crisis and its intention to become a bigger player in the global nuclear market, opposition to cooperation with U.S. security policies is a real possibility. These are the types of issues that can be productively discussed in an unofficial forum, and provide an opportunity for the perspectives of both sides to be shared and discussed in an informal setting.

Given the dynamic nature of issues in this area affecting U.S.-South African relations and the strategic position of South Africa for the achievement of U.S. goals on the continent, promoting cooperation between the two countries is extremely important. There have been concrete steps towards cooperation in multiple nonproliferation fora at the bilateral, multilateral and regional levels. This dialogue aimed to build on and support these official engagements with unofficial talks between academics from both countries.

One such matter is PSI, to which South Africa has not signed. As a counter-proliferation measure that involves intercepting WMD trafficking, the question is why South Africa is opting out when seventy other countries regard the PSI as important global measure in this area. South Africa's geographical position (having the Indian and Atlantic Oceans as borders) makes the country a vital maritime component of the PSI. The dialogue could tease out the reasons for South Africa's reluctance to join, e.g. resource limitations, concerns over taking on additional counter-proliferation obligations, the implications for sovereignty and trade, concern over the PSI's approach to counter-proliferation, etc. The dialogue will also try to tease out how the US can encourage South Africa to review its stance on the PSI, e.g. offering military aid specifically targeted to counter-proliferation within the PSI framework.

Larger questions in U.S.-South African relations remain unanswered. What does U.S.-South African strategic partnership (and 'going global') actually mean? What are the rights and duties of each side? How can the two countries maximize the likelihood for cooperation on the issues

discussed above? What are potential roadblocks to such cooperation? Given uncertainties from South Africa's new BRICS membership and pursuit of energy independence, misunderstanding between the two sides is all too likely and opportunities for joint gains are easily squandered. Frank discussion between the South African and United States strategic communities is therefore essential.

WORKSHOP SESSION ABSTRACTS

Session One: Global and Regional Security – Views from South Africa and the United States

The first panel discussed the global and regional security trends as viewed by general international relations scholars from both the United States and South Africa. The overview of U.S. views emphasized that historically, U.S. interest in and prioritization of Africa has waxed and waned, especially when considering U.S. assessment of Africa's strategic value. The Cold War provided a clear lens to prioritize foreign affairs, and within that, African policy received lower prioritization than other global areas. U.S. policy towards sub-Saharan Africa between 1989 and 2001 was categorized by large shifts, again due to the low prioritization of African issues but more so the general lack of a concrete foreign policy agenda in that time period. At times, democratization, human rights, and economic development were prioritized, and for a brief moment, these considerations had the potential to trump strategic concerns. This began to change in 1998 after the bombings of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, but shifted most concretely in the wake of the 2001 terrorist attacks. After 9/11, geostrategic imperatives once again set foreign policy agendas and priorities.

In the 2000s, therefore, the United States policy community viewed sub-Saharan Africa through the lens of ungoverned spaces and Africa's place in the Global War on Terror, which prioritized Africa as geostrategically important and a potential, though indirect, security threat. The main security concerns today are drug trafficking, Islamic extremism, maritime security, peacekeeping support, and refugee issues. Despite this increase in U.S. attention, sub-Saharan Africa is not prioritized as highly as North Africa or East Asia. The United States considers South Africa as an anchor state in Southern Africa and the continent, due to its preeminent political and economic position in the continent.

Current U.S. foreign policy towards Africa is organized into "five pillars": support for democratization; support for market-based economic growth; conflict prevention and resolution; support for presidential initiatives; and working with Africans on transnational issues. In 2007 the Bush administration established AFRICOM as an agency to implement, not develop, policy. Overall, there is normal engagement in the theatre of security cooperation with few direct threats. U.S.-South African relations are stronger when viewed through the lens of bilateral relations rather than within multilateral institutions. Potential areas for growth include market-based concerns with the potential for closer economic ties.

The overview of South Africa's conception of global and regional security emphasized that the South African government has been committed to the same foreign policy themes since 1994, while restructuring and repositioning South African foreign policy due to its emerging power aspirations. South African claims to continental leadership go back to the early 20th century administration of Jan Smuts. According to South African Foreign Minister Nkoana-Mashabane, "We have defined ourselves as a progressive agent for positive change. In practice, we have assumed the role of peacemaker and negotiator in Africa, and a champion of Africa's interests abroad."¹² South Africa's foreign policy aims include an anti-hegemony and independent foreign policy, which is aligned with the approach of other emerging powers like China and Brazil.

In the last decade, South Africa has redefined its foreign policy aspirations of global and regional leadership. The course was set during the administration of Thabo Mbeki, who focused on foreign policy during his presidency (some say, more than domestic issues). Mbeki was a leader in creating the AU, hoping to help the continent assert itself in the global realm. To position South Africa more forcefully within Africa, he restructured South Africa's foreign policy institutions to play a continental leadership role, and attempted to leverage South Africa's international impact through strategic multilateralism – increased participation in BRICS, the G20, and as a UNSC non-permanent member. This was an attempt to shift South Africa from being a "European bastard in an African sea" to a true leader on the continent. Although now de-racialized, South Africa has retained its leadership idea based on its position as the most developed African state. Additionally, to be a true regional leader, knowledge of the continent is a necessary prerequisite. South African awareness of the African continent can be characterized as episodic and wanes the farther north it strays from the South African epicenter.

Finally, the speaker argued that the current administration of President Jacob Zuma needs to shift the focus from foreign policy to domestic issues. South African foreign policy ambitions are slowly being realized, but unemployment and other economic issues hamper full domestic and regional success. The party politics of the ANC and the stain of corruption have damaging effects on leadership roles within the continent. The future will determine if South Africa can sustain its global and regional leadership positions while dedicating resources to domestic concerns and focusing political will on new networks. Although South Africa is recognized globally as the leader of Africa, there is a more contested view within Africa. Since RSA's global status is based on the perception of its moral authority, economic dominance, and military capacity, declines in its economic and military position within Africa could challenge its claim to global and regional status.

Discussion

¹² Maite Nkoana-Mashabane, "SA's aim: champion of Africa's interests abroad," *Sunday Independent* (January 15, 2012).

The discussion focused on the South African views of U.S. actions and initiatives on the continent and the increasing securitization of U.S. defense policy in Africa. A South African participant cited a litany of puzzling recent U.S. foreign policy cases including Egypt, Libya, AFRICOM, and Syria. In response, several noted that for the United States, strategic concerns often override rhetorical commitments; and acknowledged that this can create trust issues for South Africa and the rest of the continent. An American participant commented that the U.S. frustration with the inherent difficulties of multilateral institutions is the cause for unilateralism, although acknowledged the negative international perceptions it creates. Furthermore, the perceived securitization of U.S. foreign policy persists globally despite lack of numerical evidence: both the U.S. Department of State and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) vastly outspend the Department of Defense (DoD) within sub-Saharan Africa. The visceral anti-AFRICOM reaction promotes the negative perception of the United States on the continent.

In regards to foreign assistance, the discussion also focused on the necessity that U.S. posture shift towards engaging emerging powers as equals, rather than clients. Expectations of modernization differ: RSA views modernization in the traditional sense of building infrastructure and developing the economy, while the United States views modernization in a contemporary light of equal rights and the mitigation of social ills. In the future, South Africa might look towards China to realize its development goals. In order to move the U.S.-South Africa relationship towards one based on equality, the United States needs to support South Africa's new forms of activism like norm construction and bridge-building. These are necessary to support its position as an African leader and advocate "African solutions for African problems."

Session Two: Nuclear Deterrence and Disarmament Considerations

The second session focused on joint nuclear deterrence and disarmament considerations. The first speaker argued that RSA and the United States maintain fundamentally different perceptions on matters of national security. U.S. foreign policy and bilateral engagement with foreign states is best characterized by its expanding national security influence and a focus on bilateral relations, rather than working with and through multilateral institutions. In contrast, South Africa pursues regional and multilateral approaches and views the strengthening and deepening democracy as a means to address human security needs. In this, it views itself as a norm creator for the rest of the continent. "Africa first" is the key driver in South Africa's foreign policy of stabilization through global peacemaking, peace-building, and UN mandated operations. South Africa views the AU framework as the basis for involvement in activities outside of its borders that will bring future economic benefits. This speaker also acknowledged that a more cynical interpretation of South Africa's activism in the continent considers this a means to gain access to natural resources.

In both the USA and RSA, foreign policy choices are not easily made or modified; instead, political choices often do not reconcile with humanistic impulses. In South Africa there is currently a window of opportunity to redefine and reformulate policy positions that integrate and formalize

the country's international role and strategic interests into a foreign policy framework. South Africa's development profile determines its foreign policy and is a driver of its participation with BRIC states, although it has had difficulty harmonizing its own foreign policy goals with BRIC states and the AU. South Africa maintains a progressive international foreign policy agenda and remains anti-imperialist. The intervention of Libya demonstrated the limits of African and South African peacemaking abilities, regime change as a driver of intervention, and the death of responsibility to protect (R2P) as a guiding concept for military intervention.

