South Africa and a close look at the sanctions against Apartheid: did they work?

By Casper van Roekel
Student number: 1372653
June 2016
Leiden University
Political Science
Word count: 8000

1. Introduction

The eleventh of February 1990 was a historic day that will be etched on the memories of all South Africans for evermore. After 27 years of imprisonment Nelson Mandela was released (Limb, 2008, p. 99). In his speech after his release he addressed the economic sanctions that were implemented against apartheid. Mandela declared: "to lift sanctions now would be to run the risk of aborting the process towards the complete eradication of apartheid' (Mandela, 1990). In the years after apartheid Mandela continued to state that economic sanctions had helped to stop apartheid (Levy, 1999, p.2). However, his opinion about the contribution of sanctions to the abolishment of apartheid was not shared by everyone. On the side that regards sanctions as having no effect on the dismantling of the regime is the last apartheid President, de Klerk. De Klerk had mentioned that conflict and violence were the determining factors for his consideration to end apartheid. De Klerk also denied the effectiveness of the sanctions in 1993 when he accepted the Nobel Prize for Peace (Gerhart & de Villiers, 1995, p. 197). Even the scientific community seems to be inconclusive on the effectiveness of sanctions against Apartheid. Levy perfectly captures this inconclusiveness: 'it is impossible to argue conclusively that trade sanctions failed in the South African case' (Levy, 1999, p. 420). The case of South Africa has often been used on both sides, to prove that sanctions did work and to prove that sanctions did not work. The goal of this research is to find out which side was right about the effectiveness of economic sanctions against the apartheid regime. The research question is: were the economic sanctions a determining factor contributing to the dismantling of the apartheid regime?

2 International attention and the economic sanctions:

2.1 The beginning and the characteristics of the sanction episode

In 1960, the Apartheid system attracted international attention when sixty-nine black Africans were killed in Sharpeville by the police during a protest against the pass laws (Clark & Worger, 2001, p.5). In response, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 134. The Council recognized that the event was caused by the apartheid policies of the government and called for the abandonment of apartheid. In 1962, The United Nations General Assembly created the non-binding resolution 1761which asked its members to cut off fiscal and trade ties with South Africa (Doxey, 1980, p.61; David, 1995, p.217). It formed the start of a sanction episode that lasted from 1962 until 1994 (HSEO, 2007, p.78) the sanction episode knows two characteristics. Firstly, it is one of the longest sanctions episodes in the history. Most sanctions do not last longer than a few years, so 32 years of sanctions is an exception HSEO, 2007, p.78). Secondly, there was a great variety of sanctions imposed by a great number of senders. In the heydays of the sanction episode there were trade sanctions (import and export sanctions) and financial sanctions imposed by international institutions and many individual countries (Hefti & Staehelin-Witt, 2008). In the South African case, two important forms of trade sanctions are arms and oil embargoes. Arms, oil and finance were vital to the economy and the functioning of the apartheid regime. Oil and arms were needed to police the country and suppress upheaval (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.103). What finance and oil have in common is the fact that they were both needed to run the economy. Foreign finance was a necessity for South African economic growth and oil was needed for the domestic transport system (Riddell, 1986, pp.1-4). So without oil trade and finance economic growth would be impeded. Trade sanctions and finance sanctions will be briefly discussed. Their effectiveness will be evaluated in the analysis.

2.2 Important sanctions:

2.2.1 Arms embargo:

The arms embargo was not implemented only to combat apartheid, but also to stop the aggressive attitude of South Africa. Until 1990, South Africa invaded Namibia and had military conflicts with the surrounding countries. The international community figured that South Africa depended on military force to repress its own people and on the battlefields (Labuschagne, 2009). Therefore, an arms embargo could kill two birds with one stone.

In August 1963, with resolution 181 the Council recommended the members to stop the shipment of arms to South Africa. A voluntary arms embargo was chosen over a mandatory one, because the US and the UK opposed any broader action (Doxey, 1980, p.62). In 1977, the arms embargo became mandatory by the Security Council Resolution 418 which condemned South Africa's "acts of repression" (the UN, 1977). Besides export sanctions, there was also a voluntary import embargo implemented. In 1984 the Security Council created Resolution 558 that requested all members to stop importing ammunition, arms and military vehicles from South Africa (the UN, 1984).

In response to these institutional calls, many countries decided to stop arms trade with South Africa. For instance, Britain's government prohibited all forms of arms exports to South Africa in 1964 (Doxey, 1980, p.62). The US chose a more incremental path to block arms trade. The US implemented sanctions in 1963 blocking the shipment of weapons. The embargo was expanded to include high-tech equipment for the military in 1977 and expanded to include dual-use products such as computers in 1986 (Edgar, 1990, p.182).

2.2.2 Oil sanctions:

The supply of oil was called the 'Achilles of South Africa', because South Africa had no discovered oil reserves. It was an opportunity for the sender countries (Sanlam, 1979, p. 1-12).

The most important oil sanctions against South Africa came from OPEC. They introduced an oil embargo in 1973 against all supporters of Israel. This is called the oil crisis of 1973 (Garavini, 2011, p. 473). Due to South Africa's apartheid and relations with Israel, oil sanctions were implemented. Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Iraq stopped shipping oil to South

Africa after the call. They supplied almost 50 percent of the total South Africa's import of crude oil before the crisis (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p. 106). The oil crisis ended in 1974 and many sanctions against other countries were lifted. However, the embargo against South Africa remained. In 1977 almost all OPEC members (Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995, p.13).

Supporters for oil sanctions also existed outside OPEC. In 1963, the UN General Assembly called for oil sanctions against South Africa by creating resolution 1899, but could not persuade the Security Council to adopt mandatory oil sanction (Chesterman, Johnstone & Malone, 2016, p 373). These calls were answered voluntarily by several institutions and countries. In 1981, Denmark and Norway both stopped exporting oil to South Africa. The European Economic Community prohibited oil trade with South Africa in 1985 and the United States introduced the Anti-Apartheid Act in 1986 which banned oil transfers to South Africa (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p. 106).

Financial sanctions 2.2.3

South African economy was dependent on foreign capital for economic growth. South Africa was a developing county and there were many new industries that needed investment. The industry growth became seriously dependent on imports of machinery and transport equipment. Forty percent of the imports were capital goods by the 1980s (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p. 160). Additionally, the South Africa often borrowed money from the IMF and private banks. This need for foreign capital made financial sanctions an interesting too (Trewhela, 1990).

