

THE DIFFERENTIAL IMPACT OF SANCTIONS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SOUTH AFRICA AND NORTH KOREA

DEBORAH EBUNOLUWA ADEYOMOYE

Department of History and International Studies, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo.
Email: Adeyomoyed@babcock.edu.ng, debbieadeyomoye@gmail.com

SAMUEL CHIEMELA

BIMUN Nigeria. Email: samuelc@bimun.org.ng

Abstract

This paper explores how international sanctions have affected South Africa and North Korea in different ways, despite both countries facing significant global pressure. Using a comparative approach, the study looks at the political and economic conditions that influenced the outcomes of these sanctions. In the case of South Africa, international sanctions, especially those targeting trade, finance, and cultural exchanges, played an important role in supporting domestic resistance and pushing the apartheid regime toward reform. These measures were more effective largely because of South Africa's deep ties to the global economy and growing internal opposition to apartheid. North Korea, by contrast, has remained largely unaffected in terms of policy change, even under some of the toughest sanctions ever imposed. Its isolated economy, strong centralized control, and backing from key allies have helped the regime withstand external pressure. The comparison reveals that sanctions do not work the same way in every context. Their success depends on factors like type of government, level of global integration, and international political dynamics. By analyzing these two cases, the paper offers insight into the conditions under which sanctions are more or less likely to influence state behavior.

Keywords: Apartheid, Diplomacy, International Sanctions, North Korea, Regime Change, South Africa.

INTRODUCTION

Sanctions have long been a central tool of international diplomacy, used by states and international organizations to influence the behavior of other governments without resorting to military intervention. While often viewed as a peaceful alternative to conflict, the effectiveness of sanctions remains widely debated. Some cases suggest that sanctions can play a pivotal role in bringing about political change, while others highlight their limitations, especially when applied to regimes that are resistant to external pressure. This paper examines the contrasting outcomes of sanctions in two notable cases: South Africa during the apartheid era and contemporary North Korea. Both countries faced sustained international sanctions, yet the results were marked different. In South Africa, sanctions were part of a broader global and domestic effort that eventually led to the end of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic government.

North Korea, on the other hand, has continued to defy international demands, maintaining its nuclear program and authoritarian rule despite decades of increasingly severe actions. By comparing these two cases, this study aims to identify the key political, economic, and strategic factors that influence the effectiveness of sanctions. Understanding these differences is essential for evaluating the role of sanctions in global policy and their potential as instruments of change.

Indices of Comparison of Sanctions Effectiveness in South Africa and North Korea

The indices of comparison are the specific factors that are used to compare and contrast the effectiveness of international sanctions in South Africa's apartheid regime and North Korea's nuclear program.

Sanctions Duration

South Africa

International sanctions against South Africa were imposed incrementally beginning from the 1960s and peaked in the 1980s. The imposition of sanctions against apartheid South Africa expanded over several decades, with the involvement of different countries and international organizations at different times. The initial appeal for international sanctions against apartheid South Africa began in the early 1960s. In this decade, the United Nations issued resolutions that condemned South Africa's apartheid policies. For instance, in 1962, the U.N. General Assembly urged member states to sever diplomatic, trade and transport relations with South Africa in order to compel South Africa to abandon its apartheid system.¹ These initial actions however, were not as methodical, punctilious or productive as the later sanctions. The 1970s heralded more international actions aimed at dismantling the apartheid regime. In 1973, the United Nations initiated a binding prohibition on the sale of weaponry to South Africa.

The 1980s witnessed a significant intensification in the imposition of global sanctions on South Africa. These sanctions were inclusive of economic, trade and diplomatic boycotts. In 1985, the Security Council urged members to apply more extensive economic sanctions against South Africa. The UN Security Council, adopted a resolution that mandated arms embargo and a ban on oil sales to South Africa.² The United States, in 1986 imposed comprehensive economic sanctions on South Africa, ranging from ban on new investments to restrictions on loans. By the early 1990s, international sanctions had significantly pressured the South African government to reconsider its racist policies. Added to these pressures were extensive negotiations with anti-apartheid leaders, all of which ushered in the significant changes announced by the then South African President, F.W. de Klerk in 1991. This action contributed to the easing of some sanctions. As negotiations between the apartheid government and the anti-apartheid groups (especially African National Congress) progressed, international sanctions were further eased. Upon the dismantling of apartheid and its transition to democracy, South Africa was reunited with the international community and the remaining sanctions were lifted or substantially reduced.