South Africa views the UN as the best forum for developing countries to address arms control, nonproliferation, and renewable and reusable energy sources. Since it is also key to sustainable development, South Africa believes that nonproliferation is not a reason to obstruct or erode states' rights to nuclear energy. RSA articulates that all states, including Iran and North Korea, have the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. It is concerned, however, with non-compliance of IAEA standards and nuclear weapons tests. South Africa seeks a WMD-free world and has demonstrated its commitment on nuclear material, energy, and weapons nonproliferation and security through IAEA engagement.

The American speaker began by arguing that the Obama administration shares the concerns of the previous administration with respect to the risks of nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism, but has offered a strategic response that is considerably different in many key areas. Current U.S. nuclear policy is based on President Obama's 2009 Prague speech.¹³ Obama has embraced the long-term aspirational goal of a world free of nuclear weapons, re-committed the United States to the NPT process, and taken a number of steps to reduce U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence. These actions are intended to demonstrate a serious U.S. commitment to disarmament in the hopes of generating greater international support for toughening current nonproliferation rules. Despite early gains such as the New Start treaty and a positive outcome at the 2010 NPT Review Conference, momentum behind the "Prague Agenda" has slowed considerably, and it is not clear the degree to which foreign attitudes have changed.

Steps to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons include new approaches to hedging geopolitical and technical risk in nuclear stockpile planning, changes to Cold War era planning assumptions and methodologies, and continued development of missile defense and other non-nuclear weapons. Additionally, presidential guidance states that the United States can safely meet its requirements for deterrence with one-third fewer weapons than permitted in the New Start Treaty, providing the basis to pursue further nuclear arms reductions.

¹³ In this first major foreign policy speech, President Barack Obama announced his doctrine for a nuclear-free world by pledging to downgrade the importance of nuclear weapons in U.S. security doctrines, ratify the CTBT, and strengthening the NPT. For the text of this speech, see: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/04/05/obama-prague-speech-on-nu_n_183219.html.

The individual steps to advance disarmament goals may appear modest, but the attitudinal shift of the Obama administration represents a significant evolution in U.S. nuclear posture. Rapid movement toward disarmament would carry significant dangers. The soundest approach is a step-by-step process that works to reduce U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons, reduce the weapons themselves, and strengthen the rules that prevent nuclear states from emerging. The panelist succinctly described the progress: “slow and steady; incremental but meaningful.”

Discussion

The discussion in this session made clear that the different positions on disarmament sets the two states at odds on a fundamental level. One point of divergence centers on the pace and scope of disarmament. The United States is focused on a near-term agenda to reduce existing nuclear weapons on a step-by-step basis, while South Africa wishes to see more far-reaching steps to advance the more ambitious goal of achieving a nuclear weapons-free world. Further, South Africa is skeptical about establishing conditions for achieving progress in disarmament (“conditionality”) that seem to favor a continued special status for the P5. The United States and other P5 states continue to claim a special right to possess nuclear weapons and to use them as needed to respond to threats. As long as these states persist in relying on nuclear deterrence, South Africa will challenge their assertion of a legitimate right to possess nuclear weapons. One American participant suggested that if the United States ratified the CTBT, it could bridge some differences.

The countries have different perspectives on how to measure and evaluate progress in disarmament. While U.S. participants noted that the United States has made substantial progress in achieving nuclear disarmament, several South African participants said flatly that “it was not enough.” The South Africans focus on the normative aspect of disarmament - ratifying the CTBT, agreeing to FMCT, ratifying the Protocols to the Treaty of Pelindaba, and partnering in joint P5 disarmament initiatives.

The United States and South Africa also disagree on whether all nonproliferation rules should be applied universally to all states without exception. South Africa believes in universality and believes the United States promotes a double standard. This paternalistic attitude seeks to make a distinction between nuclear states that behave responsibly and those that do not and then uses that distinction to justify exceptions to what should be nonproliferation rules that apply to all states.

Another area of disagreement concerns access civil nuclear technology. The United States favors policies - nationally and in the NPT regime - that encourage states seeking civil power programs to purchase fuel cycle services through some type of market mechanism rather than through the acquisition of indigenous capabilities. South Africa views such an approach as inherently discriminatory and inconsistent with the right of NNWS under the NPT. This is a fundamental point of disagreement that surfaced in several workshop panels.

Participants from both sides agreed that it would be difficult to bridge these fundamental differences in principle and perspective, which are deeply entrenched and reflect the entrenched views of the nuclear “haves” and “have nots.” The participants thought it best to avoid discussions that perpetuated these differences and instead focus on identifying a more pragmatic agenda for future discussions.

Session Three: Views on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Peaceful Uses

This session sought to expand understanding of the American and South African perceptions of nuclear nonproliferation and peaceful uses. How does each country perceive the nonproliferation regime, expansion of nuclear energy, and the nuclear export regime and counter-proliferation measures? The presenters and the discussion focused on the U.S.-RSA incongruity on the prioritization of the NPT pillars and each country’s positions towards emerging nuclear weapon states (NWS). Perceptions on nonproliferation are historically divergent, but the presenters highlighted each country’s policy positions and ways to leverage the concerns to collectively strengthen the international nonproliferation regime.

The first speaker began by noting that the U.S. focus on the nonproliferation pillar of the NPT is historically contentious for both the United States and South Africa. South Africa and the NAM countries argue that U.S. nuclear policy disproportionately focuses energy and resources on nonproliferation compared to disarmament. Furthermore, these countries argue that U.S. nuclear energy policy emphasizes security and nonproliferation rather than finding a way to meet the real energy requirements of emerging countries. Although the United States has decreased its nuclear arsenal by 84% since 1967, the Bush Administration had little interest in new multilateral accords (such as the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty [FMCT]) and no interest in ratifying existing treaties (such as the CTBT). Further, the Bush Administration postured that it was willing to use nuclear weapons against NNWS that had signed the NPT. This posture has left an enduring imprint on how the United States is regarded by South Africans on these issues. Despite the rhetorical shifts outlined in the previous panel and the signing of a New START treaty between the United States and Russia in which both countries agreed to reduce their stockpiles by thirty percent, in reality there has been a small change in bilateral relations with Russia, the CTBT is still not ratified, and there is an impasse on FMCT negotiations.

In preparation for the 2015 NPT Review, the panelist argued that the United States needs to overcome significant domestic political hurdles. The limited implementation of the 2010 RevCon Action Plan lowered expectations of reforms post-2015. As long as Iran and North Korea continue their trajectory, the United States will continue to focus its political energy on nonproliferation, not disarmament and energy issues. While rhetorical political will exists, a follow-up to START is unlikely and the imbalance within the three pillars of the NPT is likely to remain.

In order to advance the nonproliferation regime, the panelist endorsed utilizing the NPT Review Process as leverage to promote global solutions through capacity building in the Global South. Addressing the resource needs of poorer states will foster conditions for sustainable commitment to the NPT. South Africa demonstrated previous leadership on this issue, and both states should partner together to lay the international foundations for a “global 21st century NPT regime.”

Speaking on the South African perspective, the panelist emphasized that each country has a unique perspective, framework, priorities, and influences, but the ultimate shared goals are strengthening the nuclear nonproliferation regime through disarmament and enhancing regional and global peace. For South Africa, the African countries, and the NAM, nonproliferation and disarmament policy are inexorably linked with democracy and human rights. Furthermore, while South Africans saw evidence of narrow success in U.S. nuclear policy, anything short of disarmament is overshadowed as disappointment. This is also a reflection of the South African view that the United States has ignored or dismissed South African priorities and perspectives, and not kept its nuclear nonproliferation and arms control commitments made at important international forums such as previous NPT RevCons (in 1995, 2000, and 2005).

The South African perspective is that the NPT is the cornerstone of the global nuclear disarmament and the nonproliferation regime, and that equal weight must be placed on all three of the NPT pillars. These pillars are inextricably linked and mutually reinforcing, so focusing on one, as does the United States, threatens to unbalance the entire enterprise. In the 2010 NPT RevCon, RSA had serious concerns over the collective lack of urgency and seriousness towards disarmament. Furthermore, South Africa feels that it has not been recognized in the international arena for its significant progress in implementing past agreements and restoring trust in the post-apartheid era. The panelist argued that South Africa is the only member of NAM, other than Belarus, that is party to all the nonproliferation treaties, and that this should earn it respect within the global community. Disarmament is also necessary because there are unacceptable humanitarian consequences for use of nuclear weapons. Contrary to deterrence theory, South Africa believes that nuclear weapons detract from security rather than guaranteeing it.

