ENTRY #209

MALULEKE RIVONINGO ZANDI

TSHWANE UNIVERSITY OF TECHOLOGY

222713315

Analyze how trade protectionism, especially higher import tariffs, affects South Africa's ability to create jobs.

INTRODUCTION

With a youth unemployment rate of over 46% and an unemployment rate of 32.9% as of early 2025, South Africa faces a significant socioeconomic crisis. As a result, trade protectionism, especially higher import tariffs, has become more popular among policymakers as a means of defending homegrown businesses and maintaining employment. This strategy has shown both offensively, as South Africa considers hiking duties to the WTO-permitted maximum of 50% on specific automobiles, and defensively, against the prospect of cheap imports from nations like China and India. However, this strategy's effectiveness is complicated. Although protectionism provides an effortless way to safeguard local jobs, economic analysis and historical experience indicate that these policies frequently have unforeseen repercussions that could eventually hurt the very workers they are supposed to protect.

Background: The Protectionist Impulse and the Industrial Context of South Africa

Significant structural constraints have been placed on South Africa's manufacturing industry, which has historically been a major employer. Local manufacturers and their supply chains have been badly undercut by an increase in automobile imports, with China and India making up 53% and 22% of the total, respectively. Local producers contend that their prices are too high to compete with those of these imports, which results in job losses and business closures. The government is now considering increasing tariffs on components to 10–12% and on passenger cars from 25% to 50% as a result. The rationale is presented as an essential defense to "maintain employment and industrial capability."

At the same time, tariffs imposed by its own trading partners have caused disruptions for South Africa. As a mid-sized open economy, South Africa is vulnerable to protectionist policies elsewhere, as demonstrated by the United States' declaration in 2025 of a 30% tariff on South African imports. According to official estimates, just one policy might result in the loss of about 30,000 jobs and a 0.2 percentage point slowdown in economic growth. This highlights a basic risk: protectionism can set off cycles of retaliation that result in net losses for all parties.

The Conflict Between Job Creation and Protectionism

Whether higher tariffs can consistently promote net job creation is the main source of conflict. Tariffs make domestically produced alternatives more competitive by raising the price of imported items. This should enable local businesses to expand their workforce and boost output. This reasoning supports the planned car tariffs in South Africa, which aim to restore market share from imports for domestic producers like Mercedes-Benz, Ford, and BMW.

This viewpoint is not full, though. First, for domestic producers who depend on imported components, tariffs increase input costs. This kind of trade restriction "may boost production costs" and is "usually a costly strategy to protect jobs for select groups within society," according to the World Trade Organization (WTO). For instance, in the automobile industry, suppliers who import parts may suffer greater costs, which could squeeze their margins and force them to cut their workforce, even while final product assembly may be protected.

Second, inefficiency may be encouraged by tariff protection. Businesses that are protected from global competition are less motivated to innovate and boost output. Eventually, this may weaken them rather than strengthen them. Instead, then depending on trade barriers, which might only protect jobs for some at the expense of others, governments would do better to assist workers in acquiring in-demand skills, according to the chief economist of the WTO. In South Africa, where the high unemployment rate necessitates sustainable rather than fake job development, this is especially pertinent.

Third, the South African economy's export-oriented industries offer a sharp contrast. US tariffs, which might raise export costs by $4.25 per carton, have directly endangered the citrus industry, a significant employment. Protecting the jobs of one industry can unintentionally expose others to foreign retribution, as seen by the anxiety in the Western Cape's citrus-growing regions. By encouraging export market diversification and utilizing the African Continental Free Trade Area in response to the US tariff threat, the South African government recognizes that a protectionist strategy is unsustainable and that a strong and open trade environment is essential for job preservation.

CONCLUSION

Higher import tariffs are a crude and frequently ineffective tool for promoting long-term job growth, according to an analysis of trade protectionism in South Africa. Tariffs can give targeted domestic industries a temporary reprieve, as demonstrated by the proposed automotive measures, but this advantage is usually outweighed by increased production costs, the possibility of retaliation against important export industries, and the potential to promote long-term industrial complacency. The US tariffs on South African goods serve as a lesson in how relying too much on protectionist reasoning can result in large job losses.

A more complex and all-encompassing industrial policy that prioritizes increasing competitiveness, investing in workforce skills, and actively broadening export markets is needed if South Africa is to successfully address its unemployment crisis. Instead of trying to construct walls that can easily crumble under the pressure of the global market, this strategy is more likely to create a resilient economy that can generate jobs in the face of international competition.