North Korea

International sanctions against North Korea in reaction to its nuclear and missile programs have been imposed over a period of time. The first significant international sanctions were enacted following North Korea's inaugural nuclear test on October 9, 2006. In reaction to this test, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1718 on October 14, 2006, imposing restrictions on North Korea. These sanctions included restrictions on the import and

export of arms and related material.³ A second nuclear test on May 25, 2009 earned the North Korean government expanded sanctions under Resolution 1874. These included restrictions on North Korea's weapons-related financial transactions. In reaction to a third nuclear test on February 12, 2003, the UN Security Council initiated Resolution 2094 which expanded the existing sanctions, targeting North Korea's banking and financial sectors.⁴ In 2016, following North Korea's fourth and fifth nuclear tests on January 6 and September 9 respectively, the UN Security Council imposed measures to cut North Korea's coal exports and sources of revenue.⁵ Sanctions were imposed on North Korea's oil and petroleum imports and textile exports in 2017 after it conducted its sixth and most powerful nuclear test on September 3, 2017.⁶ In spite of diplomatic efforts aimed at negotiating sanctions relief measures, sanctions have remained an integral part of the international response to North Korea's nuclear ambition and missile activities.

It is therefore evident that the South African apartheid regime experienced a longer sanctions duration, totaling over three decades compared to North Korea which has barely experienced two decades of sanctions.

Targeted Industries for South Africa

International sanctions imposed on South Africa's apartheid system targeted numerous key industries and sectors. The objective was to isolate the South African economy and mount pressure on the apartheid government to abandon its racist policies. The following are the industries targeted by international sanctions.^{7,8}

Arms and Defense: The export of arms, military hardware and technology to South Africa was restricted or banned in the bid to hinder the bolstering of its security forces. The reasons for targeting South Africa's Arms and Defense are a combination of human rights abuses perpetrated by the racist regime and the desire to discourage its participation in armed conflicts in neighboring countries like Angola and Namibia. In addition, the international community feared that South Africa's nuclear program had potential for nuclear weapons development which could further destabilize the region.

Trade and Investment: International sanctions limited South Africa's trade relations and foreign investment opportunities in order to pare down its economic growth. One of the primary objectives of imposing trade and investment sanctions was to weaken the South African economy and political influence by leveraging on its reliance on international trade and foreign investment, thereby making it difficult for the government to sustain its racist policies. Imposition of sanctions on South Africa's trade and investment was also from a moral and ethical stance as many countries and organizations feared their continued engagement with South Africa might indicate a support for the oppressive regime. It was also a means of identifying with the anti-apartheid movements within South Africa.

Mining and Minerals: South Africa is a leading producer of minerals, especially gold, diamonds and platinum. International sanctions limited international trade in these resources. Sanctions on these industries were specifically to reduce South Africa's revenue base and foreign exchange earnings because mineral exports were a major source of revenue for its government. Cutting the revenue available to the government

was intended to induce an abandon of the racist regime and an embrace of a more-inclusive political climate. Like in the case of its trade and investment, its mining and minerals industries were targeted also for moral and ethical reasons as well as global symbolism and international solidarity.

Oil: Sanctions were imposed on oil imports to South Africa to reduce its access to energy resources which was invaluable to its economy and transportation. Limiting the sale of oil, a crucial resource to South Africa threatened its economic capacity. This vulnerability raised the costs of daily living and economic activities, thereby raising economic costs of sustaining apartheid policies.