In regards to nonproliferation, RSA wants to expand the peaceful application of nuclear technology within and understands the necessity of strengthening safeguards to establish confidence and trust. Furthermore, establishing credible assurances of undeclared nuclear materials and activities can be advanced through the AP as an indispensable instrument for IAEA inspections. South Africa advocates for the Treaty of Pelindaba to further enhance disarmament and the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

South Africa supports the inalienable right of all states to a peaceful nuclear energy program under Article IV of the NPT. These principles were established in President Eisenhower’s 1953 Atoms for Peace proposal, but received less attention. Since South Africa is party to the NPT, it has an internationally legally binding obligation to exercise its right to enrich uranium for peaceful

purposes. This is further emphasized in Article II of the IAEA statute: to “accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world.”¹⁴ Nevertheless, the United States and other leading international actors seem to oppose this right. The P5 emphasize the inherent dangers in NNWS pursuing indigenous fissile material production. While Article IV entitles these rights, the P5 states prioritize the nonproliferation obligations in Articles II and III as a demonstration of full compliance. While South Africa calls on NAM countries to exercise their Article IV right, it simultaneously calls on North Korea to dismantle any nuclear weapons and re-enter the NPT and for Iran to become more transparent in its NPT related reporting and in welcoming IAEA inspections.

The panelist argued that the RSA nuclear agenda is historically consistent and very clear of future intentions. South Africa does not anticipate progress during the 2015 NPT RevCon unless advancement is made on equalizing the other pillars. To the South Africans, the prospect of success hinges on advancing the disarmament cause and establishing a Middle East NWFZ. South Africa believes its intentions are clearly shown through the dismantling of the nuclear weapons program and joining international binding obligations: it has been to the dark side and now it is ready to reap the benefits. Although RSA is a NAM state, the United States should not focus on the NAM collective rhetoric and instead look at South Africa’s overarching historical record. Furthermore, PSI is ideologically consistent with RSA policy, but needs to be approached and presented correctly. Overall, the U.S.-RSA relationship on nuclear issues is strained, but South Africa views dialogue and partnership based on mutual respect of priorities as the best avenue for substantive progress.

Discussion

The discussion following the presentations focused on how South Africa and other countries believe that possessing nuclear weapons provides states with power and leverage in the international community, which influences the aspirations and implications of emerging nuclear states. The perceived and unintended link between nuclear weapons and power resonates strongly among the South African public and policymakers. Many South Africans question the decision to dismantle their nuclear program, arguing that retaining it would have granted them more status in the international community. For example, they argue, the P5 states are all NWS as well. Many feel that had South Africa retained its weapons, it could make more demands in international fora. Additionally, the South African position is that “possession is the driver of proliferation” and that the U.S. deterrence strategy promotes this cycle.

While the NAM states are an important coalition for challenging the P5 status quo, questions were raised on NAM influence moving forward. Many agreed that the P5 and NAM states want the same ends, such as a non-nuclear weaponized Iran, but the P5 and other states tend not to understand this. One participant noted that President Zuma wrote a letter to the new Iranian president recommending that he reevaluate the country’s nuclear program. The NAM disagrees

¹⁴ International Atomic Energy Agency, “The Statute of the IAEA,” <http://www.iaea.org/About/statute.html>.

with the United States and the P5 over strategy and tactics, as previously discussed in this and the previous sessions.

While the United States trusts that South Africa is a “good nonproliferation partner” (a phrase South Africans disdains), many nonproliferation risks were raised in discussion. One participant questioned the security of the Pelindaba nuclear research center after an attempted robbery. South African participants confirmed that it was a petty theft and only computers, no nuclear weapon materials, were stolen. From the discussion it was clear that the South Africans are sensitive to accusations that they cannot responsibly secure the nuclear materials that currently exist within the country; arguing that the break-in at the Pelindaba facility in 2007 was about stealing computers and not gaining access to nuclear material. In South African parlance, Pelindaba was an “affirmative shopping experience” (redistribution of goods from those with to those without). They were strongly insistent that serious incidents of nuclear technology theft could not occur in the future. Yet the United States still treats the South Africans as not fully responsible and able to safeguard nuclear material, leading to an undertone that South Africa itself is a proliferation concern. In this context, strengthening the relationship is practically difficult. Other proliferation and security concerns included the A.Q. Khan network in South Africa, the possession and maintenance of nuclear medicine equipment, and the near inability of the Vastrap storage facility to obtain an NEC/NER license.

Session Four: U.S. and South African Domestic Political Interests Relating to Nonproliferation, Arms Control, and Disarmament Issues

In the session on domestic political interests relating to nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament interests, speakers reviewed the domestic landscape in the United States and South Africa. Common themes included publics relatively disengaged from nuclear, nonproliferation, and disarmament policy; active lobby groups heavily influenced by the nuclear industry in each country; and the existence of a small yet engaged set of civil society groups that oppose both nuclear weapons and energy. One key difference related to how the politics of national legislatures affect nuclear policy in each country. The dominance of the ANC in South Africa’s parliament creates a relatively unified approach to nuclear, nonproliferation, and disarmament issues in parliament, which eases the passage of key legislation and treaty ratification. In contrast, the divisions between Democrats and Republicans, and more importantly, within the Republican Party, mean that the U.S. Congress has a tendency to deadlock on the ratification of international treaties and other nonproliferation initiatives. The Americans in the group felt that South Africans did not understand how significantly divisions between and within the two political parties affect legislation and international policies.

The commentary on domestic political interests in South Africa revolved around several main themes. First, there was agreement that the South African general public is not well informed about nuclear matters and attention comes from several international and national anti-nuclear civil

society movements that operate in South Africa. A small group of academics are also engaged on these issues. The most influential community within South African civil society is the nuclear energy industry. Both civil society and academics tend to be opposed to the plans of the government to expand its nuclear energy and related industries, but these constituencies wield little influence on decision-making. Marginalized and stigmatized, civil society remains sceptical about the quality of and participation in the democratic process in respect of nuclear matters.

Given the dominance of the ANC, nuclear and disarmament policy is formulated primarily at the executive level and within the relevant government ministries; Parliament is predominantly silent on the issue. This party and executive dominance leads to a situation in which the government has a relatively coherent stance towards nuclear energy, nonproliferation, and disarmament. Importantly, nuclear energy issues are viewed as a means to achieve the national transformation project, while a firm stance on nuclear nonproliferation is viewed as an important component of an international activist agenda. The South African government's stated intention is to develop the country's nuclear energy sector and related industries, which it feels will serve as a stimulus to socio-economic development via industrial development. At the same time as it is open about these goals, the government remains secretive about its full range of nuclear intentions and, finally, has stigmatized anti-nuclear groups in the country. For example, during the Mbeki-era, anti-nuclear groups were effectively stigmatized as representing the marginalized interests of white middle-class liberals, and thus of being anti-state and racist. By playing the race card, the government was able to direct attention away from the criticism, and to avoid answering the charges of the anti-nuclear lobby.

The main actors and groups that are involved in domestic policies in South Africa were identified as:

- Community groups opposed to the locations identified for the six nuclear power stations planned to be constructed by 2030;
- Anti-nuclear groups such as Earthlife Africa, the Coalition against Nuclear Energy (CANE), and the Environmental Monitoring Group (EMG), which protest against allowing nuclear ships to dock at the Cape Town harbor;
- International NGOs concerned about the government's ability to manage nuclear energy in a responsible and secure manner, such Greenpeace International; and
- The local nuclear energy industry private actors, which focus predominantly on research and development capabilities.

Regarding U.S. domestic politics around nonproliferation, three themes emerged in the workshop. First, similar to the situation in South Africa, the general public tends to lack knowledge and do not prioritize nuclear weapons issues. Therefore, most of the activism and public influence on the policy process comes from special interest groups. The private nuclear industry, led by the Nuclear Energy Institute, is especially important and powerful. Because the general populace

continues to have concerns about international nuclear energy, rather than lobbying for the expansion of nuclear energy *within* the United States, the nuclear industry seeks to find new overseas markets for civilian nuclear products to sustain its U.S. defence contracts. A second significant lobby group includes the environmental groups opposed to the expansion of the nuclear industry and non-profit organizations opposed to nuclear proliferation. Groups like the Arms Control Association, the Center for a Liveable World, the Council for Arms Control and Nonproliferation, and the Ploughshares Fund are the strongest advocates of nonproliferation. A third influential lobby includes diaspora groups who monitor nuclear policy towards their home countries (examples of vocal diasporas include Israel and India). In another similarity to South Africa, nuclear and arms control issues have taken backseat to other foreign policy issues in Congress and policy tends to emanate from the executive branch.