Before any international institutional financial sanctions were adopted, many governments had decided for themselves to block loans and investments. Japan was relatively early, because it implemented a ban on direct investment in 1964 and on loans in 1975. Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland restricted or entirely prohibited loans in the 1970's (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p. 161).

In 1983 the first international financial institutional sanctions were implemented. The IMF denied South Africa additional funds. This refusal was caused by the US that used it power in the IMF to block loans to flow to South Africa. The US itself prohibited new portfolio investments, direct investments, loans and credits in 1986. The EEC and the Commonwealth followed in 1986 by banning new investments. (Hefti & Staehelin-Witt, 2008, p.1-3)

3. South Africa analyzed with the theoretical framework of economic sanctions

3.1 The economic sanction literature in general

What must be noted is that the discussion about the economic sanctions against South Africa is part of a broader discussion about the effectiveness of economic sanctions in general. Do economic sanctions work effectively and under what conditions do they work best? One of the most influential scientific publications of the second wave is the book *Economic Sanctions reconsidered* by Hufbauer, Schott, Elliott and Oegg (Hereafter HSEO) first published in 1985. HSEO created a database with economic sanctions cases found that in a third of the cases economic sanctions were successful (Hufbauer, et al, 2007, p 258). Their work made the main focus of the scientific community shift to searching factors that influence the effectiveness of sanctions (Hufbauer et al, 2007, ix). Evidence was found for the following: target's regime type, policy goals of the sanctions, economic and political costs, target's economic strength and political stability, the presence of black knights (sanction busters), unilateral vs. multilateral sanctions, sanction implementation speed, issue salience, type of sanctions companion policies and relation between target and sender.

3.2 Theoretical framework of sanctions applied on the South African case:

The South African case might be one of the most complex sanction cases. Factors that did play a role in the South African case are: policy goal in combination with target's regime type, target's economic strength, sanction implementation speed, economic costs, political strength, political costs, black knights, issue saliency and type sanctions. These factors are closely interwoven and cannot be seen separately. It is a network of factors that had an influence on the outcome of the sanction episode, but also on the factors itself. For instance, political strength was negatively influenced by issue saliency and positively influenced by the South African regime type. Another complexity of the sanction episode is gradual change that some factors went through. For instance, South Africa gradually became political unstable and the issue salience increased gradually (Michael, Kennedy & Zald, 2000,p. 348). Two phases can be distinguished in the South African sanction episode. The first phase runs from 1962 to the mid-1980s and the second phase runs from the mid-1980s to 1994. The big difference between the two phases is the level of international issue salience and domestic political unrest. In the first phase sanctions were weak and the sender countries lacked willingness to see the sanctions succeed. In the second phase, more effort was generated by the sender countries due to the increasing pressure of the global anti-apartheid movements. More and better sanctions were introduced and more sanction senders arose. The sanctions contributed to higher economic and political costs that eventually reached an unbearable level of hardship that led to the abolishment of apartheid. The analysis will be split up in two parts. The first part will discuss the factors that caused sanctions in the period from 1962 until the mid-1980s to fail. The second part will discuss the factors that caused the sanctions in the period from the mid-1980s until 1994 to succeed.

3.2 A hard task to fulfill with weak sanctions: 1962 until mid-1980s

3.2.1 Type of policy goal in combination with regime type:

HSEO distinguish five different policy goals: modest policy changes, regime change and democratization, disruption of military adventures, military impairment and other major policy changes. The success rate depended on the type of policy goal pursued. Sanctions that involved modest changes in policy had a success rate of 51 percent (HSEO, 2007, p.66). Cases involving attempts to change regimes had a success rate of 32 percent (HSEO, 2007, p.668). The disruption of minor military adventures has a success rate of only 21 (HSEO, 2007, p.69-70).

HSEO give the advice to beware of autocratic regimes (HSEO, 2007, p.166). Their findings suggest that when the sanction goal is categorized as a regime change the success rate mentioned above is lower. HSEO state that there is no benefit for an autocrat in complying when the demand is for democratization, because in many cases the autocratic regime guarantees the leader or leaders a source of wealth and security (HSEO, 2007, p.52). In such case compliance costs are extremely high and the benefits are extremely low for the leaders.

HSEO coded South Africa with a 2 in their regime index (HSEO, 2007, p.78). This means that South Africa was neither an autocracy (1), nor a democracy (3). South Africa was an anocracy: a regime type that is an ‘incoherent mix of democratic and autocratic traits and practices’ (Marshall, Monty, Cole, Benjamin, 2014, p 21). Democratic characteristics were the free elections for the withe population. An autocratic characteristic was the suppression of the black and coloured population. They had no political rights and their human rights were ignored while their citizenship got denied.

The policy goal was to change the regime. It would mean the end of white minority rule and many white South Africans were afraid that abolishment would have negative consequences for the white population. In the eyes of the whites, a ‘black’ government would make the white population give up their wealth and lands (De Klerk, 1999, p.70). Additionally, there would be no room for the apartheid ruling party, the NP, in a new democratic system. A party betrayed its own people by abolishing apartheid and had discriminated the black population for years would not be chosen by white voters, nor be chosen by black voters. So, the NP party was not eager to hit the final nail in its own coffin (De Klerk, 1999, p.70).

Throughout the sanction episode, the government was fighting for its own life, because of the regime type in combination with the sanctions goal. This perfectly suits with the HSEO findings described above. The combination of the regime type and the sanctions goal is one of the most important factor in understanding the fierceness and thoughtfulness of the South African government in the fight against sanctions. South Africa was more willing to deal with high costs to keep apartheid intact, because it seemed to be the only choice they had.

3.2.2 Economic costs for the target

The economic costs that sanctions create for the target are important factors that affect the success rate of sanctions. The higher the costs, the higher the change that sanctions are successful. The idea behind this variable is that an unbearable pain level needs to be reached in order to force obedience. The target economic costs as percentage of the GNP is twice as low in failure cases as in successes on average (HSEO 2007, p. 106). They also found that when the goal is regime change and/or democratization the costs in success cases are fifty percent higher than in failure cases. In failure cases the average costs as a percentage of the GNP is 2.3 percent and in success cases that is 3.4 percent. (HSEO, 2007, p.168).