Banking and Finance: International sanctions restricted South Africa's access to international financial markets, making it more difficult for the country to secure loans and investments. Sanctions on the banking and finance sector impacted investor confidence. The international business community grew hesitant about investing in South Africa because of concerns about political instability in the country and risks associated with affiliation with the apartheid government.

Transportation: International sanctions impacted South Africa's transportation industry, restricting access to international shipping, airline routes and ports. The South African government's discriminatory policies introduced severe racial isolation in every aspect of life, including transportation. Non-white South Africans were subjected to a separate and inferior public transportation system. The transport industry represented a symbol of the apartheid government. Sanctions on transportation were therefore a means to signal the dissent of the international community as well as call attention to the injustices of apartheid. Sanctions on transport also affected the smooth-flow of communication and international trade in South Africa.

Food and Agriculture: South African agricultural products, including fruits and vegetables were subjected to export restrictions. Many black South Africans were denied access to productive farmland, reinforcing the economic marginalization and food insecurity. By targeting major sectors like agriculture, the international community sought to enervate the apartheid regime.

Sporting and Cultural Events: Sanctions isolated South Africa from international sporting and cultural events. For example, it was banned from international sporting competitions such as the Olympics (1964-1992), FIFA World Cup (1964-1992) and International Rugby. It was also suspended from the Miss World pageant during the racist regime.

Education and Academic Exchanges: International sanctions also impacted academic and educational exchanges between South Africa and the international community, limiting its access to international research and educational opportunities.⁹ Exclusion from academic and educational exchanges was a means to criminalize the apartheid regime.

Tourism: International sanctions against South Africa also discouraged tourism and traveling to the country as part of international disapproval of the apartheid system.

Targeted Industries for North Korea

International sanctions against North Korea are aimed at several key industries and activities, especially those related to the country's nuclear weapons program and human rights violations. The following are some of the strategic industries targeted by sanctions.^{10,11}

Military and Defense Industry: North Korea's military and defense industry is the primary target of international sanctions in North Korea. Sanctions have been imposed to obstruct North Korea's capability to develop and export nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technologies. These sanctions have been imposed primarily due to the international community's apprehensiveness about the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the potential security threats they pose for the region and the international community at large.

Trade and Finance: International sanctions inhibit North Korea's access to international trade and financial systems. This frustrates the regime's ability to generate revenue to finance its nuclear program and conduct illegal activities such as counterfeiting, smuggling and cyber-attacks. Targeting North Korea's trade and finance is also a diplomatic tool to help induce North Korea's participation in negotiation and denuclearization talks. By isolating it from international trade and finance, sanction are meant to create economic and diplomatic inducements for cooperation.

Luxury Goods: Restrictions have been placed on luxury items to limit the access of North Korean elites to luxury goods. High-end products such as luxurious cars, watches and electronics represent the grand lifestyle of the elite in the country including its leadership and high-ranking officials in spite of the impoverishment of the general populace. Restricting access to luxury goods is aimed at emphasizing the contrariety in the living conditions of the elite and the general populace.

Minerals and Natural Resources: Restriction on North Korea's export of mineral resources such as coal and iron have undermined its ability to generate revenue from natural resources which it could utilize to advance its nuclear weapons program and military. The concern that revenue generated this way may only benefit the country's leadership and not the entire population is another rationale behind these sanctions.

Labour Exports: North Korea has a culture of sending its citizens to work in other countries under conditions that are often described as exploitative. Labour is made to endure long hours, low income and infringement of freedom, with a sizeable portion of their wage going to the coffers of the North Korean government. Revenue realized this way constitutes a significant revenue stream for the regime. By placing restrictions on labour exports, sanctions aim to cut the regime's access to funds which could be used to support its military and nuclear weapons program.

Arms and Arms-Related Sales: International sanctions limit the export and import of conventional arms as well as related materials and technologies. North Korea's arm sales are in contravention of UN Security Council resolutions, inducing international action to enforce compliance and prevent further proliferation. Similarly, there are concerns by neighboring countries such as South Korea and Japan, that arms sale by North Korea is a potential threat to regional stability and security in East Asia.