On the other hand, U.S. nuclear policy is becoming more strategic and less based on blanket principles of nonproliferation, and is increasingly guided by foreign policy interests in geopolitically important regions and relations with specific countries. Different from South Africa, however, is how divisions with Congress affect the policy process. Divisions between the two parties in Congress and within the Republican Party affect both the content of policy and the ratification of international treaties. More important than the bipartisan divide is the division within the Republican Party itself. This internal factionalization within the Republican Party provides an opportunity to exploit the differences and pass legislation on key issues, but this has not yet occurred. The incoherent U.S. nuclear policy is a result of the congressional gridlock, divisions within the Republican Party, lack of education and attention from the general public, and low attention from the administration. Nuclear policy and arms control debates have taken a back seat to other foreign policy issues (Iraq, Afghanistan, terrorism, etc.). The panel discussed how these themes have played out in recent policy initiatives, including the strategic partnership with India starting in 2005, Obama's declared commitment to Global Zero, and U.S. policy toward Iran.

Discussion

The following discussion highlighted how the origins each country's nuclear policy have implications for future plans and the nuclear legacy. First, South Africa views some of the nuclear safety and security requirements as obstacles to economic activity due to added costs. South Africa wants to enrich uranium and tries to justify this desire with the benefits of added jobs and prestige. Instead of enriching HEU for medical isotopes (as Canada, the biggest supplier to the United States does), South Africa is forced to enrich LEU to lower the proliferation risk. South African participants viewed the limitations on the role South Africa can play in the nuclear energy field as purely a manifestation of economic diplomacy rather than real security concerns. There was acknowledgement that factors such as supply security, environmental concerns, and lack of capacity are real factors, but they aggravate the accusations of double standards.

Another point of discussion included South Africa's legacy of nuclear scientists and whether they should be a source of concern. A South African participant highlighted how nuclear scientists previously had a strong "international" culture despite the limitations of sanctions. Furthermore, it was also made clear that no nuclear scientists have gone over to the "other side" since they were initially picked because they were patriots and there is now pride to work in the nuclear sector. South Africans view American concerns with the integrity of their nuclear scientists as "confusing the issue" and "throwing suspicion." There is concern from both sides regarding the mentorship problem and generational gap as the former apartheid scientists retiring without a new generation of nuclear scientists taking their place.

Last, there was a brief but important discussion regarding the potential humanitarian consequences of nuclear proliferation. Some participants saw this as an opportunity to engage on a non-nuclear topic and train first responsible on the consequences of a nuclear use.

Session Five: Identifying Areas of Mutual Interest

In this session we asked the speakers and participants to consider what issues the United States and South Africa generally agree are short and long-term opportunities and challenges in nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament. What competing priorities affect the range of issues in which the countries agree? How can the United States and South Africa further promote and enhance the implementation of UNSCR 1540 in line with the January 2013 AU Assembly Decision (Assembly/AU/Dec.472)? The session presentations and discussion highlighted the following points.

Particular areas of agreement and opportunities:

WMD nonproliferation: From the U.S. perspective, the speaker highlighted that the United States and South Africa have been mutually dedicated to preventing the spread of WMD, a common theme in the workshop. South Africa has demonstrated its nonproliferation commitment in numerous ways over the past two decades by providing leadership and support to the associated WMD nonproliferation treaties, conventions, and control regimes, including IAEA safeguards and the NPT (including the AP), the Treaty of Pelindaba (establishing a NWFZ in Africa), Nuclear Security Summit participation, signing and ratifying numerous other conventions, including the CTBT, the CWC, and the BWC. The United States recognizes that RSA is the most important and able actor in Africa in this area. The variety and extent of bilateral collaboration in this area impressed participants, and include, for example, the International Nuclear Safeguards and Engagement Program (INSEP), the Partnership for Nuclear Security (PNS) and scholarships and student exchanges. The two states also cooperate in multilateral forums, such as on promoting nuclear nonproliferation in the AU and at the G8. Collaboration on issues, such as implementation of UNSCR 1540 and managing uranium resources also exist at the bilateral level.

Bilateral cooperation on WMD and terrorism: The speaker reviewed a large number of bilateral efforts to combat global terrorism and the spread of WMD: investigations and prosecutions of specific cases related to South Africans; the conversion of SAFARI-1 to LEU fuel operations (and U.S. repatriation of 6.3 kg of HEU); security awareness and physical security improvements at nuclear facilities; health and safety initiatives; and UNSCR 1540 implementation and cooperation with other AU state reporting.¹⁵ Bilateral cooperation in this area is steered by an agreement signed in 2009, which established the U.S.-South Africa Nonproliferation and Disarmament Dialogues. South Africa welcomed Obama's Prague speech and other measures related to reducing the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. national security strategy and the effects that have had on U.S. nuclear posture.

However, differing views exist around additional states acquiring fissile material, the concept of a Nuclear Renaissance (more players, more pathways), the right to uranium enrichment, oversight and control of dual use items, and cooperative efforts on UNSCR 1540.

From the South African perspective, the speaker felt that it is difficult to highlight the areas of agreement without referring to areas of disagreement. In many cases there may be agreement in principle but there is disagreement on how to achieve certain goals. This echoed a theme that further underlining its importance: finding synergy between approaches and understanding can be difficult. Once again, the speaker raised the issue that both countries want to strengthen the NPT, but the difference between how they weight the three pillars can lead to problems. Here, the speaker raised the by now recurring issue of how the pressure placed on NNWS is often viewed as double standards given that the United States and other NWS are not leading by example.

This speaker raised the perceptions issue, articulating that non-participation by the Global South (including RSA) in nonproliferation initiatives is often viewed by the USA as "noncompliance." However, U.S. officials need to understand, the speaker argued, that such "noncompliance" is often simply a lack of capacity to implement these initiatives. Given this, the simple use of the term "noncompliance" by U.S. officials was considered insulting and showed a lack of understanding of the South African position: too many competing priorities and not enough knowledgeable personnel to manage them. In their view, noncompliance indicates that the United States considers this an issue of political will, not a capacity constraint.

The South African government places emphasis on its regional context, with particular focus on the AU. In this respect, the United States can help to develop regional and sub-regional strength and interest in nuclear issues, including promoting sharing of information through the AU. U.S. resources would be best spent focused on UNSCR 1540 which the AU is taking up as a portfolio matter. The South African government has requested assistance from the United States, which provides an opportunity for the two states to collaborate. Also in regional context, the United States is seen as a strategic partner in implementing the Pelindaba Treaty and ratification of the protocols

¹⁵ Upon request, a list of these initiatives can be obtained from the Department of State Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation.

(with appended reservations/interpretative declarations with respect to Diego Garcia). U.S.-RSA cooperation can also be directed to create open environments for dialogue, especially in the Middle East. The question was also posed where the United States is positioned with respect to the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons used, an issue that RSA feels strongly about.

The break-out sessions were tasked with identifying areas of mutual interests, agreement, and opportunity for cooperation or greater cooperation.

Within mutual interest and agreement, there was consensus that both South Africa and the United States desire good outcomes to the 2015 RevCon. They both believe that a straightforward and non-contentious approach is the most important aspect for conference dynamics. Furthermore, there is mutual interest between both the United States and South Africa to approach capacity building practically. Another area of agreement was that academia would be a suitable and willing interlocutor to build capacity outside the official channels. By increasing technical cooperation at the scientist-to-scientist level, there are greater chances for cooperation by removing the discussion from the political realm.

Furthermore, there was a vibrant discussion regarding the opportunities for initial cooperation and expanding cooperation into other areas. First, many participants viewed the public as an important partner for capacity building. It was viewed as essential to have positive public opinion, and acknowledged the challenges in the future course, prioritization of issues, and demographics since lack of public interest is indicative of lack of threat perception. One participant raised the historical success of the landmines campaign as a precedent for a campaign to raise awareness of nuclear weapons. Another way to harness public interest and support is by demonstrating that projects will work; one possible project is the peaceful application of AFCONE. Other areas of opportunity include detaching controversial issues away from core areas of agreement to increase progress through a step-by-step approach. By first tackling the soft security issues outside of the political realm, there would be increased opportunities for reaching the hard security issues in the future. For example, South Africa does not have ideological obstacles to PSI and dealing with the economic implications is an avenue for eventually reaching PSI ratification. Last, it is important to look past the big WMD issues and reach the same goal through focusing on other areas of agreement, like on small arms.

Session Six: Looking to Areas of Misunderstanding and Disagreement

In this session, the speakers and general discussion focused on the issues that South Africa and the United States view differently. The speakers were asked to consider topics ranging from Iran, sanctions, the IAEA Additional Protocol, minimizing stocks and the civil use of HEU in lieu of LEU, or competing economic interests in nuclear technology, trade and the uranium market.

