**MANDELA’S SOURCES**

**DOC A: Nelson Mandela, speech describing international boycotts due to apartheid, “Address to the Conference of the Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa” (excerpt), 1962**

12 January 1962, Addis Ababa [Ethiopia]

**The movement for the boycott of South African goods and for the imposition [placement] of economic and diplomatic sanctions [by other countries] against South Africa has served to highlight most effectively the despotic [tyrannical] structure of the power that rules South Africa, and has given tremendous inspiration to the liberation movement in our country.**

But uneasy lies the head that wears the crown of White supremacy in South Africa. The banning and confinement of leaders, banishments and deportations, imprisonment and even death, have never deterred South African patriots.

**In May last year a general strike was called. Our people stood up to the test most magnificently. The response was less than we expected but we made solid and substantial achievements. Hundreds of thousands of workers stayed away from work and the country`s industries and commerce [business] were seriously damaged. Hundreds of thousands of students and schoolchildren did not go to school for the duration of the strike.**

**The celebrations which had been planned by the government to mark the inauguration of the republic [South Africa led by Afrikaners] were not only completely boycotted by the Africans, but were held in an atmosphere of tension and crisis in which the whole country looked like a military camp in a state of unrest and uncertainty. This panic stricken show of force was a measure of the power of the liberation movement.**

**Only by our combined efforts and united action can we repulse the multiple onslaughts of the imperialists [Afrikaner gov’t] and fight our way to victory. Our enemies fight collectively and combine to exploit our people.**

**During the last ten years the African people in South Africa have fought many freedom battles, involving civil disobedience, strikes, protest marches, boycotts and demonstrations of all kinds. In all these campaigns we repeatedly stressed the importance of discipline, peaceful and non-violent struggle. We did so, firstly because we felt that there were still opportunities for peaceful struggle and we sincerely worked for peaceful changes. Secondly, we did not want to expose our people to situations where they might become easy targets for the trigger-happy police of South Africa. But the situation has now radically altered.**

South Africa is now a land ruled by the gun. All opportunities for peaceful agitation and struggle have been closed. Africans no longer have the freedom even to stay peacefully in their houses in protest against the oppressive policies of the government. During the strike in May last year the police went from house to house, beating up Africans and driving them to work.

Hence it is understandable why today many of our people are turning their faces away from the path of peace and non-violence. They feel that peace in our country must be considered already broken when a minority government maintains its authority over the majority by force and violence. A crisis is developing in earnest in South Africa. [. . **.] Certainly, the days of civil disobedience, of strikes, and mass demonstrations are not over and we will resort to them over and over again.**

**DOC B: Nelson Mandela, statement from the dock at the opening of the defense case in the Rivonia trial (excerpt), 1964**

**Adapted from:** [**http://www.anc.org.za/content/nelson-mandelas-statement-dock-rivonia-trial**](http://www.anc.org.za/content/nelson-mandelas-statement-dock-rivonia-trial)

Pretoria Supreme Court, 20 April 1964

I am a convicted prisoner serving five years for leaving the country without a permit and for inciting people to go on strike at the end of May 1961.

I do not [. . .] deny that I planned sabotage. I did not plan it in a spirit of recklessness, nor because I have any love of violence. [. . .]

Firstly, we believed that as a result of Government policy, violence by the African people had become inevitable, and that [. . .] there would be outbreaks of terrorism which would produce an intensity of bitterness and hostility between the various races of this country which is not produced even by war. Secondly, we felt that without violence there would be no way open to the African people to succeed in their struggle against the principle of white supremacy. All lawful modes of expressing opposition to [white supremacy] had been closed by legislation, and we were placed in a position in which we had either to accept a permanent state of inferiority, or to defy the Government. We chose to defy the law.

But the violence which we chose to adopt was not terrorism. We who formed Umkhonto [Spear of the Nation] had behind us the ANC tradition of non-violence. We believe that South Africa belongs to all the people who live in it, and not to one group, be it black or white. We did not want an interracial war, and tried to avoid it to the last minute. [. . .]

It was only when all else had failed, when all channels of peaceful protest had been barred to us, that the decision was made to embark on violent forms of political struggle, and to form Umkhonto we Sizwe. We did so not because we desired such a course, but solely because the Government had left us with no other choice. I can only say that I felt morally obliged to do what I did.