Financial Institutions: International sanctions have targeted North Korean banks and financial institutions that are suspected of being involved in illegal financial activities such as money laundering, counterfeiting and cyber-attacks. The involvement of the regime in financial activities that enhance its nuclear ambition is in violation of non-proliferation commitments and UN Security Council resolutions. Sanctions are used to induce compliance.

International Cohesion

International cohesion pertains to the extent of unity, cooperation and solidarity among the governments of different countries in the global arena. It refers to the willingness of states to combine and coordinate their efforts to address common challenges, advance common goals and foster stability in the international system. International cohesion is crucial for addressing international challenges and preserving the existing world order. It is influenced by factors such as competing interests, economic dissimilarities and changing leadership in different countries, all of which can foster or erode international cooperation.

The international dissent against the apartheid regime in South Africa was robust, accentuated by the passage of multiple resolutions that condemned the policies of the regime as well as encouraged the imposition of sanctions. Several countries, including major powers, consented to resolutions aimed at crippling the racist system. Countries such as the United States and European powers championed the promotion of resolutions against the apartheid government. This indicates high cohesion in addressing apartheid in South Africa. The topic of North Korea's nuclear program on the other hand, has occasioned major divisions among UN member states. Major world powers such as the United States and China have had differing positions on how to handle North Korea's nuclear ambitions. The involvement of the two super power nations has resulted in opposite stances and a lack of consensus on how to address North Korea's nuclear program.

Role of Regional Blocs

There was a concerted effort from African states to annihilate the apartheid system, with unflinching support for UN sanctions against South Africa. Several countries from different regions in the world, particularly in Europe and in the Americas, also expressed solidarity, further reinforcing cohesion. Whereas, in North Korea's case, regional dynamics and divergent opinions have further complicated and undermined the efforts to address the challenge of North Korea's nuclear program. North Korea's neighbors, South Korea and Japan, have taken different approaches on the matter. While both countries share serious

concerns about North Korea's nuclear program, they have employed different approaches. Japan perceives North Korea's nuclear program as a direct threat to its own security and the stability and security of the region at large. It has participated in peace talks and negotiations, as well as consistently supported international sanctions against North Korea. South Korea on the other hand, counterbalances its security concerns with a focus on inter-Korean engagement and diplomacy with the aim of fostering peace and disarmament on the Korean Peninsula. These differences are influenced by their unique historical context and geopolitical locations, and they further reveal the lack of a concerted effort to curb North Korea's nuclear weapons proliferation.

Several African states played a pivotal role in supporting sanctions against South Africa. Front Line States like Zimbabwe, Zambia and Mozambique worked closely in the imposition of sanctions on South Africa.¹²The Front Line States were a loosely aligned group of African states, who from the 1960s to the 1990s were united in their dedication to dismantling apartheid and white minority rule in South Africa and Rhodesia. The African National Congress (ANC), which was resisting apartheid, enjoyed massive support from neighboring countries and other African states. Safe haven for ANC members were provided as well as applying international sanctions. The sweeping support of the international community contributed in no small measure to making it a well-coordinated movement. This is however not the case in the North Korean nuclear scenario. In the case of North Korea, its neighbors, China, Russia, Japan and South Korea, have been hesitant to support severe sanctions for different reasons. While China and Russia fear that comprehensive sanctions may destabilize the region, Japan and South Korea have been constrained by their proximity to North Korea. The lack of cohesion within the region has undermined the effectiveness of sanctions. Since China and Russia are two of the five countries which enjoy the right of veto in the UN Security Council, their restraint has impacted the level of sanctions to be imposed on North Korea. This clearly depicts a more extensive regional cohesion within the context of South Africa as opposed to the inherent divisions brought on by differing regional interests in the case of North Korea.