Presenting the U.S. view, the speaker argued that general foreign policy misunderstandings and disagreements feed into nuclear relations. On the one hand, South Africa lacks trust due to U.S.

historic use of hard power (military; coercion) in foreign policy with examples including the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the creation of AFRICOM, U.S. policy toward Zimbabwe, and U.S. support for NATO's military intervention in Libya. These incidents suggest that the United States ignores South Africa's foreign policy principles: a commitment to diplomacy rather than force and African solutions to African problems. A speaker from among the South Africans argued that the two states have different identities that influence how interests are defined and pursued and shape how each country operates in the international realm. This led to a discussion amongst the participants about the divergence between principles and tactics: while the countries may agree on end-states, goals and general principles, they often disagree on the means.

Both sides emphasized that RSA sees the United States as not living up to its commitments under the NPT and agreements reached at the review conferences, e.g. the 13 Practical Steps of the 2000 NPT RevCon. At the same time, the United States does not fully trust the motivations behind South Africa's desire to regain production capabilities across the entire fuel cycle. The discussion again focused on how the United States sometimes refers to South Africa as a "proliferation danger" or "concern." Again, panelists noted that the label is not clear and may imply a deliberate inclination of the South African government to restart a nuclear weapons option, which places the country's civilian nuclear energy program under suspicion.

Particular aspects of the nonproliferation and disarmament regime that the two disagree on are:

The "three pillars" of the NPT: RSA sees all pillars of the NPT as equal but believes the United States emphasizes pillar 2: "nonproliferation." In contrast, pillar 1: "rights of all states to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes" is strictly conditional on observance of nonproliferation rules. To the United States, pillar 3 (disarmament) is optional and aspirational and can be pursued outside the context of the NPT, e.g., through the New START and other bilateral arrangements with Russia. South Africa sees the failure of the NWS to disarm as a violation of the NPT that is roughly equivalent to certain NNWS not complying with NPT rules.

Iran: Long term relations between the ANC and Iran mean that South Africa has more trust than the United States in Iranian statements that Iran is peacefully developing nuclear energy. RSA has voted for resolutions against Iran's intransigence even though it has been rhetorically emphasizing Iran's inalienable right to nuclear energy and the fuel cycle for peaceful uses. Sanctions against Iran are a bigger "ask" for RSA as a result of historic relationship and reliance on Iranian oil (previously, providing a quarter of RSA's oil imports). American sanctions against companies dealing with the Iranian government have had economic and reputational impact on South African companies. The urgency for RSA to resolve the Iran issue was seen in President Zuma's mentioning of the issue in his congratulatory letter to Iranian President Rouhani after his recent election to office.

Nuclear weapons, NPT Article VI, and Global Zero: South Africa sees the very existence of nuclear weapons as problematic whether in the hands of the P5 or any other states. RSA espouses

equality among states and believes that nuclear weapons are one of the greatest sources of inequality; the so-called nuclear apartheid. The United States views New START as the good faith first steps on the long road to Global Zero; in contrast, RSA sees a gradual, step-by-step approach outside the NPT framework as lip service to Article VI. South Africa wants to see unconditional and substantive reductions in nuclear weapons as a definitive indication of total disarmament.

RSA's NAM membership and identity: South Africa works with the NAM, which opposes the dominance of "superpowers" and emphasizes equality, justice, and fairness in international relations against a history of colonialism, often referred to as "a principled position." In contrast, the United States believes that superpower leadership has maintained the stability of the global order and the relatively peaceful world since 1945. South Africa, like the NAM, does not appreciate third parties negotiating measures "above their heads" and then presenting these measures to be implemented, as a *fait accompli*. South Africa sees itself as representative of NAM in nuclear forums like the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) and feels accountable to NAM, which makes it difficult for RSA to take positions that contradict NAM positions. The Arab League is a strong group within NAM that puts Israel's nuclear status on the agenda. The United States is content with Israel's ambiguous nuclear policy, which provides an important part of its security. South Africa wants to see Israel disarm, in line with the position of Egypt and other NAM states.

Nuclear Weapon Free Zones (NWFZs): South Africa sees NWFZs as a fundamental part of the NPT goal of nuclear disarmament. In contrast, the U.S. defense establishment views NWFZs, including protocols of the African Nuclear Weapons Free Zone (AFNWFZ), as intended to close military options to NWS through negative security guarantees. The U.S. Senate is customarily reluctant to ratify treaties, including NWFZ treaties.

The Indo-U.S. nuclear deal and Indian membership of the NSG: Despite RSA's India, Brazil, and South Africa (IBSA) and BRICS membership, it was reluctant to allow the Bush Administration to push through agreements to allow nuclear exports to India. South Africa believes that because India violated the NPT by redirecting peaceful nuclear technology to military purposes and remained outside the nonproliferation regime, it should have been penalized. But allowing exports of nuclear material to India normalized it as a nuclear weapons country, and in South Africa's view, was in violation of the NPT. South Africa sees a double standard: India was provided an exception to export nuclear material to a state without a comprehensive safeguard agreement; however, RSA and other NSG members are required to abide by many nonproliferation obligations without India's inclusion. Now the United States wants India to become a member of the NSG, which would prevent similar obligations from being imposed in the future. RSA is likely to eventually support Indian membership but will have to be able to justify this position to the NAM. This may require concessions from India, such as joining the CTBT. Nevertheless, the time is ripe to pursue issues that have been on the back burner in previous administrations, such as this one.

Article IV and RSA's pursuit to be a global nuclear industry player: RSA, along with the NAM, opposes any measures that impede what they perceived to be an inalienable right to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. As an emerging power RSA sees itself playing its rightful role as a country with an advanced nuclear industry in the international market. RSA's stated policy is the pursuit of building the capacity to beneficiate its minerals, including uranium. It will thus not give up or limit its option to enrich uranium and therefore did not support the idea of signing up to international fuel banks, a proposal that the United States supports in an effort to limit and control the spread of sensitive nuclear technology and material.

Article IV and the AP: Under the Bush Administration, the United States pursued a policy that would deny any state without an already functioning nuclear fuel cycle access to such technology, irrespective of intent. The U.S. push to make the AP a condition of supply of sensitive nuclear technology and material (ENR) was seen in the context of former President Bush's nuclear policy. The AP strengthens IAEA safeguards of civil nuclear programs to monitor and verify non-diversion to military uses, but is additional to the comprehensive safeguard system to which the NPT members are legally bound. Although South Africa has an AP in place it did not support this measure, not least because an exemption was negotiated for Brazil and Argentina.¹⁶ RSA and the United States cooperated to negotiate text in the NSG that RSA was able to sell to NAM. However, it is in this context that Abdul Minty (the South African ambassador to the IAEA and NSG) noted that the NSG is outside the nonproliferation regime and should not be used as a pseudo-IAEA. The matter is now under discussion at the IAEA.

Fissile Material Treaty and the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMT/FMCT): In general, RSA resists measures that do not revise P5 privileges or what they consider to be the historic injustices built into NPT. This is manifested in the tension over fissile material for nuclear weapons: eliminate all fissile material or focus on eliminating new production of fissile material. For RSA, any treaty that does not address reductions in the existing stockpiles of fissile materials within the NWS in a legally-binding way is a non-starter (i.e., the FMT). Failing to address this would perpetuate historical imbalances between NNWS and the NWS/P5. In contrast, the United States emphasizes the need to stop *new* production of fissile material, leaving existing stockpiles out of the treaty. This would promote the role of bilateral and voluntary arrangements to reduce existing stockpiles of fissile material, pointing to the bilateral efforts of Russia and the US to reduce their fissile material (Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty). The difference is not simply one of semantics (as the tension is often portrayed), but of basic principles.

CTBT ratification: RSA wants to see the United States ratify the CTBT. It was negotiated by the State Department in 1996, rejected by the U.S. Senate in 1999, and the chances that it will be ratified are slim, especially in the current U.S. Congress. Despite overtures to multilateral fora under the Obama administration, the U.S. remains resistant to have international organizations make

¹⁶ Neither have APs in place, but they have a bilateral regime, the Brazilian–Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials (ABACC), considered by most to be weaker than the AP.

rules about what it sees as its strategic assets and security interests. Domestic politics and interests will continue to curtail progress on this issue.

NPT Withdrawal clause: Article X of the NPT confirms the right of member states to withdraw from the Treaty if “extraordinary events” related to the subject matter of the Treaty jeopardizes the supreme interests of the country. The United States wants to make it more difficult for states to withdraw so states (like Iran or North Korea) may use the Treaty to get nuclear technology that will eventually serve their respective aims to build nuclear weapons, violating the Treaty.