On the basis of the South African case, it can be concluded that economic costs inflicted depend on a three factors. Firstly, it depends on strength of the economic sanctions. Secondly it depends on the economic strength of the target country. A country that is economically strong will cope better with economic sanctions than countries that are weak

(HSEO, 2007; Drury 1998). An economic strong target is more likely capable of applying counter strategies to avoid the economic hardship that surpasses the bearable level. Thirdly, the capability of applying counter strategies on the right time to prevent economic costs depends on the sanction implementation speed. HSEO (2007, p.172) state that a strategy of incremental implementation affords the target more time to adapt by finding other trade partners and building domestic industries However, if sanctions are quickly and unexpectedly implemented the target might not be on time to prevent economic hardship, even when the target is strong. All three factors will be addressed, but the weak sanction factor was caused by the South Africa's economic and international political strength and will therefore be explained under these subheadings.

3.2.2.1Target's economic strength of South Africa

South Africa engaged in economic interdependency relationships due to its outward orientated economy. Two important countries that were depended on South Africa were the two main trading partners, the US and Britain. South Africa was the biggest gold producers. In 1970 South Africa produced approximately 1000 metric tons of gold, while the second largest producer only produced around 60 metric tons (Williams, 2015) Until 1971, Gold was the foundation for the value of the dollar and therefore also for other currencies. South African gold needed to be pumped into the world markets to keep the American and British currencies steady (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.86). Additionally, until the mid-1960s, Britain and the US were also completely reliant on uranium imports from South Africa for their nuclear industry (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.76). Dependent countries with their own interest at stake are less likely to impose adequate sanctions, because senders also try to keep the costs of conflict for themselves as low as possible (Lektzian & Sprecher, 2007, p.415). In such case, symbolic sanctions are to be expected (Dashti-Gibson et al., 1997, p.616)

With Britain and the US South Africa was in good company, because both countries were members of the UN Security Council, Britain had major influence in the Commonwealth, while the US was dominant in the IMF (van den Berg, 2011 p.15). Their economic dependency was the reason (besides the political dependency reason that will be discussed under the subheading political strength) why sanctions were weak in the first period of the sanction episode running from 1962 until the mid-1980s. In that period the shortcomings of Apartheid were partly ignored and the United States and Britain used their vetoes in the UN Security Council to hinder everything more than voluntary sanctions (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.86). There was a voluntary arms embargo put in place in 1963. This embargo did not become mandatory until 1977 after the Soweto massacres (Guelke, 2005, p.195). Additionally, there never were mandatory oil sanctions introduced by the UN. OPEC was the only organization to implement an influential oil embargo. This oil embargo was not implemented until 1973 and contained many loopholes (Chesterman, et. al 2016, p.373). The fact that the two main trading partners of South Africa were reluctant to impose adequate sanctions and the failure of the sanctions in the first period of the episode suits well with the findings of Mclean and Whang (2010, p.427). They found evidence that sanctions are more likely to fail when they are not supported by the target's major trading partners.

Its resilient economy gave South Africa the opportunity to apply counter strategies. The two economic strategies used were applying import substitution and finding black knights (term for allies in the sanction literature) (Levy, 1999). The emergence of black knights will be elaborately addressed further on in this thesis. The use of counter strategies by strong economic targets corresponds with the Pape's explanation why sanctions are often unsuccessful. He argues that a developed target with good administrative capabilities can reduce economic hardship caused by sanctions (Pape 1997, p.93). This process is easier for a country with a strong economy, because it has more resources to create and protect the new industry (Bruton, 1989, p.1606.) Various industries that were important for the South African apartheid regimes were established within South Africa years before the sanction started to work effectively.

For example, The South African arms industry flourished in 1960's. In 1964 Armaments Development and Production Corporation of South Africa (Armscor) was brought to life. Armscor was an organization that consisted of a few state-owned companies combined with private companies that together regulated the arms industry. They had to makes sure that as many weapons as possible needed by South African army on South African soil (Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995, p.273). In the 1960s, government decided to upscale the budget of research and development for military research. In the 1960s, less than 15 percent of all research and development spending went to arms-related research and by the 1989 it had increased to 32 percent (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.54). This import substitution caused the South African arms industry to grow gigantically. The effect of the import substitution by the late 1980s was that the South African arms import was decreased with more than a half compared to the beginning of the 1960's (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.54). Another effect was that South Africa became the seventh biggest arms producer in the 1980s (Doxey, 1987, p

112).

Another example is the import substitution taking place in the oil industry. South Africa had no discovered oil reserves and had to import all its fuel. The GNP growth allowed the government to follow a varied energy policy throughout the sanction episode. To replace their oil shortage they explored the South African soil for mossgass, increased coal production, started synthetic fuel production from mossgass and coal, and introduced nuclear and hydroelectric power (Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995, p.198).Three subsidized plants were built (Sasol 1,2 and 3) in the apartheid era that transformed coal into oil. The first plant was built as in 1955, years before the OPEC oil sanctions (Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995). During the heydays of coal-to-oil production in the 1980s Sasol created around half of the gasoline needs in the country (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.115). Crawford and Klotz (1999, p.121) state that South Africa could not have dealt with the oil sanction if they did not have the coal-to-oil production plants. Therefore, import substitution was very vital to South Africa.

3.2.2.2 Incremental implementation

On top of the weak sanctions in the beginning, South Africa could see the sanctions coming. The South African government was warned before embargoes were implemented. Sometimes years of hesitancy and international dialogue preceded the sanction implementation (Crawford & Klotz 1999, p.12). For example, there were many UN calls for action before official resolutions were adopted. As early as 1946, the South African discrimination policies were put on the agenda (South African History Online, 2011). Import substitution of the military industry commenced years before the resolution of 1963 introduced a voluntary embargo (Levy 1999, p.4). The time needed to consider and impose sanctions is one of the most influential factors in understanding the slow downfall of the apartheid system. The South African industries and government had the opportunity to bring on board black knights and employ import substitution before sanctions were imposed. It is clear that the slow implementation of the sanctions had a negative effect on the capability of sanctions to cause economic hardship (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.12). The potential discomfort that all sanctions together could have caused is higher than the actual pain felt. Unexpected strong sanctions could have bought South Africa no time to build strategic policies to outmaneuver senders.