**In the light of our [peaceful history, we chose sabotage]. Sabotage did not involve loss of life, and it offered the best hope for future race relations. Bitterness would be kept to a minimum and, if the policy bore fruit, democratic government could become a reality.**

**We felt that planned destruction of power plants, and interference with rail and telephone communications, would tend to scare away capital from the country, make it more difficult for goods from the industrial [business/factory] areas to reach the seaports on schedule, and would in the long run be a heavy drain on the economic life of the country, thus compelling [forcing] the [white] voters of the country to reconsider their position.**

**Attacks on the economic life lines of the country were to be linked with sabotage on Government buildings and other symbols of apartheid. These attacks would serve as a source of inspiration to our people. In addition, they would provide an outlet for those people who were urging the adoption of violent methods and would enable us to give concrete proof to our followers that we had adopted a stronger line and were fighting back against Government violence.**

**In addition, if mass action were successfully organized, and mass reprisals [acts of revenge] taken, we felt that sympathy for our cause would be [created] in other countries, and that greater pressure would be brought to bear on the South African Government.**

**Umkhonto was to perform sabotage, and strict instructions were given to its members right from the start, that on no account were they to injure or kill people in planning or carrying out operations.**

During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination [control], and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.

**DOC C: Article published in *Time Magazine* – Nelson Mandela – Dec. 31, 1999 – “The Sacred Warrior: The liberator of South Africa looks at the seminal work of the liberator of India”**

[**http://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,993025-1,00.html**](http://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,993025-1,00.html)

India is Gandhi's country of birth; South Africa his country of adoption. He was both an Indian and a South African citizen. Both countries contributed to his intellectual and moral genius, and he shaped the liberatory [freedom] movements in both colonial theaters [India and South Africa vs. Europeans].

His strategy of noncooperation, his assertion [statement] that we can be dominated only if we cooperate with our dominators, and his nonviolent resistance inspired anticolonial and antiracist movements internationally in our century.

**Both Gandhi and I suffered colonial oppression [unjust, cruel treatment], and both of us mobilized our respective peoples against governments that violated our freedoms. The Gandhian influence dominated freedom struggles on the African continent right up to the 1960s because of the power it generated and the unity it forged among the apparently powerless. Nonviolence was the official stance of all major African coalitions, and the South African A.N.C. remained implacably opposed to violence for most of its existence.**

**Gandhi remained committed to nonviolence; I followed the Gandhian strategy for as long as I could, but then there came a point in our struggle when the brute force of the oppressor could no longer be countered through passive resistance alone. We founded Unkhonto we Sizwe and added a military dimension to our struggle. Even then, we chose sabotage because it did not involve the loss of life, and it offered the best hope for future race relations.** Militant action became part of the African agenda [. . .] following my address to the Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa (PAFMECA) in 1962, in which I stated, "Force is the only language the imperialists can hear, and no country became free without some sort of violence."

Gandhi himself never ruled out violence absolutely and unreservedly. He conceded the necessity of arms in certain situations. He said, "Where choice is set between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence... I prefer to use arms in defense of honor rather than remain the vile witness of dishonor..."

Violence and nonviolence are not mutually exclusive; it is the predominance [more frequent] of the one or the other that labels a struggle. [Ghandi] **believes in the human capacity to change and wages [nonviolence] against the oppressor, not to destroy him but to transform him, that he cease his oppression and join the oppressed in the pursuit of Truth.**

**We in South Africa brought about our new democracy relatively peacefully on the foundations of such thinking, regardless of whether we were directly influenced by Gandhi or not.**

**DOC D: article from *The Los Angeles Times*** [**http://www.latimes.com/world/worldnow/la-fg-wn-nelson-mandela-legacy-violence-20131206-story.html**](http://www.latimes.com/world/worldnow/la-fg-wn-nelson-mandela-legacy-violence-20131206-story.html) **“Nelson Mandela's legacy: As a leader, he was willing to use violence” Robyn Dixon, December 6, 2013**

**After his release, and on becoming South Africa’s chief executive [President] in 1994, Mandela adhered to the commitment to peace, tolerance and equality that became the hallmark of his presidency.** [. . .] Mandela in 1993 was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, along with then-South African President F.W. de Klerk, for the negotiations ending apartheid. **Mandela’s rhetoric [speech] changed from the sharp, angry words of a young revolutionary to the considered, dignified wisdom of a beloved elder. “Well, in a climate of this nature, when we are trying to reach settlement through negotiations, you don’t want rabble-rousing speeches,” Mandela replied. “I don’t want to incite [stir up] the crowd. I want the crowd to understand what we are doing and I want to infuse a spirit of reconciliation to them.”** Ultimately, the world remembers Mandela not for his call to arms, but for his gentler call for reconciliation in a country deeply divided by race to this day. The popular conception of Mandela as a saint, one he always debunked [exposed as untrue], ignores the moral struggle in the ANC that caused the movement to abandon nonviolence. In a 1979 letter to his then-wife, Winnie, Mandela reflected ruefully on the contradictions in people’s lives, and what it is to be human and fallible [capable of mistakes]. An excerpt appears in his last book, a collection of notes and writings, “Conversations with Myself.”