To deal with these tensions and misunderstandings, participants suggested:

- Increased diplomatic communications at the track one and two levels because the current system of strategic dialogue and lower level dialogues are thought to work well.
- Increased U.S. investment for capacity building in South Africa.
- Foreign Service Officials could better communicate U.S. positions to RSA counterparts; and U.S. officials could better understand South African concerns, priorities, and constraints.
- U.S. elite education/workshops to impress on RSA elites why CTBT or Pelindaba Protocols ratification are difficult in the United States and vice versa to explain why RSA may take a position that seems contradictory to its stated principles.
- A “no first use” of nuclear weapons posture from the United States to gain confidence from South Africa that the United States is moving in the right direction.
- Increased military to military outreach to increase RSA naval capacity (could promote RSA’s willingness to join PSI) and help build confidence.
- On both sides it was noted that there are executive level workarounds in foreign policy and nonproliferation to get around institutional obstacles and that the countries should not limit their options.
- The United States should refrain from “othering” (employing us vs. them rhetoric), targeting South African diplomats at multilateral meetings for U.S. surveillance, and using carrots and sticks approaches to push through unilateral approaches.

Discussion

Participants were divided into three groups dealing respectively with each pillar of the NPT.

The group focusing on disarmament agreed that both states want to see a world free of nuclear weapons, but disagree on how to achieve this goal. The discussion highlighted that the United States will not unilaterally relinquish its nuclear weapons (unlike RSA). The South African participants emphasized that as long as nuclear weapons exist, they might be used with dire global humanitarian and economic consequences. Despite this disagreement, the group highlighted the change in tone from the Bush to the Obama administrations, encouraging presidential declarations, and the fact that the Obama administration has assembled a committed team to work on nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation (the group called it a “Dream Team”). Despite the welcoming

these measures, the South African participants were keen to see the measures brought into the NPT linked multilateral forums, such as the Conference on Disarmament and the NPT RevCons. The discussion also highlighted the *de facto* NWS (India, Pakistan, North Korea, and Israel). The United States and RSA agree on North Korea, but disagree on the other countries, especially that U.S. allies of Israel and India seem to be treated differently. A point was made that nuclear weapons represent power and prestige and therefore disarmament is also about delegitimizing nuclear weapons. Civil society also plays an important role: during the Oslo Conference the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons use were highlighted, especially by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

There was a sense that the differences on this issue could be greatly bridged if there were more trust between the two countries, leading the group to argue that an accelerated confidence building process is needed. Building closer relations will also call for pragmatism from both states with respect to NWFZs (Middle East and Pelindaba). Participants questioned what “we” (academics) can do and provided suggestions such as building rapport among the academic community of experts, producing knowledge that reflects more nuanced insight of each countries’ policies and motivations, and influencing governments (including legislatures and public opinion).

In the nonproliferation group, both sides agreed that the United States and South Africa have a shared interest in good outcome of 2015 NPT RevCon. The group discussed ways to achieve these goals and came concluded that keeping the focus on enhancing broad cooperation and making progress in international fora would be preferable to going into the details of nonproliferation issues where the differences can cause stalemate. More concrete cooperation in upcoming years could involve capacity building generally and specifically in governmental and regulatory institutions and cyber security, as well as through measures to build public confidence and understanding. This can be done through scientific and technical exchanges between South Africa and United States (e.g. lab-to-lab exchanges) and working together on verification and monitoring technology, i.e. proactive campaigns/initiatives. Along with this, the group thought there is a broader context for the cooperation avenues and that it might be productive to start with soft issues (e.g. developmental issues) to generate goodwill and a positive track record, smoothing the way to make greater progress on hard issues. In this respect, the United States was challenged to identify ways to help make the AFCONE a successful forum.

The discussion also considered why South Africa has not yet joined the PSI. Engagement and cooperation on this issue will be difficult but it can be brought back to the table. Both sides agreed there are no principled or ideological objections to the initiatives, but the obstacle is the way it has been approached by the United States and capacity issues within the South African government. Therefore, PSI discussions should occur on their own, and not linked to principled issues that South Africa cannot agree to, due to its international constituency. Additionally, the United States needs to understand the significant capacity constraints that the South African government operates under; for some, the PSI has too many requirements that they cannot possibly fulfill, and this undermines

support for inclusion. Finally, the South African side is sensitive to impression that PSI might impede RSA's economic growth or sovereignty; therefore pressuring the government to join, which could be seen as an infringement of its sovereignty or potential block to economic growth (nuclear energy), will generate resistance.

The group thought that there is not much scope for progress on the intractable issues or issues of fundamental disagreement. However, suggestions were made that the United States should continue to support South African civil society and more Track 1.5 initiatives that can feed robust track one diplomacy.

In the nuclear technology breakout group, the participants agreed that access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes is an inalienable right if a state is an NPT member in full compliance. Different understandings of what an "inalienable right" means to each state, leads to disagreement. For example, the United States does not consider it an automatic right of states to engage in the entire process of nuclear material enrichment and reprocessing because technology for LEU can be adapted to make HEU. For the United States, this means that it is impossible to guarantee complete transparency where a number of openings exist, and this can easily lead to a proliferation risk – evidenced by suspicions about Iran's energy program and Brazil and Turkey retaining the capabilities. Therefore, the United States favors fuel banks (consolidated HEU production and storage) to prevent proliferation. The South Africans were critical of U.S. acceptance of Germany, Japan, and South Korea, but not South Africa, as states trusted to enrich uranium. Despite the material benefits of part-taking in both the domestic and international nuclear industry, this denies South Africa both the material and intangible benefits of reputation previously afforded. In extreme cases, some argue that this is an example of the West trying to stymie the economic growth of "the rest."

Furthermore, the United States regards RSA's stock of HEU as a concern and would like to see it diluted or handed over. Conversely, the South African government considers the stockpile a strategic resource and is unlikely to accede to these wishes. Additionally, South African aspirations to regain the full nuclear fuel cycle are linked to conceptions of sovereignty and economic growth. The United States instead focuses on the potential proliferation risk: if it re-acquires this technology, South Africa could be pulled or pushed into providing nuclear material to proliferators. Given RSA's record, the South Africans regard this distrust as a non-proliferator to be an insult to the country.

SA also expects rewards when it "proliferation-proofs" its facilities. One example was when RSA converted its SAFARI-1 reactor to LEU and developed technology that used LEU for the manufacturing of medical isotopes. The continuing distrust of South Africa is more problematic as its competitors still use HEU and have not incurred the same costs to their economies.

Session Seven: Defining the Ideal Relationship between South Africa and the United States

In this session, we sought to forge a path forward with respect to U.S.-South Africa relations. What should or could be the ideal relationship between the two countries? How can we use dialogues like this effort to improve the U.S.-RSA relationship? In this panel, the two speakers focused at the 30,000-foot level and more concrete levels. In the more general presentations, discussion focused on how, based from the common perspective of shared values and ideals, the U.S.-South Africa bilateral relationship should be as close as that between the United States and Australia or New Zealand. In reality, however, the current official relationship lacks warmth, is often “edgy,” and remains underdeveloped. On both sides the relationship is distorted by suspicion and disappointments with historical roots. Nuclear issues could provide an avenue to generate closer relations, due to South Africa’s unique credibility on disarmament.

In the aftermath of the end of apartheid, Americans had anticipated that South Africa would lead the continent in the direction of Western values, be an engine of growth for the African continent, and a force in the developing world for democracy and human rights. Instead, because of South Africa’s diplomatic orientation toward the South and the non-aligned, many in the United States Government (USG) feel that South Africa has not upheld what they consider to be “universal” ideals of human rights and democracy in several key instances (Zimbabwe being a prime example). Additionally, a sub-stream of the political rhetoric and symbols used by successive ANC administrations calls into question the commitment to non-racial democracy.

On the other side, South Africans had anticipated massive inflows of Western – especially American – aid after 1994 and had expected that this investment that would transform the economy and lives of the majority living in poverty. When massive aid and investment inflows did not arrive, Pretoria began to question the American commitment to post-apartheid South Africa. Feeding those suspicions was liberation movement memory of Washington cooperating closely with the apartheid regime on issues related to the Cold War. Pretoria also remains sensitive to instances of American “unilateralism” which it sees manifested in military intervention in Libya, Washington’s reluctance to defer to South African leadership in Africa, and its reluctance to take into account the non-aligned perspective.

An ideal relationship would be that of a partnership between two democracies devoid of the current climate of suspicion and disappointment. As the many discussions in this workshop have demonstrated, there is a certain confluence between the U.S. and South African positions on nuclear energy and nonproliferation issues. Working these commonalities can hold potential for improving the quality of the broader relationship between the countries, and build a reservoir of goodwill and understanding that might lead to progress on bridging the differences. Rather than creating new structures for this dialogue, both countries could make greater use of their respective embassies, augmented by experts when required. Unofficial efforts, dialogues, and exchanges can also go a long way to overcoming suspicion and disappointment if participants are close to, but not part of, their

respective governments. There is also a role for international nuclear agencies. An improved bilateral relationship will be about people, communications, and better mutual understanding, not new bureaucratic structures. Nuclear issues can provide a point of entry to improved dialogue that could facilitate a closer bilateral relationship.