3.2.2.3The emergence of Black knights in multilateral corporation:

Another strategy that South Africa applied to avoid economic hardship was trading with allies that ignore the sanctions, black knights. HSEO (2007, p.8) state that sanctions are more likely to fail if the target state has powerful allies that support the target state. On the basis of the South African case, it can be concluded that the capability of a target to find black knights depends on two factors. Firstly, it depends on the target's relation with other countries. Secondly, it depends on the willingness of potential black knights to turn into black knights. The international institutions can decrease the willingness.

South Africa had many international links due to its history as an exporter of primary products. It used these international links to find black knights fill up the loss of disappearing trading partners (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.160). For example, South Africa used Iran to fill up the oil import gaps that arose after Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar stopped exporting oil to South Africa in 1973. This halt in export could have had a big impact, because the import of oil of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar amounted to nearly 50 percent of South Africa's oil import. But Iran, which already had a close relationship with South Africa, increased its oil exports to South Africa in 1973 and by 1978 Iran provided 96 percent of South African oil import (Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995, p.13). The fact that South Africa had a strong and outward orientated economy and was able to avoid economic hardship through black knights suits with the findings of Önder & Yilmazkuday (2014). They found that more trade partner diversification correlates with economic strength. States can utilize their network of trading partners to compensate for low levels of high levels of inflation. This might also be the case for the pain caused by economic sanctions. In this way, countries with many trade linkages might have a higher change to find black knight among their trade partners.

The capability of finding black knights also depends on the capability of international institutions to hold potential black knights in line. Drezner's (2003, pp.75-98) and Drury's (1998, p.507) findings suggest that when cooperation is sought within an international organization the sanctions will be more effective than unilateral sanctions, because international organizations can provide black knights with side-payments. However, when cooperation is happening outside the framework of an international organization sanctions will be less effective than unilateral sanctions. Early and Spice (2015) found results that smaller institutions are better at suppressing the emergence of black knights than those demanded by bigger ones. One of the reasons why smaller is better is the fact that smaller institutions mostly have greater homogeneity and therefore it is easier to impose widely supported and costly sanctions (2015, p.344). However, this was not the case in the South African sanction episode, because small and larger institutions were not capable of stopping the emergence of black knights. Before the mid-1980s, there were two international institutions that imposed sanctions: the UN and OPEC.

What must be noted is that from the period of 1962 until 1973 sanctions only came from the UN and individual countries. As mentioned above, the UN chose voluntary embargoes (arms embargo in 1963 and an oil embargo in 1987) over mandatory (Doxey, 1980, p.62). Additionally The UN arms embargo resolutions never contained a list of embargoed items. Individual countries had to decide for themselves which technology and other goods contributed to military capabilities (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.54). This caused the arms embargo to have loopholes and black knights to arise. The United States, Great Britain, France, Germany all used flexible interpretations of the UN arms embargo in order to sustain arms trade with South Africa (Robinson & Boutwell, 1996, p.599). Government-owned companies in these countries provided South Africa with dual-use technology with a potential military application that the UN embargo did not ban explicitly, such as computers and vehicles (Robinson & Boutwell, 1996, p.599). These black knights were neither willing to find and punish private companies. For example, two gun manufactures from US transported millions of rounds of ammunition and thousands of weapons to South Africa in the 1970's. Firms from West Germany exported all the needed parts of an ammunition manufacture plant in 1980s (Robinson & Boutwell, 1996, p.600). It is certain that South Africa could not become the seventh biggest arms producer in the world in the 1980s without the help of black knights (Doxey, 1987, p 112).

OPEC was also not capable to stop the emergence of black knights, despite its smaller size and greater homogeneity. This characteristic helps OPEC exert pressure on its members (Sobel, 2012). In the South African case, these characteristics did not help. As mentioned above, Iran did become a black knight despite the OPEC oil embargo that started in 1973. However, Iran was not the only country. After the Iranian Revolution of 1979, Iran stopped exporting oil to South Africa and from that point on it became hard for South Africa to buy oil at normal market prices (Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995, p.21). Access to oil was only hard to attain for a short period. After 1979 the black market was used by South Africa and oil was purchased secretly, mainly from Oman and The United Arab Emirates. Oil bought on the black markets was transported on ships from private companies that sailed under numerous flags, for example, Transworld Oil sailing under the Dutch flag Hengeveld & Rodenburg, 1995, p.66). The effect that the black knights had on the oil supply was that South Africa never ran out of oil.

3.2.2.4 Actual Economic costs for South Africa

It is important to note that estimating the costs of sanctions to South Africa is a hard task, because it is impossible to know how the South African economy would have performed without sanctions. There are also other factors besides the economic sanctions that affected the economic performance of South Africa, such as the economic crises in the 1980's (Kandé, 2010). Although it is certain that the economic costs of sanctions were reduced by black knights and import substitution, economic costs could never be prevented totally. South Africa's fight against the sanctions was expensive, because clandestine trade often happened at disadvantageous 'apartheid prices' and import substitution was inefficient. The South African government used resources to bypass the sanctions and could have spent these resources directly on suppression (Guelke, 2005, p. 195). The economic costs for South Africa have been estimated by HSEO and were documented in their database. Their database includes the sanctions imposed by the UN lasting from 1962 until 1994 and belonging to the first period sanctions (HSEO, 2007, p.116). The sanction episode was estimated to cause economic cost that equaled 1.2 percent of the South African GNP (HSEO, 2007, p.116). As mentioned above, successful and failed sanctions with the goal to cause regime change had respectively an average cost of 3.4 percent and 2.3 percent of the GNP (HSEO, 2007, p.170). So it seems that the economic costs that South Africa had to bear in the first period were not that high compared with other sanction episodes and the costs were even lower than the average costs caused by failing sanctions. These relative low costs have been caused by the weakness of the sanctions, import substitution, sanction busting and the slow and incremental implementation of sanctions mentioned above.

3.2.3 Political costs

Apart from level of economic hardship exercised, there is no reason for target states to obey without political costs (Blanchard and Ripsman 1999/2000). Political costs are the emergence of any anti-governmental activity that is costly to the government (Allen, 2008, p.916).

Political costs might give new more progressive leaders the change to take power or persuade the old leaders to change their policies, because costs of obeying have become lower than costs of disobeying (Losman1979, p.128).