“One may be a villain for three-quarters of his life and be canonized [made sacred] because he lived a holy life for the remaining quarter of that life. In real life we deal [. . .] with ordinary humans like ourselves: men and women who are full of contradictions, who are stable and fickle, strong and weak, famous and infamous [. . .]”

1. How did Mandela use **nonviolence** to end Apartheid? List examples from the documents to support your answer.

**Strikes:**

**“In May last year a general strike was called” (DOC A).**

**“Hundreds of thousands of workers stayed away from work”” (DOC A).**

**“I am a convicted prisoner serving five years for [. . .] inciting people to go on strike at the end of May 1961” (DOC B).**

**Boycotts of the inaugural celebration of South Africa:**

**“The celebrations which had been planned by the government to mark the inauguration of the republic [South Africa led by Afrikaners] were not only completely boycotted by the Africans” (DOC A).**

**Civil disobedience and mass demonstrations:**

**“During the last ten years the African people in South Africa have fought many freedom battles, involving civil disobedience, strikes, protest marches, boycotts and demonstrations of all kinds. In all these campaigns we repeatedly stressed the importance of discipline, peaceful and non-violent struggle” (DOC A).**

**“Certainly, the days of civil disobedience, of strikes, and mass demonstrations are not over and we will resort to them over and over again” (DOC A).**

**“Nonviolence was the official stance of all major African coalitions, and the South African A.N.C. remained implacably opposed to violence for most of its existence” (DOC C).**

1. Why did the nonviolent actions work? List examples from the documents to support your answer.

**Strikes hurt the economy of South Africa (specifically its businesses and industries).**

**“the country`s industries and commerce [business] were seriously damaged” (DOC A).**

1. How did Mandela use **violence** to end Apartheid? List examples from the documents to support your answer.

Sabotage:

**“I do not [. . .] deny that I planned sabotage” (DOC B).**

**“In the light of our [peaceful history, we chose sabotage]” (DOC B).**

**“We felt that planned destruction of power plants, and interference with rail and telephone communications” (DOC B).**

**“Attacks on the economic life lines of the country were to be linked with sabotage on Government buildings and other symbols of apartheid” (DOC B).**

**“if mass action were successfully organized, and mass reprisals [acts of revenge] taken” (DOC B).**

**“We founded Unkhonto we Sizwe and added a military dimension to our struggle” (DOC C).**

1. Why did the violent actions work? List examples from the documents to support your answer.

**Sabotage**

**Mandela felt that nonviolence was so important that he did not want his sabotage to hurt or kill anyone.**

**Sabotage would not kill anyone, which prevented the Afrikaners from being even angrier against the non-white South Africans. Sabotage would help to end apartheid, but it would end it in a way that would also set up a better possibility for white and non-white South Africans eventually to work together to make a new South Africa. Without killings, having fair and equal elections might would be a possibility in post-apartheid South Africa.**

**“Sabotage did not involve loss of life, and it offered the best hope for future race relations. Bitterness would be kept to a minimum and, if the policy bore fruit, democratic government could become a reality” (DOC B).**

**“Even then, we chose sabotage because it did not involve the loss of life, and it offered the best hope for future race relations” (DOC C).**

**Destruction of Power Plants and Communication Interference**

**Mandela and the anti-apartheid activists were hoping that the destruction of power plants and the interference with communications would make South Africa lose capital (factories, machinery, money, etc.), would prevent produced goods from getting to the ports on time, and the destruction would eventually hurt the economic health of the country. Once the economy was weak, white voters would be more willing to vote to end apartheid so that the economy could become strong again.**

**“would tend to scare away capital from the country, make it more difficult for goods from the industrial [business/factory] areas to reach the seaports on schedule, and would in the long run be a heavy drain on the economic life of the country, thus compelling [forcing] the [white] voters of the country to reconsider their position” (DOC B).**

**Mass Reprisals**

**The acts of sabotage would make other countries feel bad for the oppression of the non-white South Africans, and the countries then would put pressure on the South African government to end apartheid.**

**“we felt that sympathy for our cause would be [created] in other countries, and that greater pressure would be brought to bear on the South African Government” (DOC B).**