Forging a relationship based on nuclear and nonproliferation issues is not a panacea, however. Moving below the level of grand international relations, and more concretely considering the nonproliferation and nuclear energy realms, it is important to reflect on the historical context of this relationship. South Africa's strong support for nuclear disarmament and its critical position vis-à-vis U.S. policies and nuclear doctrine, its unique nuclear related relationship with the United States, as well as its role as "bridge builder" between the nuclear weapons states on the one side and the majority of NNWS (as represented by the NAM) on the other, all impose constraints on the degree to which the RSA and USA will ever align perspectives on nuclear and nonproliferation issues.

There remains a deep dividing line between South Africa and the United States regarding their divergent approaches to national, regional, and global security. The United States and its NATO and other strategic allies consider nuclear weapons to be fundamental in their defense strategies. In contrast, South Africa holds that the development of new types of nuclear weapons or the rationalization of their use contradicts the spirit of the NPT and its RevCons. South Africa fundamentally holds that its national security - and the security of the African region - is guaranteed by a strong NPT and not by nuclear weapons. Therefore, the South Africa of today firmly believes that possession of nuclear weapons provides only an illusion of security for those who possess them, but in reality such possession only serves to increase insecurity. These different postures reflect important fundamental difference in approach between the two governments: while South Africa's nonproliferation policy is one of principle, the United States and its allies consider matters of nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament from a national security perspective.

Nonetheless, a strong dialogue between the two governments continues to exist on a number of key issues, and there is also a mutual understanding on some of the limitations by each government to further enhance cooperation. South Africa's principled position on nuclear disarmament and the unequivocal right to nuclear energy and technology for peaceful purposes remain the guiding principles in its relationship with the United States on these matters. American expectations that South Africa will continue to bring about miracles by rallying the NAM behind key compromise positions in response to some of the most challenging issues on the nonproliferation agenda, as it previously did in 1995 and 2000, can strain the limits of this cooperation. An important element that is often overlooked by the United States is the limited resources available to South Africa for it to (1) be a bridge builder on some of the most dividing issues, or (2) conform to standards as defined by the United States. If the United States would reduce both expectations, it could help to improve some of the tensions noted above.

Formal mechanisms like the bi-annual strategic dialogue between South Africa and the United States to discuss issues and matters related to WMD related nonproliferation, disarmament, and arms control, as well as nuclear energy cooperation, initiated in 1995 and re-initiated in the late 2000s, are important mechanisms through which the two countries can pursue the relationship between them. Initially established in the late 1990s between Mbeki and Gore, the dialogue between the two governments was not only based on a formal mechanism, but an open line of communication that existed between senior officials. This mechanism broke down during the Bush administration, and was re-initiated by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in 2009 as the U.S. South Africa Nonproliferation and Disarmament Dialogue. Continued informal dialogue, based on mutual respect and often interpersonal relationships, will prove to enhance understanding and cooperation alongside the more infrequent formal mechanism. Nonetheless, due to the actions of the United States during the apartheid era and immediately following, deep suspicion remains in South African government circles about U.S. intentions and commitments. This has been brought into the current era because important components of the South African government consider South Africa's support for the indefinite extension of the NPT a mistake, especially since none of the concrete promises made by the United States to South Africa at the time have been met. This continues to generate distrust on the part of the South African government towards any closer collaboration with the United States and its goals in this realm.

Despite mistrust on both sides, the nonproliferation and disarmament relationship between the two is not based on a "checklist approach" to evaluate the level of agreement or disagreement over issues. Instead, the two governments already closely cooperate on a number of practical nonproliferation issues, in particular in the areas of law enforcement and joint investigations into export control concerns, strengthening of the NSG and Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), implementation of UNSCR 1540, and other areas. This forms the basis of continued practical engagement even when the diplomatic and political rhetoric becomes less than warm. At the same time, continued lack of acknowledgement by the current and future U.S. governments of South Africa's principled positions as legitimate policies and not as obstinate opposition to U.S. national security interests, could over time erode the nonproliferation relationship between the two countries.

Once again, the speakers on this panel reiterated that the United States needs to understand that there is a critical lack of capacity in the South African government: it simply does not have the personnel within DIRCO to accede to all of the initiatives that the U.S. pressures South Africa to sign, such as PSI. On the U.S. side, there is a tendency to assume that "non-compliance" – a term rejected by South Africans – stems from opposition to the initiatives, when in fact it is because they do not have the personnel to comply with all the requirements of the initiatives.

There are also several "irritating" factors impeding the creation of stronger relationships between the USA and RSA. They include the continued lack of progress in the United States towards ratification of the CTBT; moving the goal posts in areas such as fissile material control, both in

terms of military and civilian uses; and re-defining the “unequivocal right” to peaceful uses of nuclear energy and technologies for peaceful uses. The last factor has been a strong driving force in an increasingly suspicious South African view of U.S. intentions in the NSG, NPT RevCons, Nuclear Security Summits, etc. A particularly thorny irritant is continued U.S.-driven efforts to eliminate HEU in civilian stockpiles, including the remnants of the South Africa’s former weapons program. South Africa considers its HEU stockpile a strategic national asset and it is unlikely to be reduced significantly in the near term due to two main considerations: (i) the stockpile has a significant commercial value, and (ii) it serves to provide political leverage in support of South Africa’s nuclear disarmament objectives.

Finally, it is important to consider the relationship with third party nations, as well the broader political dynamics between the various political and regional groupings that typically put South Africa and the United States in opposing camps. Much has already been said about South Africa’s relationship with key historical political partners, including Iran and India. South Africa’s role in IBSA and BRICS are important factors in determining its relationship with the United States. While U.S. nonproliferation objectives have in the past played a dominant role in shaping many of South Africa’s own policies, this may no longer be the case.

On a more optimistic note, all this may change with the next generation. Education remains an important tool to advance the nonproliferation and disarmament objectives that are shared by South Africa and the United States. Future track two dialogues, similar to this workshop, should also explore how academic institutions and governments can collaborate to develop and promote disarmament and nonproliferation education.

Discussion

The discussion in this session focused a great deal on the different outlooks and orientation of the United States and South Africa: pragmatic vs. principled. Many focused on how to deepen a cordial relationship into something more substantial, and related to this, whether it is in South Africa’s interest to do so. The USA and RSA have very different constituencies in the international realm, and South Africa could risk alienating its constituencies in IBSA, NAM, and BRICS should it draw closer to the United States. The South African government cannot be viewed a “stooge” of the United States. Therefore, the United States can hope to generate closer ties with South Africa, but there are limits. There is a strategic imperative for the South Africans to maintain public distance even when in reality the relationships can become close at a working level.

U.S. rhetoric claims that it desires a closer relationship, but the realities of the relationship are difficult to overcome. One participant suggested that the United States must support South Africa’s African agenda by desecuritizing. Another participant suggested that if the United States cannot deliver on economic and trade issues, it will turn to the growing position of China. To illustrate the future of U.S.-South African relations, the comparison was made to the U.S.-India relationship. Although the United States has retained its decades-long position of power, it has grown to view

India as an emerging middle power and regional hegemon. Instead of viewing South Africa with suspicion, it should help cultivate this leadership role.

A second main point of discussion focused on the U.S. assumption of the role of international policeman, and the lack of sympathy within the United States for the problems it brings upon itself when assuming this role. While the South Africans in the room recognized why the United States acts as the global policeman, and agree that at times this was necessary, they also felt that military and other force-based options should never be used until all other avenues have been thoroughly exhausted. In this context, there was much discussion of the current (at the time the workshop took place and the report was written) situation in Syria, where the U.S. Congress has been debating President Obama's request to use force against the Assad regime, while the Russian government was attempting to forge a diplomatic way out.

Session Eight: Roundtable Discussion to Shape Future U.S.-South Africa Track Two Dialogues

The workshop concluded with a roundtable discussion to isolate key points and raise suggestions for future U.S.-South Africa track two dialogues. Participants valued the track two arena of honest interactions and appreciated the high level of subject matter expert interaction. The discussion began at the debate level with significant academic analysis and an increase in collective knowledge. To continue to foster a frank and academic environment between the United States and RSA in the future, all participants must be treated as equal partners and not treat the relationship asymmetrically.

Attendees stressed the importance of involving legislators from both the U.S. Congress and South African Parliament. It was also raised that it would be particularly useful to involve government and private sector practitioners tangibly involved in policy formulation and implementation. While interdisciplinary partners of functionalists and academics can provide contributions, policymakers can recommend changes. Also, it is important for the government representatives to provide insight and viewpoints into their government's policies. Particularly in South Africa, nuclear issues are generally fragmented across the defense and DIRCO committees; a caucus on nuclear issues would centralize and inform these disparate groups.