On the basis of the South African case, it can be concluded that the level of political costs depends on two factors. Firstly, it depends on the strength of economic sanctions. According to Losman (1979, 128), Sanctions will only succeed, if the economic pressure is large enough to cause domestic political pressure that will push the government to do what the sender demands. There could be a political dependency reason; if potential targets are politically strong and senders are strategically dependent on the target, the target is less likely to encounter strict sanctions and more likely to encounter weak and symbolic sanctions (Dashti-Gibson et al., 1997, p.616). This is especially the case when the dependent countries are strong economic players in the international community that might be crucial for the effectiveness of sanctions, such as the United States. In the past, the US often turned a blind eye to human rights violations of countries that opposed communism (Apodaca, 2006 ,p.85).

Secondly, it depends on target's domestic political strength. The lower the level of political stability, the higher the change of sanction success (HSEO, 2007, p.166). The logic behind this relationship is that political unstable country cannot handle much more politically domestic unrest. Sanctions might form the last straw that breaks the camel's back by creating more political unrest. The target's political strength, in turn, depends on two factors. Firstly, it depends of the amount of opposition against the government within the country. A homogenous population with few opponents of the government will not be likely to pressure its government to obey the sender. The idea behind this argument is given by Kaempfer and Lowenberg (1999, p. 51).They argue that international sanctions will only have a positive influence on the target's policymakers if there is a good organized opposition group whose political strength could be enlarged as a chain reaction of sanctions. If such a group does not exist, it is hard to make sanctions work. In a country where there are more competitors for power, the population might revolt against its government and choose other leaders. Secondly, it depends on the level of suppression of the opponents. If there is lot of political dissent, it does not necessarily mean that the government is political unstable. This is especially the case when the target is autocratic. In such case, the government can suppress the political unrest by eliminating its opponents in order to secure its authority (Escribà-Folch 2012, p.684). A strong government might be able to decrease the effect of sanctions by increasing the costs of revolting for its opponents.

3.2.3.1 South Africa's political strength

The conditions for sanctions to cause political costs were present in South Africa. In South Africa there was a great amount of opposition, because the government only looked after the interests of the white population (Clark & Worger, 2001). So, opponents and supporters of the government also emerged along racial lines. The South African case suits with Chua's (2003) ethnic tension emergence pattern Chua (2003) argues that the pursuit of democratization and the process of liberalization have often generated ethnic violence, when a racial minority dominates the poor indigenous majority economically. The black population in South Africa was excluded from the democratization process and did not profit economically from the liberal markets. Sanction implementers can anticipate on this division line by weakening the government and strengthening the groups in society that are in favor of the sender's will (Blanchard and Ripsman 1999/2000). Sanction can increase political instability and, in this way, destabilize the government. In South Africa these groups were present in the society, so sanctions had the potential to cause high political costs. However, the sanctions against South Africa barely caused political costs in the first period of the sanction episode due to sanction weakness caused by South African international political strength and government's domestic political strength.

The strength of economic sanctions has already been discussed, but there was also a political reason why the sanctions were relatively weak until mid-1980s. The political reason was the Cold War. South Africa played on the concern of the West about revolutionary communist movements in Africa to persuade many western countries to be thoughtful on their attitudes towards apartheid (Robinson & Boutwell, 1996, p.599).The governing NP party implemented the Suppression of Communism Act in 1950 that outlawed any communist party in South Africa (Guelke, 2005, p.94). South Africa sent a clear message to the west; South Africa was one of 'the good guys' and was fighting upcoming communist movements caused by decolonization (Robinson & Boutwell, 1996, p.599). Due to its anti-communist attitude the increasing brutal measures of Apartheid were partly ignored in the beginning and conciliatory approaches were given priority. The United States and Britain even used their vetoes in the UN Security Council to hinder everything more than an official disapproval of apartheid (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.86). Oil and arms embargo, as mentioned above, were applied, because oil and arms were essential for maintaining apartheid. Such sanctions had the potential to weaken the government, but due to their weakness their capability to inflict political costs was limited.

Small political costs can still have a relative big impact on weak governments when they cause unrest, such as politically motivated ethnic violence. However, instead of being a victim of ethnic violence, the South African government used ethnic violence as a suppression tool to minimize political upheaval. These suppression practices of the black majority were the reason why sanctions were imposed, but also made the sanctions less effective. Black political parties with the goal to unite all Africans to fight for political rights, such as the ANC and PAC were beaten down and prohibited (Thompson, 2000, p.210). Demonstrations against apartheid were met with brutal police violence. The Sharpeville massacre in 1960 is a well-known event in which innocent black people were killed in order to silence the black community (Thompson, 2000 p.210).These fierce reactions of the government increased the costs for the black community to overthrow the apartheid government.

Another suppression tool used by government in order to prevent economic sanctions from doing their job was the unbalanced income distribution along racial dividing lines. The black population was exploited and kept poor on purpose (Chua, 2003, p.169). The rapid annual GNP growth in the 1960's and 1970's mentioned above did advantage the standard of living for whites only. In this way, costs of overthrowing the apartheid government for blacks were increased. Economic sanctions barely had political costs

3.3 The turning point and intensified sanctions: Mid-1980s until 1994

3.3.1 Issue salience

As Ang and Peksen (2007, p.138) explain, if a target state is more willing to bear high costs (like South Africa), senders should be more resolute in achieving their policy goal. Their results indicate that the sender's issue salience has an effect on the sanction success. The higher the priority and importance attributed by the sender to an issue, the more determination the sender will have to make the sanctions successful (Ang & Peksen, 2007, p.143).

Around the mid-1980s a crucial change occurred. Global anti-apartheid movements had expanded immensely. The increasing political unrest in the 1970's was increasingly getting covered by international media and this affected policymaking (Schraeder, 1994, p.218). The global public saw a crisis of ethnic violence and suppression that was clearly the fault of the South African government. Additionally the connections between the different anti-apartheid movements all over the world started to connect and form a strong transnational civil society. Lobbyist, NGO's (grassroots and other sorts of NGO's), Multinationals, congressmen and Banks from all over the world pressured reluctant governments to implement more adequate sanctions (Klotz, 1996, p177). Two major trade partners that got pressured to do more were the US and Britain (U.S Department of State, 2009).

Before 1986 Britain was one of the few members in the Commonwealth that opposed Commonwealth sanctions against South Africa. Thatcher opposed Commonwealth sanctions, because she claimed it would hurt Britain's trade and make black South Africans suffer (Neville, 2013, p.265). However, in 1986 Britain changed its protective tone and agreed to Commonwealth sanctions. The sanctions prohibited government funding for trade missions to South Africa, new government loans to the government of South Africa and selling computers for the South African military forces. Cooperation with South Africa on oil, nuclear and military technology was also proscribed (The new York times, 1985).

