**CHY4U Unit 4, Activity 2 – Effectiveness of Economic Sanctions**

**Against Apartheid**

**Instructions:**

1. **Read the excerpts from the article below and give evidence for the following categories (a,b,c,d):**

* Non-economic impact of sanctions.
* An anti-sanction person’s views.
* How sanctions affected the popularity of anti-apartheid movements.
* A disadvantage of looking at international organizations as the main factor in the end of apartheid.

**Source**: Joshua Keating, "Why did international sanctions work against South Africa but not against other dictatorships?", *Slate*, Dec. 6, 2013,  <http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_world_/2013/12/06/opponents_of_sanctions_on_south_africa_were_wrong_but_that_doesn_t_mean.html>

**a)**

'[Some people have given ] far too little credit to Nelson Mandela and his allies, to argue that international pressure was the main reason that apartheid fell. In the years since, some economists have even questioned just how much impact they [economic sanctions] really had.

In a [1999 paper](http://aida.wss.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp796.pdf), Phil Levy, then of Yale, argued that sanctions had far less of an impact on the situation than other factors including “the effectiveness of the political opposition of the black majority; the inefficiency and growing economic cost of the apartheid system; and the fall of the Soviet Union.”'…

**b)**

"If Congress imposes sanctions," [Ronald] Reagan [US President] [said in 1986](http://articles.philly.com/1990-02-13/news/25882801_1_sanctions-nelson-mandela-black-workers) speech, ''it would destroy America's flexibility, discard our diplomatic leverage, and deepen the [South African] crisis."…

**﻿c)**

'All the same, even if the economic impact of the sanctions and boycotts has been overstated, the psychological effect of them was clearly profound. As Levy acknowledges, “The sanctions signaled the extent to which South Africa was isolated in the international community.”

As one concerned high-level South African banker [put it to the *New York Times*](http://www.nytimes.com/1988/11/13/business/sanctions-squeeze-south-africa.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm) in 1988,  ''In this day and age, there is no such thing as economic self-sufficiency, and we delude ourselves if we think we are different. … South Africa needs the world.''

This goes to support the argument that sanctions are [most effective](http://www.piie.com/publications/papers/paper.cfm?ResearchID=342) against governments that *want* to trade with the countries sanctioning them and are sensitive to international public opinion. A country like South Africa, which had been a close U.S. ally throughout the Cold War, was more sensitive to sanctions than a place like North Korea or Cuba.'

**d)**

"The anti-apartheid movement was also effective because of the level of popular support it received. Former Free South Africa Movement Coordinator Cecelie Counts [explained it well](http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/01/27/is-divestment-an-effective-means-of-protest/divestment-was-just-one-weapon-in-battle-against-apartheid) earlier this year to the *New York Times*:

The 1976 Soweto uprising was the catalyst for new energy and sustained mobilization and protest. Local coalitions, candlelight vigils, picket lines, organizational caucuses against apartheid multiplied drastically. Most campuses saw heightened activity after Soweto. College students took over buildings and walked out of class in solidarity with their South African counterparts.

The apartheid regime’s brutality reached a new level in 1984, and one response came when the Free South Africa Movement engaged people from all walks of life in daily demonstrations and in civil disobedience for more than a year. Shantytowns sprung up on college campuses that had not yet divested [taken their money out of South Africa], an international campaign against Royal Dutch Shell was launched in 1986. The groundswell of opposition to apartheid led Congress to override President Reagan’s s veto of the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 [in which he had refused to impose sanctions].

Divestment began to affect South Africa as corporations let apartheid leaders know that it had become too expensive to continue operating there. Some would argue that many corporations simply shifted to indirect investments, but when banks began to refuse to renew loans it caused some real pain as the value of the rand fell."

1. **In terms of the causal triangle for the ending of Apartheid, where would you place the X? Why? Explain below using proof.**

X

Social Conditions/Forces/Isms (internal AND external)

Individuals (internal AND external)

Groups (internal AND external)