For the future, it would be important to include a broad cross-section of South African participants. As this was an initial, pilot workshop, the size of the group was kept small. All attendees were people with track records specifically in nuclear weapons, nonproliferation, or international relations. Most participants were academics or government-employed academics. Greater involvement with NGOs and think tanks could leverage the dialogue process as a way to build new networks. Another avenue to shape policy and create an enlarged vision would be a separate or follow-on effort to include the AU, SADC, or regional actors. Discussion could also be opened to a more demographically diverse range of South African and American subject matter

experts on other types of WMDs.¹⁷ Yet while expanded participation is desirable, limited research and travel funding is a genuine issue for South African capacity building. To cultivate the relationships and networks established at the dialogue, a low-cost solution recommended was a mailing list or regular forum through e-mail or the internet to disseminate scholarship.

Several participants raised concern over a lost generation of South African nuclear scientists and experts, and the chasm between the two worlds. Participants affirmed the utility in bringing together nuclear scientists and political scientists so both jointly understand the technical and policy side of the issues. To bridge that gap, students could be utilized as emerging representatives of the new generation to cultivate knowledge through participation. This is a constructive investment in the future because the student can observe and learn the language, terms, and process surrounding nuclear policy. Capacity should not begin after a government career has begun; instead, it should start in universities. Historically, South African students are not interested in pursuing a career in international relations or security studies, and these initiatives could generate greater interest. However, students are not a guaranteed capacity-building apparatus and track two and 1.5 negotiations are a trusted vehicle to build networks and knowledge.

In the future, there should be more focused representation of both governments' policies by raising lexicon issues and challenging key assumptions. Even though all participants are speaking the same language, discussions should focus on lexicon issues so all participants understand the connotations for each term to erase perceived grievances. Furthermore, key assumptions should be challenged to gain further depth on core issues: an example for the South African view is that all nuclear weapons are equally undesirable. From the U.S. perspective, an assumption that can be challenged in the future is the legitimacy lent to some nuclear weapons and their ability to provide deterrence value.

Alternative locations were suggested to strengthen participation and representation in future events. The inaugural dialogue was hosted in South Africa in order to attract local academics and government officials with limited travel funds, and Pretoria was selected in order to lower in-country conference costs. For future dialogues, Cape Town could be desirable to increase the involvement of the South African parliamentarians. A location in the United States was also viewed as desirable because there is a bigger constituency of American policymakers and subject matter experts on nuclear issues. Another option is a neutral third country.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DIALOGUES

The participants made several constructive recommendations and suggestions to enhance future workshops on nuclear issues.

¹⁷ While some raised this point as a criticism, others noted that the demographic profile of the community of experts on these issues in both countries is neither gender nor racially diverse. This led to a side discussion about promoting educational initiatives to change this aspect, in both countries.

First, participants highlighted the benefits of expanding participation to new interest groups and reengaging traditional stakeholders. There are many advantages to expanding the discussion to include emerging scholars, a wider cross-section of U.S. and South African academics, the interdisciplinary level, and other relevant communities outside of academia. Also, there was some interest in expanding the workshop to a track 1.5 and inviting government officials to speak in their unofficial capacities. To encompass such a wide-range of people in academia, government, and the scientific community, the capacity has to be grown and fostered within South Africa:

- Within academia – capacity building to generate a more specialized field of academics within South Africa. Several noted that no institutions of higher education in South Africa offer a degree in nonproliferation studies, and few scholars specialize in the field.
- Within scientific community – to generate a stronger community of interest outside of government to counter the industrial lobby groups that push for expanding nuclear technologies. This community should engage in sophisticated discussion and potentially educate the public about the issues.
- Amongst the next generation of South African students – to create a greater supply of public officials and scholars engaged in these matters.

Other recommendations focused on the content of the workshop. One participant recommended increasing the level of specialization so there is more focus on specific areas of government policy. This is particularly important for South Africa since the academics and policymakers concentrating on nuclear issues rarely meet together due to lack of capacity and lower prioritization.

In the future, the workshop facilitators aim to engage with embassy officials and USG stakeholders at the very beginning of workshop formulation. Closer collaboration will allow for the workshop to augment and strengthen existing initiatives. Future workshops could also benefit from a preparatory trip to the U.S. Embassy in South Africa or be hosted at alternative sites within or outside of South Africa. Also, future workshops could expand beyond the dialogue focus and include academic or student exchanges.

PARTICIPANTS

Panelists and Presenters

Amelia Broodryk, Institute for Security Studies
Anthoni van Nieuwkerk, Centre for Defense and Security Management
Beth Whitaker, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Chris Alden, South African Institute of International Affairs
Frank Pabian, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Jean du Preez, Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Organization
Jessica Piombo, Naval Postgraduate School
Jo-Ansie van Wyk, University of South Africa
Joelien Pretorius, University of the Western Cape
Johan Bergenas, Stimson Center
John Campbell, Council on Foreign Relations
Paul Bernstein, National Defense University
Stephen Burgess, U.S. Air War College
Thomas Markram, United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs

Support

Emily Burke, Naval Postgraduate School
Kerry Kartchner, representing the Defense Threat Reduction Agency
Luke Fabiunke, Naval Postgraduate School
Rian Leith, University of the Western Cape

Observers

David deCoursey, U.S. Embassy Pretoria
E. Nicki Tamarkin, U.S. Embassy Pretoria
Johann Kellerman, Department of International Relations and Cooperation, South Africa
Kate Pognonis, U.S. Embassy Pretoria
Melanie Reddiar, Department of Trade and Industry, South Africa

ACRONYMS

ABACC – Brazilian–Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials

AFCONC – African Commission on Nuclear Energy

AFNWFZ – African Nuclear Weapons Free Zone

AFRICOM – United States Africa Command

ANC – African National Congress

AP – Additional Protocol

AU – African Union

BRIC - Brazil, India, and China

BRICS – Brazil, India, China, and South Africa

BWC - Biological Warfare Convention

CANE – Coalition against Nuclear Energy

CTBT – Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty

CTBTO – Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty Organization

CWC - Chemical Warfare Convention

DIRCO – South African Department of International Relations and Cooperation

DoD – U.S. Department of Defense

EMG – Environmental Monitoring Group

FMCT – Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty

FMT – Fissile Material Treaty

G20 – Group of Twenty

HEU – Highly Enriched Uranium

IAEA – International Atomic Energy Association

ICRC – International Committee of the Red Cross

INSEP – International Nuclear Safeguards and Engagement Program

IBSA – India, Brazil, and South Africa

LEU – Low Enriched Uranium

MENWFZ – Middle East Nuclear Free Weapons Zone

MTCR – Missile Technology Control Regime

NAM – Non-Aligned Movement

NNWS - Non-Nuclear Weapons States

NWS – Nuclear Weapon States

NPT – Nonproliferation Treaty

NPR – Nuclear Posture Review

NSG – Nuclear Suppliers Group

NWFZs – Nuclear Weapons Free Zones

P5 – Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council

PNS – Partnership for Nuclear Security

PSI – Proliferation Security Initiative

RevCon – Review Conference (of the NPT)

R2P – Responsibility to Protect

RSA – Republic of South Africa

SADC – Southern African Development Community

UNODA – United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs

UNSC – United Nations Security Council

UNSCR – United Nations Security Council Resolution

USA – United States of America

USAID – U.S. Agency for International Development

USG – United States Government

WMD – Weapons of Mass Destruction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like first and foremost to thank the Project on Advanced Systems and Concepts in Combatting WMD (PASCC) of the Naval Postgraduate School, and its sponsor, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), for supporting this initiative. At the Naval Postgraduate School, the Director of the Center for Contemporary Conflict, Clay Moltz, and Meghan Rasmussen were key supporters of the project. The CCC Executive Director, Michael Malley, provided invaluable advice in the execution of the event. The workshop itself would not have occurred without the dedicated and excellent assistance of Ms. Emily Burke. She not only facilitated the logistical arrangements, but also navigated the DoD bureaucracy and conference approval requirements. She deserves a medal just for that. Emily also helped to write and edit this report, along with Major Luke Fabiunke and Dr. Joelien Pretorius.

Joelien was a partner in every aspect of the substantive planning and execution of the workshop. She and I developed the agenda, brainstormed about subject areas, generated and vetted the list of participants, and co-facilitated the workshop. The significant representation of a diverse range of South African perspectives and interests in the agenda and final report stem in large part from Joelien's influence.

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to all the participants who attended the workshop, especially those who were skeptical about its motivations and objectives. We had the right mix of people in the room to generate exciting, detailed, critical, and nuanced discussions on all these issues. We are grateful that members of the U.S. and South African governments were able to attend in their personal capacities, and that they spread the word about the successful workshop after the fact. The process of convening and participating in the workshop certainly generated a great deal of interest in seeing it continue into the future. My personal and heartfelt thanks go out to each and every person who participated.

Jessica Piombo
Monterey, CA
March 2014