In 1986, the U.S. introduced the Comprehensive Anti- Apartheid Act (CAAA) over President Reagan's veto. The act was a grand victory for American anti-apartheid movement, which had worked hard for strong sanction s. The repression had caught the eye of the American public and raised the topic with Congress (Edgar, 1990, p.1). The act prohibited trade in, coal, kruggerrands, uranium, and oil. Most importantly, it also prohibited all new US investments and loans to South Africa (Guelke, 2005, p.196).The stricter sanctions had a positive effect on the economic and political costs.

.3.2 Economic costs in combination with sanction type

Another factor that has an effect on the success of sanctions is the type of sanction used. HSEO come to the conclusion that use of different sorts of sanctions has a higher success rate than the use of one sort of sanction. Cases in which export, import and financial sanctions are all implemented have a success rate of 40 percent. Trade sanctions (either solely import, solely export, or both) have a success rate of 25 percent. The sole use of financial sanctions produced a success rate of 36 percent (HSEO, 2007, p.168).

It seems that the use of financial sanctions has a positive influence on the success of sanctions. Financial embargoes may be more successful, because they have a more direct effect on leader elites by restricting their foreign currency flow. The elites are highly likely to depend more on foreign capital than the public (Dashti-Gibson et al., 1997, p.610). Sanctions have a better chance to succeed when they focus on creating revenue loss for groups that support the government (Kaempfer and Lowenberg, 1992).

Early in the sanction episode there mostly were trade sanctions. Relatively late in the sanction episode, in the 1980s the commonwealth, the IMF and the US introduced adequate financial sanctions (Riddell, 1986, pp.1-5). These sanctions further increased the pressure on the South African government which already had to deal with balance of payments difficulties and recession in the beginning of the 1980s due to the anti-apartheid movements, risk assessments and a global crisis. Its economic strength had declined and finance had become South Africa’s weak spot (Orkin, 1989, p.26).

In 1983 the first adequate financial sanctions were introduced. The IMF denied South Africa additional funds. This denial was an initiative of the US that used its great power in the IMF. In the past times of balance-of-payments problems and recession, South Africa relied on the IMF for bridging loans, but now this path was gone. Although this IMF refusal did not stop South Africa from getting private loans, it did make foreign finance costly and made loans from Bank of International Settlements impossible. The high costs of borrowing caused a considerable increase in debt (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.162). At the same time, the value of both the rand and gold diminished and, therefore, the value of the debts increased in US dollars (Riddell, 1986, p.1). Gold played a very important part in the economy. Forty percent of all foreign exchange income came from gold and was fundamental to the balance of payment (Riddell, 1986, p.1). In 1985, the 17 billion dollar debt was a 12.6 billion Rand debt (20 percent of GDP). By1984, it had risen to a 24.3 billion dollar debt that converted to a 48.2 billion Rand debt (46 percent of GDP) (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.164). Additionally, due to the unrest, short-term loans became the most favorite form of borrowing in South Africa. So the proportion of the short-term to long-term debts increased to 66 percent in 1985. Other developing countries had an average proportion of 44 percent (Orkin, 1989, p.26).

The South African proportion appeared to be way too high for a healthy economy, because a financial crisis arose (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.165). The government was urged to react in order to keep the economic and political situation under control. The government resorted to old solution and implemented the state of emergency. This method had worked in the past after international commotion after the Sharpeville massacre the Soweto uprising. In the past it boosted investor trust and decreased capital outflow (Guelke, 2005, p. 164). However, the state of emergency only worked counterproductively, because the confidence in the economy of foreign investors dropped dramatically. The influential Chase Manhattan Bank made the call to stop providing loans to the country. In response many bankers decided to transfer their investments to funds outside South Africa. This brought an end to an increasingly essential source of funds for South Africa for future growth opportunities (Riddell, 1986, p.4). This caused the Rand to drop in value even more and the financial crisis got worse (Riddell, 1986, p.5). South Africa could not repay its obligations, because it had a short-term debt (term of one year) of 43.3 billion Rand, an account surplus of 5 billion Rand and a reserve of 784 million Rand(Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.165).

Between 1985 and 1990, the government did their best to ease the financial crisis by freezing payments on 58 percent of its total foreign debt, organizing debt negotiation in 1987, restricting the media to report about apartheid, lifting certain petty apartheid policies like the pass laws and by releasing prisoners (Riddell, 1986, p.4). With moderate successful debt negotiations the apartheid government rescheduled obligations and temporarily saved the day. Although the government avoided a bankruptcy, things were not getting any better soon (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.169). South Africa stayed in serious need of finance and calls for change were becoming more prominent. Government problems with meeting its debt obligations in combination with increasing political unrest and already low business trust caused more stagnation and capital outflow (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.169). Additionally the US and the Commonwealth sanctions caused trade with its major trading partners to drop dramatically. Trade with the US decreased with 40 percent in 1987 and trade with Britain decreased with 15 percent in 1986 compared to before the new sanctions implementation (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.12). Additionally, the bad economic situation caused by South Africa's financial vulnerability, financial sanctions, declining profitability and the anti-apartheid movement caused led to the departure of many companies. Between 1984 and 1990, around one third of all foreign firms, especially the US firms, left the country (Riddell, 1986, p.3).

Financial sanctions limited South Africa's policy options. In this way South Africa could not properly tackle its political and economic hardship. From 1985 to 1992, South Africa's GDP grew only 0.5 percent per year, and inflation rate was 15.3 percent per year. Its economic performance was worse than in any eight-year span after the Second World War.