Participation and Compliance

Comparing participation and compliance in the imposition of international sanctions in the cases of South Africa's apartheid system and North Korea's nuclear program highlights major differences in the approach and enforcement of the sanctions. The imposition of sanctions against South Africa's apartheid system enjoyed open consensus in the global community. The sweeping consensus on the criminality of the system made it easier to generate support for sanctions. Several countries, especially in Africa and in the Western world, took active participation in these sanctions with the UN and international organizations playing significant roles in coordinating the efforts. In the case of North Korea's nuclear program, reaching international consensus has been more difficult. While there is widespread affirmation of the threats to regional and global stability that the nuclear program poses, major powers like China and Russia have been reluctant in imposing extreme sanctions.

The sanctions imposed on South Africa achieved relative success in terms of compliance. South Africa's status of a political and economic pariah in the international system, mounted significant pressure on its government to abandon its racist policies. Eventually, a combination of internal and external pressures led to the termination of the apartheid government and the installation of a more inclusive democratic government in the early 1990s. In North Korea's case however, sanctions have often been compromised and undermined by sanctions evasion and laxity in enforcement. North Korea has demonstrated sturdiness in the face of sanctions. Its attitude is partly attributable to its self-sustaining economy and engagement in illegal activities such as cybercrime and smuggling. There have however been occasions of sanctions evasion by countries like China, Russia and Malaysia, making unanimous wide-spread compliance difficult to achieve.¹³ For example, North Korea is notorious for conducting ship-to-ship transfers of items such as oil, coal and other sanctioned items at sea, thus avoiding detection. It also uses front companies in third-party countries and intermediaries to facilitate trade, shroud the true origin of goods and conceal financial transactions.¹⁴ It has also been associated with using diplomatic pouches to transport sanctioned items as well as misleading port authorities by either under-reporting the value and quantity of goods or intentionally mislabeling them to avoid scrutiny.

Sanction Types

The typicality of the issue addressed and the types of regimes involved, necessitated the application of different types of sanctions on South Africa and North Korea. In the instance of South Africa's apartheid system, a combination of economic sanctions, arms embargo and cultural and sporting boycotts were implemented. The economic sanctions included restrictions on trade, foreign investments and financial transactions. Arms embargo implied a prohibition of the sale of arms and military equipment to South Africa. In addition, South Africa was excluded from participating in international cultural and sporting events. For North Korea, a combination of economic sanctions, arms embargo, Travel restrictions, asset freezes and sanctions on luxury goods have been imposed on the regime. The economic sanctions include trade and financial restrictions, and targeted sanctions against persons and entities that have been linked with the nuclear program. Sanctions on luxury items are a means to limit North Korea's leadership access to luxurious goods.

Diplomatic Isolation

South Africa was subjected to considerable diplomatic isolation as it was expelled from the UN General Assembly in 1974 and was not readmitted to the UN until it ended its apartheid system in 1994. Several countries and international organizations implemented sanctions that isolated South Africa from many international events (including sporting events), forums and financial markets. In addition, South Africa was subjected to cultural and academic isolation as artists, musicians and academics stayed away from South Africa and refused collaborations with individuals and entities associated with the regime. North Korea on the other hand, continues to maintain its membership at the UN in spite of the several rounds of UN sanctions it has been subjected to. Another dissimilarity is

that North Korea has been involved in some multilateral discussions concerning its nuclear program, such as the six-Party Talks involving the United States, China, Russia, Japan and South Korea. Even though these diplomatic efforts have not yielded a resolution, they signal a level of diplomatic engagement. Similarly, in spite of sanctions, North Korea has been involved in direct bilateral diplomacy with numerous countries including the United States, South Korea and China. In addition, North Korea enjoys economic and diplomatic relations with a few countries, notably, China and Russia, thus providing a level of diplomatic and economic solidarity, reducing the overall impact of the isolation. Evidences therefore point to the fact that South Africa suffered a more substantial diplomatic isolation compared to North Korea.