3.3.3 Political costs

What must be noted is that sanctions were part of a greater anti-apartheid strategy. Political parties like the ANC, religious groups, trade unions and more than hundred other activist organizations inside South Africa engaged in an intense struggle for race equality for several decades which found its peak in the late 1980s (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.3)

West showed its support for political resistance group such as the African National Congress (ANC). Partly because of the sanctions, these political resistance groups became more cohesive and the violence increased (Kaempfer et al., 1999, p.51). In the 1980s there was increasing political violence coming from the black population, mostly coming from uMkhonto we Sizwe (MK), the armed wing of the ANC (South African History Online). The MK had invaded South Africa from its bases in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Angola and carried out a strategy of terror in urban white areas since 1960's. Due to their violence the ANC was seen as a terrorist group by many countries. However, in the 1980s, that gradually changed due to the anti-apartheid movement (Norval, 1990). The new sanctions were used as a communication tool to encourage the South African government to acknowledge opposition groups (Klotz, 1995, p.475) For instance the anti-apartheid comprehensive act of 1985 had a provision that demanded for better coordination and communication with Nelson Mandela's ANC and other organizations participating in the struggle against apartheid. This signaled a "shift in U.S. policy to change its characterization of the ANC from a terrorist, communist-backed organization to a group with a legitimate voice in South Africa" (Mokoena, 1993, p. 52). The support from the west validated the anti-government activity and helped the ANC to channel the upheavals into a rise of domestic support (Klotz, 1996, p.187) ANC had become a legitimate political opposition group; a group that Kaempfer and Lowenberg (1999, p. 51) call a necessity in order to make sanctions work. In1990 the South African government legalized the ANC that later played a huge role in the negotiations between 1990 and 1994, partly because of sanctions (Mtimkulu, 2000).

The anti-apartheid movement including the sanctions also caused disunity among the white elites. Business elites started to demand political change. Business elites increased their demands for political reform in the mid-1980s when they faced more political protests and labor strikes (Guelke, 2005). Important corporations, such as Barloworld Limited, made themselves clear about the urgency of huge political change and publically addressed the role of foreign pressure (Crawford & Klotz, 1999, p.141). These increasing labor strikes were caused by the strengthened black labor unions. The government legalized black unions in

1979 and gave the union's limited collective bargaining rights. Most important and biggest union was the nonracial COSATU, which was affiliated with the ANC. Membership of labor union increased during the 1980s and by 1987 the new black trade unions took a leading role in the opposition. Due to their strikes 5.8 million work days were lost in 1987 (Byrnes, 1997).

3.3.4 Effects of political and economic costs

The economic and political costs described above made the NP government party willing to embrace change. In 1990, the ANC was legalized and in 1991 the pillars of apartheid were abolished. These moves of the government were clearly made to comply with the conditions of Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act for the ending of US sanctions (Guelke, 2005, p.197).

To return to the debate between Mandela and De Klerk: who was right? De Klerk states in his own book that the overall anti-apartheid movement was an important factor. (de Klerk 114). He states that the loss of financial support and its effect became a "source of social unrest" (de Klerk, 1999, p.183). De Klerk cannot see the causal connection, but political and economic costs were caused by the anti-apartheid movement including the economic sanctions. By using de Klerk's own reasoning, sanctions did contribute partly to the end of apartheid. Mandela was right.

4. Conclusion

In the period of 1962-1985 sanctions were not having the desired effect. South Africa outmaneuvered sanction senders by applying import substitution, using black knights and having a strong economy. Economic costs were not taking their toll and South Africa had rapid economic growth. This all changed around 1985. Around that year a downward spiral was started. A financial crisis, economic sanctions, intensified anti-apartheid sentiments in the international community and civil society and domestic intensified demonstrations together caused the apartheid to spiral out of control. Financial sanctions were introduced on top of the trade sanctions which created more forceful sanctions. Additionally, there already was financial vulnerability caused by anti-apartheid sentiments and a global crisis. The international community anticipated the financial vulnerability well by introducing financial sanctions in a time where South Africa was in big need of more finance. The pressure from the international community and civil society (issue salience) to end apartheid also increased. Their disapproval was partly signaled by intensifying the economic sanctions. By giving its support to the black population, the international community caused more political unrest in South Africa. The political unrest, financial crisis partly caused by economic sanctions and the increasing anti-apartheid sentiments caused many multi corporations to leave South Africa which only made matters worse. The increased political and economic costs of the apartheid system and diminished economic and financial strength led to a critical level that would eventually lead to the abolishment of Apartheid. Apartheid was beaten by complex network of factors; factors that all influenced each other. In the network of factors economic sanctions played an adequate role.

References:

Allen, S. H. (2008). The Domestic Political Costs of Economic Sanctions. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 52*(6), 916-944. doi:10.1177/0022002708325044

Ang, A. U., & Peksen, D. (2007). When Do Economic Sanctions Work?: Asymmetric Perceptions, Issue Salience, and Outcomes. *Political Research Quarterly, 60*(1), 135-145. doi:10.1177/1065912906298632

Apodaca, C. (2006). *Understanding U.S. human rights policy: A paradoxical legacy*. New York: Routledge.

Blanchard, Jean-Marc, and Norrin Ripsman. 1999/2000. Asking the right question: When do economic sanctions work best? Security Studies 9:219-53.

Bruton, H. J. (1989). *Protection and development*. Williamstown, MA: Williams College, Center for Development Economics.

Byrnes, R. M. (n.d.). South Africa: A country study. *Federal Research Division, Library of Congress,* 1-532. Retrieved from https://archive.org.

Chua, A. (2003). *World on fire: How exporting free market democracy breeds ethnic hatred and global instability*. New York: Doubleday.

Clark, N. L., & Worger, W. H. (2004). South Africa: The rise and fall of apartheid. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Crawford, N., & Klotz, A. (1999). How sanctions work: Lessons from South Africa. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Chesterman, S., Franck, T. M., & Malone, D. (2008). *Law and practice of the United Nations: Documents and commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dashti-Gibson, J., Davis, P., & Radcliff, B. (1997). On the Determinants of the Success of Economic Sanctions: An Empirical Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science, 41*(2), 608. doi:10.2307/2111779

Doxey, M. P. (1980). Reaction to Sanctions. Economic Sanctions and International Enforcement, 106-124. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-04335-4_7

Doxey, M. P. (1987). Sanctions in Regional Settings. *International Sanctions in Contemporary Perspective*, 53-69. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-18750-8_5

Drezner, D. W. (2003). The Hidden Hand of Economic Coercion. *International Organization Int. Org., 57*(03). doi:10.1017/s0020818303573052

Early, B. R., & Spice, R. (2014). Economic Sanctions, International Institutions, and Sanctions Busters: When Does Institutionalized Cooperation Help Sanctioning Efforts? *Foreign Policy Analysis Foreign Policy Anal, 11*(3), 339-360. doi:10.1111/fpa.12038

Edgar, R. E. (1990). Sanctioning apartheid. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Escriba-Folch, A. (2011). Authoritarian Responses to Foreign Pressure: Spending, Repression, and Sanctions. *Comparative Political Studies, 45*(6), 683-713. doi:10.1177/0010414011427883

Garavini, G. (2011). Completing Decolonization: The 1973 'Oil Shock' and the Struggle for Economic Rights. The International History Review, 33(3), 473-487. doi:10.1080/07075332.2011.595593

Gerhart, G., & Villiers, L. D. (1995). In Sight of Surrender: The U.S. Sanctions Campaign against South Africa, 1946-1993. Foreign Affairs, 74(6), 142. doi:10.2307/20047445

Guelke, A. (2005). *Rethinking the rise and fall of apartheid: South Africa and world politics*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Guidry, J. A., Kennedy, M. D., & Zald, M. N. (2000). *Globalizations and social movements: Culture, power, and the transnational public sphere*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hefti, C., & Staehelin-Witt, E. (2004). Economic Sanctions against South Africa and the Importance of Switzerland. PNR42, 1-8. Retrieved from http://www.snf.ch/sitecollectiondocuments/nfp/nfp42p/nfp42p_staehelin-e.pdf

Hengeveld, R., & Rodenburg, J. (1995). *Embargo: Apartheid's oil secrets revealed*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Hufbauer, G. C., Kimberly, A. E., Oegg, B. & Schott, J. J. (2007). *Economic sanctions reconsidered*. Washington, DC: Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Kaempfer, W.H., Lowenberg, A.D. (1992). International Economic Sanctions: A Publi Choice Perspective. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Kaempfer, W. H., & Lowenberg, A. D. (1999). Unilateral Versus Multilateral International Sanctions: A Public Choice Perspective. *Int Studies Q International Studies Quarterly, 43*(1), 37-58. doi:10.1111/0020-8833.00110

Kandé, S. (2010). Africa 1980–2010: Tragedies, Triumphs, and Challenges. Retrieved June 6, 2016, from http://exhibitions.nypl.org/africanaage/essay-africa-2010.html

Klerk, W. D. (1999). The last trek-- a new beginning: The autobiography. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Klotz, A. (1995). Norms reconstituting interests: Global racial equality and U.S. sanctions against South Africa. *International Organization Int. Org., 49*(03), 451. doi:10.1017/s0020818300033348

Klotz, A. (1996). Norms and sanctions: Lessons from the socialization of South Africa. *Review of International Studies Rev. Int. Stud., 22*(02), 173. doi:10.1017/s0260210500118364

Lektzian, D. J., & Sprecher, C. M. (2007). Sanctions, Signals, and Militarized Conflict. *Am J Political Science American Journal of Political Science, 51*(2), 415-431. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00259.x

Labuschagne, B. (2009). *South Africa's intervention in Angola: Before Cuito Cuanavale and thereafter*. Stellenbosch University. Retrieved from https://scholar.sun.ac.za

Levy, P. I. (1999). Sanctions on South Africa: What Did They Do? American Economic Review, 89(2), 415-420. doi:10.1257/aer.89.2.415

Limb, P. (2008). Nelson Mandela: A biography. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Losman, D. L. (1979). *International economic sanctions: The cases of Cuba, Israel, and Rhodesia*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Mandela, N. (1990). Nelson Mandela`s Address to a rally in Cape Town on his release from prison: Speech. Retrieved May 05, 2016, from http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=4520

Marshall, M. G., & Cole, B. R. (2008). Global Report on Conflict, Governance and State Fragility 2008. For Pol Bull Foreign Policy Bulletin, 18(01). doi:10.1017/s1052703608000014

Mclean, E. V., & Whang, T. (2010). Friends or Foes? Major Trading Partners and the Success of Economic Sanctions. *International Studies Quarterly, 54*(2), 427-447. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2010.00594.x

Mtimkulu, P. (200, April). One party domination, transformation and democracy: Critical mchallenges facing the African National Congress (ANC) in the new millenium. Retrieved May 26, 2016, from motspluriels.arts.uwa.edu.a

Mokoena, K. (1993). *South Africa and the United States: The declassified history*. New York: New Press.

Neville, P. (2013). *Historical dictionary of British foreign policy*. Washington DC: Historical Dictionary of British Foreign Policy.

Oechslin, M. (2014). Targeting autocrats: Economic sanctions and regime change. *European Journal of Political Economy, 36*, 24-40. doi:10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2014.07.003

Önder, A., & Yilmazkuday, H. (2014). Trade Partner Diversification and Growth: How Trade Links Matter. *University of Bayreuth, Deptartment of Economics,,* 1-12. Retrieved May 16, 2016, from https://papers.ssrn.com.

Pape, R. A. (1997). Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work. *International Security, 22*(2), 90. doi:10.2307/2539368

Resolution 418, The United Nations Security Council. (1977) Retrieved from http://www.un.org/documents

Resolution 558, The United Nations Security Council. (1984) Retrieved from http://www.un.org/documents

Riddell, R. (1986). *Sanctions and the South African Economy.* London: Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from https://www.odi.org

Robinson, T., & Boutwell, J. (1996). South Africa's Arms Industry: A New Era of Democratic Accountability? *Armed Forces & Society*, *22*(4), 599-618. doi:10.1177/0095327x9602200406

Sanlam. (1979). Sanctions and the South African Economy. Sanlam's Economic Review, 1-12. Retrieved May 7, from https://www.sanlam.com

Schraeder, P. J. (1994). *United States foreign policy toward Africa: Incrementalism, crisis, and change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sobel, A. C. (2013). *International political economy in context: Individual choices, global effects*. Los Angeles: CQ Press.

South African History Online. (2016). South Africa and the United Nations, 1946-1990. Retrieved May 16, 2016, from http://www.sahistory.org.za/article/south-africa-and-united-nations-1946-1990

The New York Times. (1985, October 21). Commonwealth Leaders Agree on Sanctions against South Africa. Retrieved May 16, 2016, from http://www.nytimes.com/1985/10/21/world/commonwealth-leaders-agree-on-sanctions-against-south-africa.html

Thompson, L. M. (1990). *A history of South Africa*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

U.S Department of State. (2009). The End of Apartheid. Retrieved May 28, 2016, from http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/pcw/98678.htm

Williams, L. (2015). South African gold mining's fall from grace. Retrieved June 1, 2016, from http://www.mineweb.com