International Public Opinion

South Africa's apartheid regime was met with widespread condemnation because of its discriminatory policies and human rights abuses. There was therefore sweeping international support for imposition of sanctions as a means of subduing the racist government. International opinion on the matter largely supported the imposition of sanctions as an ethical response to apartheid, further pressuring governments and institutions to enforce sanctions. The North Korean nuclear issue however appears to be a more complex matter and likewise the international opinion concerning the matter. It does not only involve its nuclear program, but also regional security concerns and budding humanitarian crises. Public comprehension of the issue is often limited which can impact opinions on the effectiveness of sanctions. Limited information and understanding of the historical context and intricacies of North Korea's nuclear program, as well as the geopolitical dynamics and implications, affect international perceptions on the appropriateness and efficacy of sanctions. Public opinion on sanctions against North Korea varies from country to country. While some people advocate stringent sanctions as a means to denuclearize the Korean peninsula, others worry about the biting effects they may have on the North Korean civilian population. Public opinion is also influenced by geopolitical contemplation, with countries like China and Russia having differing perspectives on sanctions due to their dynamic interests in the region. In several countries, the North Korean issue does not enjoy the same degree of attention, engagement or activism as the apartheid movement did. This is probably attributable to the complexity of the matter, the geographical distance, or the notion that it is essentially a matter between governments.

Domestic Response

Domestic responses to the sanctions regimes in South Africa and North Korea differ in some key aspects. Apartheid was a system of institutionalized racial segregation and discrimination that marginalized and maltreated the black majority population in South Africa. It was a system that was hated by the majority population (including some whites) and received strong international condemnation. The North Korean nuclear program on the other hand has nothing to do with racial segregation but military and political control. The country has a dynastic dictatorial leadership who is insistent on developing nuclear weapons and expanding its nuclear capabilities. The regime maintains a firm hold on its

population through a stringent state apparatus, propaganda and censorship. Hence, there is very little room for domestic resistance.

Regime Response

The responses of the different regimes in South Africa and North Korea to the international sanctions imposed on them are significantly different. The F.W. de Klerk led South African government acknowledged the international exclusion and economic impact of the sanctions. It prompted the South African government to seek out diplomatic solutions through negotiations with anti-apartheid leaders, notably Nelson Mandela. These negotiations eventually led to the end of the apartheid regime. Also, the South African government partially consented to domestic and international demands by reversing apartheid laws and emancipating political prisoners. North Korea on the other hand, has repeatedly ignored international sanctions. It has instead retaliated with affronting actions such as conducting nuclear tests and missile launches. These sanctions have further exacerbated tensions on the Korean Peninsula. While it has participated in negotiations and Peace Talks, they have been minimally successful. It has occasionally agreed to temporary measures but refused to consent to total denuclearization as demanded by the global community. The North Korean regime strictly controls the flow of information within the country, depicting the regime as steadfast in the face of external pressure. It portrays sanctions as unfair and harsh actions taken by foreign powers. The regime's ability to evade sanctions through illicit activities such as smuggling, cyber attacks and illegal trade has helped to provide it with alternatives for some of the economic effects of the sanctions. Its internal controls, self-reliance and support from major powers like China are responsible for the regime's continued resilience in the face of sanctions.

Economic Impact

The economic impact of sanctions on South Africa was striking. The country suffered restrictions on foreign investments, exports and loans, all of which had a deleterious effect on its economy. The targeting of South Africa's economy led to capital flight, restricted access to sophisticated technologies and foreign investment. It is noteworthy that the sanctions also had serious consequences on the South African population, especially the Black majority. Unemployment and poverty rates skyrocketed as a result of the plummeting economy.

North Korea's economic situation, like every other aspect of the country, is highly taciturn and isolated. It is therefore difficult to determine the exact economic impact of sanctions. It is however evident that sanctions have had some effect, due to reports of food shortages (especially for at risk groups such as children and aged populations), economic hardship and limited foreign trade. Shortages of essential commodities such as food, medicine and fuel and turning to illegal activities for survival are some of the consequences sanctions have inflicted on the North Korean populace. Sanctions have hampered North Korea's economic development and its ability to invest in economic sectors such as infrastructure and technology. The regime's policy of self-reliance further

isolates the country from the global economy and allows it to continue to resist sanctions to a greater extent compared to South Africa.

Political Impact

Sanctions helped to bolster political opposition within South Africa. Revolutionist like Nelson Mandela and movements like the African National Congress (ANC) gained international solidarity and legitimacy. They also drove a wedge within the apartheid government and business community. Some of the white populations began to embrace the idea of political reform as a means to end the isolation. The duality of internal and external pressures ultimately led to the transition to democracy in South Africa. Thereafter, South Africa established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) to confront past human rights abuses and foster national reconciliation. North Korea on the other hand has continued to utilize its nuclear weapons program as a shield for regime survival and leverage in international negotiations. Sanctions have not altered the regime's dedication to its nuclear weapons program. The regime's response to international sanctions have often been to scale up its nuclear and missile activities, further intensifying the divide between the country and the global community. Sanctions have also deepened security concerns in the region, resulting into an arms race in which neighboring countries have bolstered their own military abilities in response to North Korea's nuclear program.

Sanctions Outcome

The sanctions against South Africa, in addition to a strong apartheid resistance, significantly influenced the urgency to end apartheid. The economic and political isolation brought on by the sanctions, coupled with relentless internal resistance, eventually led to negotiations for a cordial transition to democratic rule. In 1994, Nelson Mandela was elected as the first black president of South Africa and apartheid formally came to an end. The effectiveness of sanctions against North Korea, on the other hand is limited. North Korea, in spite of sanctions, has continued to develop its nuclear program, conduct nuclear tests and launch missiles. The regime has signaled resilience and flexibility in eluding sanctions through illicit activities, networks and trading partners. Therefore, international sanctions have yet to result in an absolute denuclearization of North Korea.

CONCLUSION

Comparing the effectiveness of international sanctions in the two case studies reveals both successful and unsuccessful aspects of the use of sanctions as a diplomatic tool. It accentuates the importance of numerous factors such as international cohesion, domestic resistance, regime dynamism and diplomatic complexities in achieving a successful sanctions regime. In South Africa's case, sanctions played a crucial role in occasioning political change and dismantling apartheid. In North Korea's case however, even though sanctions have had some impact on the country, the regime's devotion to its nuclear program, diplomatic complexities and the aid it receives from some major actors have undermined the success of sanctions in achieving complete denuclearization. Both case

studies reveal that sanctions effectiveness can differ significantly based on context dynamics and willingness for compliance with the preferences of the global community by the target state.

End Notes

- 1) South African History Online, South Africa's Foreign Relations during Apartheid, 1948, <https://www.sahistory.org.za>. Retrieved 30/12/2022.
- 2) South African History Online, South Africa's Foreign Relations during Apartheid, 1948...
- 3) Arms Control Association, UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea, www.armscontrol.org. Retrieved 28/03/2023.
- 4) Arms Control Association, UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea...
- 5) Arms Control Association, UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea...
- 6) Arms Control Association, UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea...
- 7) S. Stevens, Boycotts and Sanctions against South Africa, <https://academiccommons.columbia.edu>. Retrieved 23/10/2023.
- 8) P. Tlale, Sanctions Against Apartheid, www.sahistory.org. Retrieved 11/01/2023.
- 9) The Guardian, "84 Colleges Withdraw Investments in South Africa" in The Guardian Newspaper, 18th April, 1986. p.5
- 10) Arms Control Association, UN Security Council Resolutions on North Korea...
- 11) A. Mansourov, The Origins, Evolution, and Current Politics of the North Korean Nuclear Program, <https://www.tandfonline.com>. Retrieved 17/03/2023.
- 12) K. Mbuende, "Conflict Prevention and Resolution in the South African Development Community (SADC)" in International Journal on Minority Group Rights, Vol. 8(1), 2001, <https://www.jstor.org>. Retrieved 20/11/2023.
- 13) K. Mallory, North Korean Sanctions: Evasion Techniques, 2021, <https://www.rand.org>. Retrieved 20/11/2023.
- 14) K. Mallory, North Korean Sanctions: Evasion Techniques...